Hagit Amirav

Authority and Performance

Sociological Perspectives on the Council of Chalcedon (AD 451)

V&R

V&R Academic

Hypomnemata

Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben

Herausgegeben von
Ewen Bowie, Albrecht Dihle,
Dorothea Frede, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, Günther Patzig,
Karla Pollmann, Christiane Reitz, Christoph Riedweg, Gisela Striker

Band 199

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Hagit Amirav

Authority and Performance

Sociological Perspectives on
the Council of Chalcedon (AD 451)

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Responsible editor:
Karla Pollmann

European Research Council
Established by the European Commission

Cover photograph: Fourth oecumenical council, Chalcedon, AD 451;
wall painting by Symeon Axenti, AD 1513, Church of St Sozomenos, Galata, Cyprus.
© Sonia Halliday Photographs

To Bas,
With love and admiration,
In celebration of our years together

Table of Contents

Preface

A fresh look at the bulky corpus of proceedings of church councils would ne-
cessitate transcending the all-obligatory theological perspective, and placing
the sociological aspects of a profoundly ceremonial event at the centre of any
interdisciplinary historical study. Dame Averil Cameron's *History as Text* and
The Rhetoric of Empire and Elizabeth Clark's *Reading Renunciation* and *The
Linguistic Turn*,[1] to name but a few notable works,[2] have been guiding lights and
boundless sources of encouragement for ancient historians, such as I am, in our
attempts at embracing the wealth of sociological and anthropological knowl-
edge en route to unlocking the social dynamics of ancient societies.

In trying to apply modern sociological and anthropological theories to the
study of ancient societies, the works of eminent scholars and thinkers in these
fields have been true eye-openers, and equally helpful in my attempts at grasp-
ing the social mindset of people involved in communal religious activities more
than 1500 years ago. Being an ancient historian, rather than a fully fledged so-
ciologist, I only hope that my occasional criticism of sociological and anthropo-
logical theories should be taken more as playful exercises en route to bettering
my sociological skills, rather than as serious attempts at refuting the theories of
minds far greater than mine. My hope and goal for the future is to refine fur-
ther my sociological, philosophical, and literary perceptions in a manner which
would further benefit the study of ancient societies in sociological and anthro-
pological contexts, and would convince other ancient historians to join the few
who have been engaged with similar tasks, or are already doing the same.

Mary Douglas succinctly describes her goals in the introduction to her *How
Institutions Think*, as 'to put the theme in a new light, to make it clearer and
more persuasive, and perhaps, at least, to say it right'.[3] Mary Douglas certainly
succeeded in achieving her goals. I hope that in trying to weave together history,

---

1 An earlier sociologically-oriented study by E. Clark is *The Origenist Controversy. The
Cultural Construction of an Earlier Christian Debate* (Princeton, 1992).

2 For additional and more recent studies, which mainly concentrate on the study of
social networks in antiquity, see note to p. 28 below.

3 M. Douglas, *How Institutions Think* (Syracuse, 1986), p. ix.

sociology, and theology, I, too, have also made the first step towards achieving mine. Given that we scholars, like Pierre Bourdieu's *homines academici*,[4] are caught up perhaps even more than anyone else in countless rhetorical loops, I remain forever aware of the fact that our attempts at analysing the discourse of others continuously shape our own academic discourse.

---

4 See, for example, P. Bourdieu on cases of euphemism in academic rhetoric: 'The academic dialectic of recognition and misconstrual attains its most accomplished form when the structure of the system of categories of perception and thought, which organize the expressions of academic judgement and this judgement itself, is in perfect harmony with the structure of the contents which the academic system is entrusted with transmitting, as is the case with literary or philosophical culture in its academic form' (Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, trans. P. Collier (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 208–209).

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to the Protestant Theological University in Groningen and Amsterdam, and to Hans-Martin Kirn, Head of the Department of Church History there, for having granted me a Post-Doctoral Fellowship which enabled me to write this book. The Faculty of Theology at VU University, Amsterdam, where I am currently based, and the Department of Church History there, have kindly provided me with the time and facilities to refine the manuscript further. The Dutch Interuniversity Centre for Patristic Research has been most encouraging. I thank its Director, Paul van Geest, and its dedicated members. Special debts of thanks are owed to the President and Fellows of the Oxford Centre of Hebrew and Jewish Studies at Yarnton Manor, and to the Principal and Fellows of Brasenose College, Oxford, who elected me to a Visiting Fellowship, and allowed me into their intriguing and wonderful worlds.

Sir Fergus Millar, who should also be credited here for introducing me to the manifold riches contained in the genre of the ancient *Acts*, Bas ter Haar Romeny, Dame Averil Cameron, Karla Pollmann, Vanja Ljujic — friends and colleagues from a variety of disciplines — have read the manuscript and made invaluable comments. I thank them for sharing their knowledge with me, and for manifesting their friendship so generously and profusely. Helen Richardson diligently corrected the English style. Dianne van de Zande and Mike Ruijsenaars prepared the manuscript for printing. I thank them, the editors who accepted my text for publication in their series, and the dedicated team at Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

I. Introduction

> Sociological theory cannot develop without knowledge of history.
>
> Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*

> An anthropologist has one first, necessary, step to make when setting out to study an ancient religion. The step is to locate the religion in some community of worshippers in some known historical time and space. Anthropologists are not trained to interpret utopias. We always try to place the religion to be studied alongside the other religions of its period and its region.
>
> Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature*

A. Choices, Aims, and Structure

The introduction to this book, as any other introduction, has a twofold purpose: to define and present the goals and limitations of the unfolding study, and to characterize its potential and intended readership. This particular work has different audiences as its focus: ancient historians and theologians, and also sociolinguists and cultural anthropologists interested in ceremonial behaviour (and I could be tempted here to end this sentence with the fashionable 'in traditional societies', but I will not do that, for society, any society, whether modern or 'traditional', is by definition also ceremonial).

In a work of an interdisciplinary nature, moving between the different audiences (and methods, and emphases) makes the writing of the whole piece, not only the introduction, a trickier task. What may be intended as a well-meant attempt at binding different ends together, at weaving a stronger rope from the vast assortment of fibres available, might easily be interpreted as an act of audacity at best, or as an act of intrusion and crude appropriation at worst. These problems present themselves throughout the body of an interdisciplinary work, but naturally, they come to the fore in the introduction and in a set of underlined questions: simplifying or patronizing; clarifying or stating the obvious; synthesizing or highlighting the new and the extraordinary?

As far as this introduction is concerned, at least, I have decided to offer a basic historical outline for the benefit of sociologists and anthropologists and a

basic sociolinguistic overview for the benefit of ancient historians, though also
for the benefit of the many sociologists who, despite Mary Douglas's magisterial
socio-anthropological study of the book of Leviticus,[1] might not be aware yet of
the vast sociological pasture ground provided by ancient texts.

1. The Scholarly Context

This study was prompted and encouraged by the recent general interest among
ancient historians whose focus is the history of ideas in texts which were hith-
erto considered purely 'theological', and the political, social, and religious cir-
cumstances which gave rise to their compilation and dissemination.

Within this intellectual context, the revival of interest in the proceedings of
ancient church gatherings in general, and in the *Acts* of Chalcedon in partic-
ular, is quite noticeable and remarkable. A better understanding of fifth-cen-
tury political, ecclesiastical and cultural landscape has been greatly facilitated
thanks to the seminal work of key scholarly figures, such as Richard Price, Fer-
gus Millar, and others who, each in their own way, have pushed the relevant
material to the fore of the scholarly arena, while embedding church politics in
general and the Chalcedonian council in particular in their wider political and
cultural contexts. In these studies, special efforts have been made respectively to
place the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon within the Theodosian heri-
tage on the one hand, and the Justinianic period, on the other.

In this context, we mention again the recent English translation (which most
importantly also includes the ancillary material), translated and annotated, on
the basis of Edward Schwartz's seminal edition,[2] by Richard Price and Michael
Gaddis.[3] Their work has greatly facilitated the current study of the text in its
original languages. A number of recently published important studies have an
equally important role in the revival of interest in ecclesiastical material.[4]

---

1 M. Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford, 1999).

2 E. Schwartz (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (Berlin, 1927-). The *Acts* of Chal-
cedon occupy *ACO* 2, of which *ACO* 2.1 contains the Greek *Acts* and related documents (in
three parts, published in 1933 and 1935). For the Latin version, see *idem*, *ACO* 2.3 (in three
parts, published in 1935, 1936, and 1938). See also A.-J. Festugière, *Éphèse et Chalcédonie:
actes des conciles* (Paris, 1982).

3 R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 3 vols. (Liverpool, 2005).

4 See G. E. M. Ste Croix, 'The Council of Chalcedon', repr. in: M. Whitby and J. Streeter
(ed.), *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom and Orthodoxy* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 259–319; R. Price
and M. Whitby (ed.), *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400–700* (Liverpool, 2009);
F. Millar, 'Bishops and their Sees at the Sixth Session of the Council of Chalcedon', in: R. W. V.
Catling and F. Marchand (ed.), *Onomatologos* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 568–577; *idem*, 'Linguis-
tic Co-existence in Constantinople: Greek and Latin (and Syriac) in the *Acts* of the Synod

I personally have been most encouraged by this renewed interest in the fifth century and the ecumenical councils of that period, and was convinced by Fergus Millar to direct my attention to the vast wealth of information contained in the *Acts*. In the following private communication, he stresses the position of the *Acts* of the Council of Chalcedon in our intellectual history, and their potential for further research:

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the *Acts* of the proceedings at the Church councils of the fifth and sixth centuries, in illuminating a vast range of aspects of the Late Roman state and the Church. For example, there is the history of language — first Greek, both as spoken and as written in their own hands by bishops subscribing to the decisions at each session — and then also Latin, in the shape of occasional interventions by bishops from the Latin West and, much more important, Latin translations made in the fifth and sixth centuries […]. Then there is the social geography of the Greek Church, with the lists of hundreds of bishops from cities large and small (and sometimes very small and obscure ones) from all over the Greek world, from the Balkans to Egypt. Then, either integrated into the texts of the *Acts* themselves, or attached to them by contemporaries assembling dossiers designed to promote one or other theological viewpoint, there are extracts from the works of the major theologians, homilies by bishops, Episcopal letters, sometimes crossing the Latin-Greek border, and, on a truly remarkable scale, official correspondence generated by secular officials or by the Emperors […].

The *Acts* of the Councils concerned are as follows: the first Council of Ephesus of CE 431; the second, of CE 449, where they are not preserved independently (except for one long selection in Syriac translation) but are quoted in vast detail in the *Acts* of Chalcedon; then Chalcedon itself, called in CE 451; the Synods of Constantinople (not formally recognized as a Church Council) and of Jerusalem of CE 536; and the Fifth Ecumenical Council, called by Justinian in CE 553, and held in Constantinople. […] However, for completeness, coherence (even if the numbering of the sessions varies as between the Greek and Latin versions vary), for dramatic vividness and for historical importance, none of the *Acts* of the others can quite match those of the Council of Chalcedon. For the extraordinary influence exercised at a distance by Leo (the Great), the pope of 441 to 460, led the Emperor to impose on the Council a Definition of the Faith, which caused profound conflicts in the Greek Church, and led to a division, which lasts to this day, between the 'Chalcedonians', or 'Dyophysites', who accepted the 'two-nature' Christological doctrines of Leo, and the

'Monophysites' who rejected them (now the Greek Orthodox and Syrian Orthodox Churches respectively).[5]

The doctrinal issues, and their long-lasting consequences, have been fully explored in major works, and some attention (though not nearly as much as the remarkably rich material would allow) has been paid both to the political context and the relations of Emperor and Church on the one hand, and to a series of fascinating local conflicts dealt with in the later sessions, which were required to settle disputed issues before the bishops departed. There has also been some analysis (though again far less than would be possible) of the initial record-taking, and the making and distribution of copies of the *Acts*. But until now no-one has taken the step of seeing the potential of these uniquely detailed records of how high-ranking government officials appointed by the Emperor controlled proceedings, of how the bishops were seated at each session, how rhetoric and gesture were deployed in expressing conflicting viewpoints, and how consensus, or apparent consensus, was reached and expressed (for though dissent was sometimes expressed during the sessions, when it came to the concluding written subscriptions, these, though formulated in each bishop's own words, always provided an image of complete unanimity). A session of such a Council could thus be seen in one sense, and with absolute justification, as a piece of theatre in which the different actors played out their roles—and in another sense as a real-life drama which was to have a determining effect on the history of Christianity. So this uniquely detailed and extraordinarily vivid record positively invites analysis in terms of social dynamics and the acting-out of different roles.

Following Fergus Millar's advice, I, too, aim to achieve a better understanding of the social, political, and religious climates which were prevalent in the fifth century in the Eastern Roman Empire, and to see how these climates affected processes of decision-making in the public sphere. Indeed, significant work has been done relating to the function of ceremony in the religious and communal life in the Graeco-Roman world.[6] However, to the best of my knowledge,

---

5 A note on my part regarding the terms mentioned: modern scholarly use, following recent discussions in the Middle Eastern Churches, reserves the more commonly used term 'Monophysite' for the strict Monophysitism of Eutyches. The term 'Miaphysite', however, calls for explanation: grammatically speaking, following the rules by which compound words are formulated in Greek, the term should be 'Henophysite' (after the masculine form). However, the term 'Miaphysite' is used today by those who wish to stay close to the historical terminology (i.e. Cyril's formula, μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη). Thus, for them it is probably not a regular compound but rather a way of referring to those who stress the formula 'Mia physis'.

6 The following works, far-sighted at the time, still focus on 'traditional societies' and do not go so far as rendering 'modern', or 'Western', and 'traditional' societies comparable: D. Cannadine and S. Price (ed.), *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge, 1987), esp. Price, 'From Noble Funeral to Divine Cult: The Consecration of Roman Emperors', *ibid.*, pp. 56–105, and, A. Cameron, 'The Construction of court ritual: the Byzantine *Book of Ceremonies*', *ibid.*, pp. 106–136. See also S. Price, *Rituals*

such a synthesis between the historical and sociological disciplines, based on a close analysis of a verbatim narrative account, carried out in full appreciation of the dramatic qualities of the texts, has not, so far, been carried out in a systematic manner. This statement is certainly true when it comes to the application of sociological methods in the study of ancient texts. I hope that I have not only identified a gap, but have also begun to fill it effectively.

2. Scope and Methodological Principles

Succinctly described, this book focuses on the study of ancient ecumenical gatherings as social events. Being in essence and in effect mass gatherings, ecumenical church councils should be considered one of our first ports of call in our attempts at understanding the social, political, and religious dynamics which determined the course of their development. In this context, the study of ceremony and ceremonial behaviour, both linguistic and gestural, is of great relevance. Again, of all the great church councils, the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD) in particular stands out, in that it not only documents a pivotal moment in the history of Christian theology and imperial policy, but is also documented in great detail in its proceedings, also known as the *Acts*.[7]

The Spectrum of Relevant Socio-Anthropological Methods

To revert to the socio-anthropological aspect of this study, having such full textual evidence documenting real-life debates,[8] opens a wide window onto a detailed investigation of imperial and ecclesiastical ceremony. Using the methods, or rather, establishing key points of reference with the thought of socio-anthropological theorists, such as Douglas who defined symbol systems,[9] Austin who studied the use of language in performative contexts,[10] De Saussure who first

---

and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor (Cambridge, 1984). Continuing this vogue is a very recent publication edited by C. Kelly, *Theodosius II. Rethinking the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA, 2013). Albeit refreshing and important in its own right, the bibliography to this volume does not mention a single relevant socio-anthropological study.

7 For the extant editions and translations, see p. 26 below.

8 In the case of the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon, the usual caveats regarding short-hand techniques and the reliability of the notaries working on behalf of the different parties should not prevent us from conducting a constructive discussion of the end result, inasmuch as we know that the first Greek edition prepared under Marcian (later suppressed by a seventh-century edition) gained the approval of all parties (for further discussion, see Price and Gaddis).

9 See discussion in *The Purpose of Group Gatherings* starting on p. 70 below.

10 See discussion in *Method and Approach* on p. 62 below.

differentiated between language and language use,[11] and Bourdieu who developed scientific methods in the study of social networks, more specifically in the world of Parisian academia,[12] and studied the relationship between language and symbolic power, will, hopefully prove to be beneficial also to the study of 'dead' societies.[13]

Having mentioned this broad spectrum of social-scientific methods, it is perhaps necessary to single out already at this stage discourse analysis as the main guiding theory, which is applied throughout the analytical section of this study.

Limitations and Focuses

In this particular work, considering the vast source material and the practical limitations which are associated with its study, two restrictions were applied: the first is the emphasis given to the social contexts in which the gatherings described and recorded in their respective proceedings were performed and enacted. The second is quantitative, resulting in my decision to offer a detailed analysis of just three sessions (first, second, and sixth) thus, hopefully, creating a scholarly blueprint for further analysis of the other sessions. Perhaps a convincing illustration of the different emphases which different people have chosen so far to place on the *Acts* is Price's own catalogue of selected, or important, sessions, with the fifth session, in which the Definition of the Faith was drafted, being the most significant.[14]

Discourse Analysis — Theory and Praxis

The analytical part of this book, which offers a running discussion of a selected number of sessions, is, both in fact and in theory, an exercise in *discourse analysis* such as can be applied to ancient texts. I have applied this method both intuitively (as we constantly do when hearing a conversation and reading a relevant piece of text) and methodologically, by consulting theorists of the field. This short survey is hardly an exhaustive survey of the field of discourse analysis, which itself is blissfully eclectic and interdisciplinary in nature. Sociolinguists have found ways of going beyond the characteristics of language and venturing into the field of *language use* in sociological contexts. The works of Austin, De Saussure, Gumperz, Hymes, Labov, O'Barr, Van Dijk, to mention but a few sociolinguists, will be discussed throughout the book with this consider-

---

11 See discussion starting on p. 68 below.
12 As mentioned on p. 12 above.
13 See discussion starting on p. 64 below.
14 Price, 'Truth, Omission, and Fiction', in: Price and Whitby (ed.), *Chalcedon in Context*, pp. 92–106.

ation in mind. Their point is that language use is predominantly, or even exclusively, set in the framework of discourses, both conversational and textual. Before we proceed to discuss the societal situations which find their attestation in the proceedings of the *Acts* of Chalcedon, it is important to conceptualize the term 'discourse' and what we mean by it when we offer a 'discourse analysis' of something we may read or say, or overhear others say.

According to a recent general introduction, 'Discourse Analysis is the study of the ways sentences and utterances are put together to make texts and interactions and how those texts and interactions fit into our social world'.[15] When analysing a conversation or a written text (or an image), we aim at identifying *discourse markers* which are distributed, for example, by gender, age, class, and geographical area and which are used to denote, among other things, power, status, group affinity, social bonding and group identity.[16]

Drawing on Hymes's simplified model, in practice, what we do when we perform discourse analysis is to explore the following set of contextual components, namely the *setting* (time, place, and physical circumstances of the *speech event*)*, participants* (the different kinds of participants, including passive bystanders)*, ends* (purpose, goals, and outcomes of the event)*, act sequence* (the form the event takes as it unfolds, for example the order of different *speech acts*, for example, preaching, lecturing, ordering, apologizing)*, key* (the tone or mood of the *speech event*), *instrumentalities* (the message form or media through which meaning is made)*, norms of interaction* (common sets of understandings shared by the participants regarding what they consider appropriate behaviour and how utterances and actions ought to be understood)*, and genre* (the 'type' of *speech event*, for example, a sermon, which is recognizable as such by members of the *speech community*).[17]

Discourse involves an innumerable range of societal situations but perhaps, the most evident of all is the exercise of political (but also socio-economic and personal) power. Thanks to Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* to name but one of his relevant works,[18] the notion of the exercise of power in society has been the subject of numerous scholarly monographs (and a random glance at the bibliography of this book will testify to the popularity of the subject). In many crucial respects, this book, too, concentrates on power, though less on the visual attestations of it (of which we have less evidence) at a church council attended by the emperor, and more on the refined manipulations of

---

15 R. H. Jones, *Discourse Analysis. A Resource Book for Students* (London, 2012), p. 2.

16 Cf. T. van Dijk, *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach* (repr.; Cambridge, 2009), pp. 177–178.

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 24–25; 66–67.

18 M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (originally published in French in 1969; tr. A. M. Sheridan Smith; London/New York, 2002).

speech and its enactment in real time. Bourdieu's *Langage et pouvoir symbolique* pertains to the same theoretical framework, and we should also mention here principal works by more recent theorists, all drawing on modern situations, such as Fairclough's *Language and Power*,[19] Van Dijk's *Discourse and Power*,[20] and Chilton's *Analyzing Political Discourse*.[21]

Speaking of 'discourse', it is hard not to recognize the apparent tension which seems to arise from the fact that 'discourse' is a term usually associated with spoken language, whereas we, in this book at least, are exclusively occupied with 'texts', which a lay reader usually associates with a written output. En route to solving the problem, Fairclough offers a broadening of the term 'text' where 'a text may be either written or spoken discourse, so that, for example, the words used in a conversation (or their written transcription) constitute a text. In cultural analysis, by contrast, texts do not need to be linguistic at all; any cultural artifact—a picture, a building, a piece of music—can be seen as a text'.[22] We see, therefore, that the scope and range of cultural outputs which can be subjected to discourse analysis is enormous.

Finally, an important issue is the interpretative nature of discourse analysis. This can be understood inwardly, in terms of how the speaker, or the object, of our investigation (which, if taking a step backwards, in some cases could be the author of a text, the creator of a piece of art, or a choreographer) and outwardly, namely how we, being the consumers of a written text or a spoken speech, interpret what we read, hear, or see. In this vein, Van Dijk's recent work focuses mainly on issues of context, in which he explains 'the function of contexts (and) how they enable and constrain the production and comprehension of text and talk.'[23] In a subsequent study, Van Dijk asks (and gives answers to) 'how text and talk are adapted to their social environment'.[24] Following Van Dijk's theory of context, it would be accurate to describe the nature of the discourse analysis offered in the following section as being the unravelling of the social contexts of the people and characters who took part in the Council of Chalcedon, while at the same time applying our own interpretative mode to find similarities with them, but also to distinguish ourselves from them.

---

19 N. Fairclough, *Language and Power* (London, 1989), esp. pp. 43–76.

20 T. van Dijk, *Discourse and Power* (New York, 2008).

21 P. Chilton, *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* (London, 2004).

22 N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.; London/New York, 1997), p. 4. See also the section 'Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis', in *ibid*., pp. 187–213.

23 Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context*, esp. pp. 111–216.

24 *Idem, Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk* (repr.; Cambridge, 2010).

Hymes's Ethnography of Speaking

In the light of Goffman's seemingly broad understanding of 'ceremonial', 'performance', both conscious and unconscious,[25] and 'ritual', I could further define my interests in mapping the manners and methods by which people enact their internalised social codes by linguistic means.[26] Here I refer to people's *ethnography of speaking* — a term originally coined by Dell Hymes, and which is further elucidated by Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer as follows:

> The Ethnography of speaking has had a relatively short history as a named field of enquiry. It was first defined in Dell Hymes' seminal essay of 1962, which drew together themes and perspectives from a range of anthropological, literary, and linguistic scholarship, and brought them to bear on speaking as a theoretically and practically crucial aspect of human social life, missing from both linguistic descriptions and ethnographies, and on ethnography as the means of elucidating the patterns and functions of speaking in societies.[27]

Precisely because of my interest in language use, or in the ethnography of speaking, I have chosen to concentrate in this book not on the 'theological/doctrinal' sessions, but rather on those sessions in which the different social dynamics came most to the fore. This is why the opening session and the sixth session, in which the Emperor Marcian made his personal appearance, were given most attention here.

Despite its traditional, 'historical' opening, which deals with the factual background surrounding the Council, this study is, again, *not* about Marcian's reign. Though this is an extremely important subject in itself, attempting to write a historical account can hardly be rewarding, if only because of the severe lack of historical evidence concerning this particular emperor.[28] Furthermore, this study does not presume to offer a study of the Chalcedonian *Acts* as such — for which reason I rely on the original research carried out by Schwartz, and its excellent summary by Price and Gaddis.[29] To conclude this negative catalogue, I should stress that this study is only superficially concerned with the theology, or rather theologies, expounded at Chalcedon — a subject

---

25 See *Goffman's Performative Consciousness* on p. 76 below.

26 D. Hymes, 'The Ethnography of Speaking', in: T. Gladwin and W. C. Sturtevant (ed.), *Anthropology and Human Behaviour* (Washington, D. C., 1962), pp. 13–53.

27 R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (ed.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 3–17. Bauman and Sherzer's volume was important in that it sought to promote the study of the broader function of language in social interaction.

28 For the extant documentation of Marcian's reign, see discussion starting on p. 50 below.

29 See the sub-sections *Documentation of the Council* starting on p. 47 below.

which has been discussed in numerous monographs and articles,[30] written by both secular academics and also — to remind ourselves that the issues raised in Chalcedon still affect the lives of living religious communities — by practising clerics.[31]

Verbatim Records

The proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon are of special interest to us: as they are presented (and perceived) as verbatim narrative accounts (rather than summaries of decisions made), a discourse analysis of these *Acts* and their reading as a real-life piece of theatre staged in several acts forms the basis for this study.[32] The stress, here represented in the italicized words, is on the intention of the compilers and their agents (i.e. notaries and short-hand scribes employed by patriarchal courts and the imperial court respectively) to produce a verbatim account.[33] The *Acts* are scattered with remarks made by members of different parties and allegiances to the effect that on occasion, records of what was said in the Council of Ephesus II were not accurate.[34]

---

30 Theological studies of Chalcedon, some written by learned clerics who, nonetheless, remain committed to the views of the community they serve, include the works by Archbishop P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils: the Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils* (Crestwood, 1996), pp. 181–328; H. Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society: from Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 557–611; V.C. Samuel, *The Council of Chalcedon Re-examined* (Madras, 1977), pp. 44–88. A major work is by A. Grillmeier and Th. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol.I and II.1–4 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1979–2002). Also see P. Gray, *The Defence of Chalcedon in the East* (Leiden, 1979), pp. 7–20.

31 In some cases the importance of Chalcedon induced authorial biases in one or the other direction, as can be seen, for instance, from the way the famous 'Canon 28' has been dealt with.

32 The overall lack of spontaneity and the acceptance of the 'rules of the game' by all participating parties form an essential part of ceremony and ritual. This statement might go against P. van Nuffelen's observation that 'many ceremonies were not staged'. However, focusing on historical anecdotes rather than acts of councils, Van Nuffelen would seem to be referring to occasions of disruption of ceremonies, rather than the ceremonies themselves (see Van Nuffelen, 'Playing the Ritual Game in Constantinople (379–457)', in: L. Grig and G. Kelly (ed.), *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 183–200).

33 A similar distinction made in modern anthropological studies between real-life speech and the evidence of written documents is discussed by D. Parkin as follows: 'The first thing to say about Bailey's analysis is that it is intentionally based on chunks of real-life speech set in a social context but on three prepared, written texts distributed by different Indian pre-independence political parties' (*idem*, 'The Rhetoric of Responsibility', in: Bloch (ed.), *Political Language*, pp. 113–139, esp. p. 114).

34 See, for example, Session I.52–64.

By way of drawing a simple analogy, these and similar protests regarding the recording of the proceedings of the previous council may teach us about the level of accuracy expected in respect of the documentation of the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon and their presumed verbatim character. Of course, the process of their compilation was far from being detached from the different agendas which were at play. Evidence of attempted and actual manipulation has been noted and discussed, among others, by Fergus Millar,[35] and by Price and Gaddis.[36] However, the scholars mentioned here all understand recorded quarrels and disagreements over accuracy as proof of the overall auditory context, in which the proceedings were recorded and circulated.

Price and Gaddis distinguish between different levels of presumed accuracy, depending on the immediate context in which the editorial work was carried out. However, they, too, affirm the overall verbatim character of the proceedings as follows:

> Scrupulous and verbatim documentation was expected for such quasi-judicial proceedings when a bishop or his conduct was put on trial, where all parties would demand assurance that proper procedures had been followed. But a different imperative governed the treatment of discussions of faith or the drafting of canons, where the authority of the final product carried an implication of ecclesiastical unanimity that might be undermined by an excess of attention given to debates and disagreements.[37]

In a private correspondence, Fergus Millar even goes so far as to lament the shortcomings of ancient historians who refuse to acknowledge the value of a rich historical 'source' on the few occasions when such a 'source' presents itself (italics and brackets are his):

> On Chalcedon (and other Acta) what we can say is that they were circulated *as* verbatim reports of what was said, including angry exchanges. Of course no system of short-hand recording is perfect, and there is evidence of deliberate malpractice. In spite of all qualifications, the *intention* was to quote people's interventions verbatim (and not just what they said or the overall conclusions of each session) — *and* (very important) the Acta of Ephesus II, however, disputed, were available at Chalcedon two years later. To ask for something more perfect than an absolutely contemprorary, widely circulated, verbatim report of what was indeed a real-life drama is to be completely unrealistic. If that is not good enough, ancient historians may as well pack up and go home.

---

35 Millar, Greek Roman Empire, Appendix A, pp. 235–247

36 Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, pp. 75–78; Price, 'Truth, Omission, and Fiction in the Acts of Chalcedon', in: Price and Whitby (ed.), *Chalcedon in Context*, pp. 92–106.

37 Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 78. Also see their full embracing of Fergus Millar's position in the very first page of their introduction: 'The Acts of the fifth-century councils offer us a type of source material extremely rare in the ancient world, the verbatim transcripts of a deliberative assembly in operation' (*idem*, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 1).

Ancient Editorial Strategies

A word should be said at this stage also about my deliberate choice to produce a sociologically oriented discourse analysis of the Greek *Acts* as these were edited by Schwartz,[38] rather than a study *per se* of the relationship of these *Acts* to the *Acts* in their Ancient Latin translation (of which the last edition is also known as Rusticus' version).[39] My point of departure is similar to Price and Gaddis[40] in that I, too, rely mainly on the Greek text and Schwartz's exhaustive studies of the textual traditions of these collections. I have two arguments for this choice.

First, leaving aside the occasional editorial changes and discrepancies between the Greek *Acts* and the three successive ancient editions of the Latin version (not to mention versions in Syriac and other Oriental and Slavonic languages), concentrating on the Greek text is a sound methodological choice: the proceedings were held predominantly in Greek. The Latin version remains a translation. In a study such as this one, which highlights communication strategies in real-time debates, it is more than logical to concentrate our attention on the version which records the debates in the original language in which they were carried out.

Second, Schwartz's studies of the various traditions have shown that the Greek version known to us differs in only two major respects from the first edition (now lost), which was produced under Marcian in Greek immediately after the closure of the council.[41] Thus either from Marcian's time or that of Justinian, there are a small number of significant editorial interventions that can be explained on clear ideological grounds. For instance, the Pope's objections to Canon 28, the canon which dealt with the authority of the see of Constantinople, which were partly excised from the Greek version, have been preserved in Latin.[42] In many other cases, omissions on the part of the editors of the Greek *Acts* (for example, as summarized by Price and Gaddis, the truncation of 'hundreds of repetitive judgements (*sententiae*), … trimming attendance lists and signature lists for the less important sessions; and … deleting speeches in Latin, leaving only their Greek translations')[43] were carried out on pragmatical rather than ideological grounds, with the aim of achieving brevity.[44] Rusticus' marginal comments show that he still had access to the fuller Greek codices.

---

38 See *The Scholarly Context* starting on p. 16 above.

39 See also *The Textual History* starting on p. 48 below.

40 Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 78–85.

41 See Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, p. 82. And see further discussion in *The Textual History* starting on p. 48 below.

42 See Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. x–xi; Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 81.

43 Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 82.

44 Similar discrepancies between presence and signatory lists are singled out and discussed by A. Crabbe, 'The Invitation List to the Council of Ephesus and Metropolitan Hier-

As discussed above, the principal aim of this study is the reconstruction of communication strategies which, in turn, can teach us about group dynamics, power sharing, and the dynamics of decision-making. Editorial strategies are, of course, an extremely important subject, but they are not the subject of this study. Omissions and changes will be dealt with, in the occasional cases in which they are relevant to our discussion, as supplementary to the Greek text[45] and only when they shed further light on the reconstruction of the social dynamics which governed the discourse of the delegates. This approach is justified, again, by the need to focus this study to a manageable scope, but also to keep the focus on the particular sociological aims in question (further discussed below), rather than producing a comparative study of the extant versions.

In this context, the vast available auxiliary and additional relevant material, papal and imperial correspondence, correspondence of notable delegates, imperial edicts etc.[46] has been dealt with in a similar manner, i.e. mentioned when it was necessary and imperative to clarify what was happening in the council. However, since the analytical discussion offered below is formed as a running commentary and since I wished to leave the reader with an impression of the rhetorical dynamics, I have decided, in most cases, not to digress by offering a comparable rhetorical and sociological analysis of material here defined as 'auxiliary', despite the fact that this material contains ample evidence for interpersonal communication and the fact that the rhetorical ploys used in correspondence and edicts can and should be studied in much the same manner, as I am proposing to apply in this study on the *Acts* of Chalcedon.[47]

The Role of Prosopography

Prosopography, the collective reconstruction of the lives and careers of individuals through the study of patterns of relationships and activities, is another aspect which is much enriched by the corpus of the *Acts*. Again, I have dealt with such material, for example, in the analysis of the delegations to the first

---

archy in the Fifth Century', *JTS* n. s. 32(1981), pp. 369–400. Crabbe explains the discrepancies in the pragmatic approach of officers working at the imperial chancellery who preferred to rely on the original invitation list issued prior to the council.

45 Price and Gaddis indicate such supplements as they appear in the Latin text with { } (see *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. xvi).

46 See, for example, the list of 'ancient sources' listed by Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*, pp. xxiii–xxv.

47 Here discussed to a very limited degree, a much fuller discussion of contemporary correspondence was carried out by A. Schor in his study of Theodoret's letters in which the social network of this important Antiochene bishop, and a major figure in the Council of Chalcedon, has been meticulously and convincingly reconstructed, using contemporary network theories (see *idem*, *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria* (Berkeley, 2011).

and sixth sessions, as far as it was relevant to my outlined scope and inasmuch as it proved to be manageable to do in a monograph of an average size. All these points are important to mention, not by way of an apology, but rather, by way of clarifying what my objectives are and what I have decided to do in order to produce a study with a coherent discussion of the discourse as it was carried out in the council of Chalcedon. Certainly, if the reader is eventually convinced of the potential of all this vast 'source' material and of the manifold ways in which the proceedings of this council and the auxiliary texts were produced, it should encourage him or her to carry out further research, whether in a similar, or different manner to mine.[48]

3. Structure

The book as a whole comprises an introduction, discussing general issues, such as the historical circumstances in which the Council of Chalcedon took place; the nature and structure of the ancient ecumenical council as an established liturgical and ceremonial locus; and, finally, an overview of the relevant sociolinguistic theories. The second chapter gives an overview, rather than an original survey, of the ecclesiastical and personal rivalries involved (mainly between the Alexandrian, Miaphysite party headed by Dioscorus, and the Dyophysite, Antiochene party headed by Theodoret of Cyrrhus.[49]), and their reflection in imperial politics. In this chapter one can also learn about the composition of a substantial imperial delegation, and its extraordinary function (thus setting a bold precedence in comparison to previous Eastern ecumenical church gatherings which were officially presided over, but not actually run, by ecclesiastical figures).[50] Furthermore and perhaps most important in this chapter, is the study of the specific set of *social codes* which determined, for example, not only the

---

48 In addition to Schor's *Theodoret's People,* other important ancient-historical studies, which concentrate predominantly on the study of social networks, using network theories and processing prosopographical data, are C. Hezser, *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine* (Tübingen, 1997), and G. Ruffini, *Social Networks in Byzantine Egypt* (New York, 2008).

49 For a full discussion of Theodoret's Christology, see P. B. Clayton, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus. Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)* (Oxford, 2007). A major study available on Theodoret's exegetical method is by P. Guinot, *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr* (Paris, 1995).

50 Neither of the two Councils called by Theodosius (i.e. Ephesus I and II) was directly chaired by imperial officials. Evidently, Marcian (or Pulcheria, for that matter) was taking no chances and the involvement in the debates of their emissaries was unprecedented (see Millar, *Greek Roman Empire*, p. 197). In the annals of the Western Church, the Council of Carthage (411) was also exceptional in that it, too, was presided over by an imperial commissioner (see Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 75).

seat allocated to each individual according to his relative importance but also the manner and time in which important individuals were allowed to speak.

The third chapter, which also best represents the original contribution of this study, is a blueprint of a detailed discourse analysis performed on the proceedings of mainly the First and Second sessions. There the close relationship between language and ceremonial, or the ceremonial functions of language, will be examined in the light of the theories and observations of key sociologists, anthropologists and sociolinguists.

The theories mentioned are not meant to be introduced here from scratch and the theoretical basis, I dare admit, is a selection of relevant methods (sociolinguistics, especially discourse analysis, but also social theory and theories drawn from the fields of cultural and social anthropology) rather than an exhaustive overview. My goal and a good measurement of success for me would be if the reader gets the sense that ancient texts can and should be read and understood in much the same way that modern texts and even modern conversations are perceived. Here it is all about contributing to a process of a desired mental and cultural change in respect of our attitudes to ancient documents (and to the bygone societies which are associated with them), however 'boring', 'irrelevant', or simply, too 'theological' they may be considered.

The fourth chapter, which is a continuation in respect of method and approach of the previous chapter, discusses the Emperor Marcian as a follower of the Constantinian model, analysing his bilingual speeches and his interaction with the delegates to reveal a self-image of a pastoral as well as an authoritative figure.[51] The last chapter summarizes the main arguments and evidence in question, arguing in favour of the application of sociolinguistic theories in the study of historical societies, and asserting the power of the emperor over the ecclesiastical establishment — a power which stemmed not only from the emperor's political status, but also from his function as *defensor fidei*, defender of the faith.

The book concludes with three main observations, arguing that, provided that they are carefully applied to the relevant textual evidence, socio-anthropological theories are relevant to the study of ancient, historical societies; that the imperial administration had undoubted supremacy over the ecclesiastical establishment, and that it had the power to impose its policies with impressive results; that Emperor Marcian, like a long succession of Byzantine emperors after him, saw himself (as he was seen by others)[52] as a 'New Constantine', and that he modelled himself accordingly, adopting the role of an authoritative ruler, as well as a Christian pastoral figure of the first rank.

---

51 See *The New Constantine: Marcian at Chalcedon* starting on p. 174 below.
52 See *The Functions of Acclamations* on pp. 120 and 177 below.

B. The Council of Chalcedon:
Historical Background, Procedure, and Documentation

In a purely religious context, ecumenical, general church councils are a unique Christian invention,[53] deeply grounded in the history of Christianity from both the intellectual and the societal perspectives. In such grand, ostentatious displays of vitality, but also of hostilities and ideological rifts, leaders of Christian communities from all over the ancient world (and also up until, and including, the modern age)[54] would gather together to debate and ultimately, to secure a consensual agreement regarding issues which pertain, for example, to ecclesiastical doctrine (the nature of Christ, the nature of the Trinity, images and iconographic representations) and government (the ecclesiastical sees and the position of their respective leaders; election or deposition of bishops, the passing of canonical laws; general disciplinary matters).

The history of general (but also regional) ecclesiastical councils is almost as long as the history of Christianity itself.[55] The first general council (it was preceded, from the second century onwards, by a number of regional synods), was held in 325 in Nicaea, and the last council convened by an Eastern Roman

---

53 Largely absent from the annals of early Judaism and Islam, it is interesting to note that modernity has seen the revival of mass religious gatherings in Islamic circles which derive their authority from the collectiveness of the process, in that all Islamic streams are represented, and from the collective interpretation (*ijtihad jamai*) which is given to the ethical issue in question (Cf. M. Ghaly, 'Muslim Perspectives on Cloning. Human Cloning Through the Eyes of Muslim Scholars: The New Phenomenon of the Islamic International Religioscientific Institutions', *Zygon* 45 (2010), pp. 7–35).

Regarding the historical context, Price and Gaddis mention in the introduction to their translation (*The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 3), a certain affinity to institutions such as the Roman Senate and assemblies of municipal governments. See also R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton, 1984).

54 In the West, the last great Roman Catholic church council, the Second Vatican Council, convened in 1962 by Pope John XXIII and later presided over and concluded in 1965 by Pope Paul VI, had on its agenda the adaptation of the Roman Catholic church to modernity. Furthermore, one could mention the ecumenical Conciliary Process for Peace, Justice, and the Integrity of Creation in the 1980s.

55 See C. J. Hefele's magisterial *Histoire des conciles* (Tübingen, 1855, trans. from the German and rev.; Paris, 1907). The first volume in the series, anonymously translated to French and later edited by H. Leclercq, opens with a definition which somewhat subdues the historical involvement of the imperial administration in such councils: 'Au nombre des manifestations les plus importantes dans la vie de l'Église se rangent les Conciles ou Synodes. Ces deux termes synonymes […] signifient avant tout une reunion laïque et, dans un sens plus étroit, une assemblée ecclésiastique, c'est-a-dire une reunion des chefs de chefs de l'Église régulièrement convoqués pour délibérer et statuer les affaires religieuses' (*ibid.*, p. 1).

emperor took place in 787, most tellingly, also in Nicaea.[56] If one is to identify certain mental and pragmatic patterns, the Council of Nicaea, the two councils held in Ephesus in 431 and 449 respectively, the Council of Chalcedon, held in 451 in a suburb of Constantinople, and a long succession of councils, both regional and ecumenical, stretching from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages and Modern eras[57] — all reflect a recurring model which testifies to the building of Christian identity via the prism of the community and its management typically in a public and ostentatious manner.

1. Before Chalcedon: The Councils of Ephesus I and II

Before we proceed to outline the purpose of this particular study, which is the sociological analysis of this early, but also particularly important, church gathering in terms of the *social codes* which governed the behaviour and practices of the different delegates and various officials, it is essential, especially for the benefit of social scientists and ancient historians, who may not be familiar with 'theological sources' in general and with conciliar history in particular, to provide first a basic outline of the events and developments in the history of the church prior to Chalcedon.

In the aftermath of the Council of Nicaea (325 AD), which, briefly summarized, set out to define the orthodox principles of the Christian church and make them acceptable to all the members of the Christian commonwealth,[58] Christians in both parts of the Roman Empire continued to engage themselves in an endless pursuit and, perhaps, unachievable end, of defining what 'orthodoxy', or the correct Definition of Faith, is.[59] In addition to several regional

---

56 The total number of councils in the East which were recognized by the Byzantine Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches as ecumenical amounts to seven: Nicaea (325) under Constantine, Constantinople I (381) under Theodosius I, Ephesus I (431) under Theodosius II, Chalcedon (451) under Marcian, Constantinople II (553) under Justinian, Constantinople III (680–81) under Constantine IV, and Nicaea II (787) under Constantine VI.

57 As far as councils were concerned, from the eighth century onwards East and West diverged: after 787 no Western council recognized or invited the East until the Councils of Lyons in 1274 and Florence/Ferrara in 1438/39. For a recent study of 'general council', albeit written from the Roman Catholic perspective, see C.M. Bellitto, *The General Councils: A History of the Twenty-One General Councils from Nicaea to Vatican II* (Mahwa, New Jersey, 2002).

58 For a general discussion of Constantine's policies and the Council of Nicaea, see A. Cameron, 'The Reign of Constantine, A.D. 306–337', in: A. Bowman *et al.* (ed.), *CAH* 12. *The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193–337* (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 2005), pp. 90–109, esp. 97–99.

59 P. Allen, 'The Definition and Enforcement of Orthodoxy', in: A. Cameron *et al.* (ed.), *CAH* 14. *Late Antiquity. Empire and Successors A.D. 425–600* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 811–834.

meetings, the Roman East saw in 381 the convening of an ecumenical council in Constantinople. It subsequently had in the first half of the fifth century the convention of two major church gatherings, Ephesus I (431) and Ephesus II (449).

If fourth-century ecumenical councils were dominated by Trinitarian dogma, that is the place of Christ within the Trinity, fifth-century councils saw the emergence of a new discourse over the very nature of Christ. How, people asked themselves, did Christ's divine nature relate to his human nature after the incarnation: did the natures remain separate, or should we speak of a union of some sort?[60] As already mentioned above, the newly aligned groups represented two contradicting ideologies, one favouring a one-nature Christology (Miaphysites representing Alexandrian dogma), and the other a two-nature Christology (Dyophysites representing Antiochene dogma).[61]

For the years leading up to the First Council of Ephesus, the major players in this saga, each of whom also stood at the extremes of the ideologies they wished to promote, were Eutyches, a Constantinopolitan monk and Nestorius, who was appointed in 428 as bishop of Constantinople by the Emperor Theodosius II. An important aspect in Eutyches' theology (*c.* 378–454) was his outright definition of the Virgin Mary as *Theotokos*, Mother of God.

Perceiving the term *Theotokos* as offensive, in that it stressed the divinity of Christ and suppressed his human nature, Nestorius, who, in turn, coined the term *Christotokos*, Mother of Christ, rejected Eutyches' term altogether, branding the latter as heretic. At this point Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, intervened in favour of Eutyches and against Nestorius. In the immediate context of this debate, Cyril expounded his doctrine in a succession of letters, three in number, addressed to Nestorius.[62] The third and last letter also included twelve anathemata, or *Chapters*, to which Nestorius was to subscribe, or face excommunication by Cyril and his sympathizers (the latter also included Pope Celestine, Bishop of Rome).

The Emperor Theodosius II, emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire (401–450), wishing, as he thought, to help Nestorius, his own choice for bishop of Constantinople,[63] initiated the convening of an ecumenical church council at Ephe-

---

60 See Hefele and Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*; J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Oxford, 1987); W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Century* (London, 1972).

61 A succinct summary is found in R. Price, 'The Council of Chalcedon: A Narrative', in: Price and Whitby (ed.), *Chalcedon in Context*, pp. 70–91. Also see Bevan, *The New Judas* and *idem*, *The Deep Politics of Chalcedon* (both studies forthcoming). Regarding the terminology, see discussion in *The Scholarly Context* starting on p. 16 above.

62 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria's third letter to Nestorius, ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 1.1.1, pp. 33–42.

63 A. D. Lee, on the other hand, claims that Theodosius was pro-Nestorian and Dyophysite at heart and that he supported Nestorius' condemnation because of his reluctance to go against the decisions of the Council of Ephesus (cf. *idem*, 'The Eastern Empire: Theodosius to Anastasius', in: *CAH* 14, pp. 33–62, esp. p. 38).

sus which eventually convened in the summer of 431.[64] However, the fact that Nestorius refused to subscribe to, or agree with, Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* mentioned above, spelled, to the surprise of his then imperial patron, Nestorius' condemnation *in absentia* at the Council of Ephesus. On the other hand, Cyril's doctrine, including the term *Theotokos*, was officially upheld and proclaimed to be in agreement with Nicaean doctrine. Nestorius had to leave his office and return to Antioch and his writings, in an act which reflected a reversal in imperial policy, were banished in a succession of imperial edicts promulgated in 435 and 438 respectively.[65] A rift with Antiochene, or East Syrian, Christianity, not to be healed to this day, emerged and was fuelled for centuries to come.

However, all these achievements on the part of the Alexandrian party did not satisfy its leaders. Cyril of Alexandria and his successor, Dioscorus, were bent on securing a *post mortem* condemnation of the important Antiochene theologians, Diodore of Tarsus (d. *c*.390) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (*c*.350–428). The memory of these two was subsequently defended by another important Antiochene pair, Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*c*.393-*c*.460) and Ibas, Bishop of Edessa (435–449; 451–457).

A new episode in the long saga unfolded when Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople from 446, and a staunch opponent of Cyrilian doctrine, went on to condemn its most extreme proponent, Eutyches. Eutyches promptly appealed to the bishop of Rome, by now Pope Leo (d. 461), who, together with the Emperor Theodosius, initiated and facilitated the convening in 449 of a second council at Ephesus (whose decisions were to be annulled by the Council of Chalcedon). However, contrary to the Pope's wishes and plans, this time, it was Dioscorus, the proponent of the one-nature Christology, rather than Flavian, the proponent of the two-nature Christology, who was appointed by the emperor to convene and thus to control the proceedings of the council.

Despite his absence from the council, Pope Leo expounded his Christology in a letter addressed to Bishop Flavian, also known as the *Tome of Leo*,[66] in which Christ was declared to be one single person, but with two natures, divine and human, each of which interacts with each other.[67] The *Tome of Leo*, ignored by Dioscorus, was never presented before the delegates, so, according to the charges of Dioscorus' protagonists, they never had a chance of endorsing it. Moreover, the faulty and biased chairmanship of Dioscorus, coupled with sheer physical violence (according to Dyophysite sources) brought about the following decisions: Eutyches was rehabilitated, Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* were endorsed, and

---

64 Cf. T. Graumann, 'Theodosius II and the First Council of Ephesus', in: Kelly (ed.), *Theodosius II*, pp. 109–129.

65 The relevant edicts are found in *C.Th.* XVI.5.66 and *CJ* I.1.3.

66 *ACO* 2.1.1, ed. Schwartz, pp. 10–20; translation by Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, pp. 14–24. The letter was dated 13 June 449.

67 Cf. Clayton, *The Christology*, esp. pp. 30–31, 216–217.

the Antiochene bishops Flavian, Theodoret, and Ibas were deposed. Appalled by what he considered as the underlying illegitimacy of the Second Council of Ephesus and totally rejecting its outcome, Pope Leo angrily dubbed the whole event 'the Robbers' Council'[68] — evidently alluding to Dioscorus and his supporters taking control of the proceedings — thus opening the floor to a new round of spiritual and physical bloodshed between the rival parties.

In summation, the centres of power, public opinion, and even imperial patronage continued to shift like a roller-coaster: Ephesus I concluded with the condemnation of Nestorius; in 448 the Miaphysite emperor Theodosius II reiterated the condemnation of the very same bishop,[69] whose election some twenty years earlier, he had initially supported; in the following year, the Second Council of Ephesus saw the condemnation of the Antiochene bishops Diodore, Theodoret, and Ibas, and the *Tome of Leo*, a manifesto in favour of the two-nature Christology, was ignored and, so Dioscorus hoped, discarded into oblivion. Furthermore, the Emperor Theodosius II, an important supporter of Nestorius and of Dyophysite principles just twenty odd years before, changed his opinion and promulgated in 448 a decree forbidding Theodoret, a pillar of Antiochene Dyophysite doctrine, to attend the Council of Ephesus II which was held in 449.

The unexpected accession of Marcian to the throne in 450 AD marked a true shift in imperial policy or, one might say, a restoration of imperial support for the two-nature Christology. The fact that the Eastern emperor was now in favour of a two-nature Christology was the basis upon which the imperial court in the East sought to smooth out previous tensions with the papal see in particular, and with the Western part of the empire in general. The road to Chalcedon, we see, passes through Ephesus.

2. Ecumenical Church Councils as a Governmental Tool

The involvement of the imperial establishment in ecclesiastical affairs was most poignantly visible in the fact that in all cases, ecumenical councils in the Late Antique and Byzantine eras were, with no exception, the initiative of the emperor(s) and their close entourages. The Emperor Constantine, calling upon the bishops and doctors of the Church to convene in Nicaea under imperial auspices, established an ongoing tradition which was to define the intertwining relationship between Empire and Church for many centuries to come. His later successor, Theodosius II, even summoned two ecumenical councils, but — and this is the most crucial innovation of the Council of Chalcedon — no Eastern emperor or his officials came so far as to chair and control the debates themselves.

---

68 Leo to Pulcheria, *ep.* 95 (dated July 451).
69 For the terms see discussion in *The Scholarly Context* starting on p. 16 above.

Imperial Patronage

By ancient standards, ecumenical church councils, the Council of Chalcedon included, were big events: they involved the congregation of hundreds of delegates, some 20 imperial officials and some 300 bishops or their representatives and lower clergy, who, in an era marked by limited mobility, came from all parts of the Roman empire, and even beyond its borders, to take part in a gathering which often stretched over several months until a resolution was agreed upon, or, more likely, until the majority of participants, tired and overwhelmed with the prospects of the emergence of yet more rifts and disagreements, demanded a dispersal of the gathering.

Ammianus Marcellinus, a fourth-century Roman historian, famously ridicules the multitude of bishops, whose frequent travels at the expense of the imperial purse resulted in constant traffic jams across the imperial highways.[70] The Council of Chalcedon, convened as a result of the specific wishes of both reigning emperors, Marcian in the East and Valentinian III in the West, followed, in many respects, an established pattern: a mass gathering of bishops and other clerics of various degrees of seniority, summoned to convene in a quiet suburb of Constantinople, just across the Bosporus.

The Council of Chalcedon reflected an established tradition of imperial patronage over ecumenical church gatherings and in that sense, the fact that the delegates were all guests of the emperor(s) — the western emperor being a nominal, rather than a real, host — was nothing new. However, as already mentioned above, a great novelty presents itself in the fact that at Chalcedon, the majority of the sessions were chaired by lay officials, as it was actively headed by Anatolius, *magister militum per orientem*, mentioned above, rather than by ecclesiastical figures. This was not a mere technicality or a pragmatic change. It represented a major shift in imperial strategy and propaganda and reflected the degree to which the Emperor wished to expose his involvement in church affairs.

The fact that senior clerics, some of whom enjoyed tremendous authority in their lifetime and are considered to this day amongst the pillars of the church (such as Theodoret), were presided over and governed by lay officials was a forceful, unambiguous, imperial statement. This had procedural as well as visual implications. In the history of religions, it created a totally new social dynamic between the delegates in particular, and between church and empire in general. It is this unique social dynamic that the present study aims to investigate.

---

70 Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus' obituary to Constantius, *Res Gestae* 21.16.18.

Consensus as the Basis for a Modus Operandi

By offering a close examination of the interpersonal communications between imperial and church officials (and between members of these groups) it is hoped that, as far as such a dichotomy can be defended, more light will be shed on the relationships between these two establishments. In this context, we ask ourselves again how communication was regulated, and by which means; what our observations can tell us about power-sharing, the process of decision-making in matters entirely ecclesiastical; what can be inferred from a close analysis of the rhetorical dynamics about the age-old question regarding the religious identities of presumed 'secular' institutions, such as the Byzantine imperial administration?

By force of their very presence and participation in the council, all parties seem to have recognized the symbiotic relationships which governed church and state.[71] All parties professed a profound, spiritually, if not mystically grounded notion that theological, communal, and political peace was often set forth as an achievable and desirable ideal.[72] They obviously did not agree on the established means by which such peace and harmony were to be achieved (hence the endless mutual accusations on grounds of heresy).[73] Nonetheless, this communal endorsement of the notion of ecclesiastical peace caused both the imperial and ecclesiastical establishments to foster a certain *modus operandi* which can explain much of the rhetoric on both sides in respect of, for example, common enemies, dangers, and the necessity to achieve unity, both physical and spiritual.

Here Nestorius, pleading with Theodosius II, Marcian's predecessor, says as follows: 'Give me the earth undefiled by heretics, and in return I will give you heaven. Help me to destroy the heretics, and I will help you destroy the Persians.'[74] We shall see that also during the Council of Chalcedon, much of the rhetoric governing the public discourse was, indeed, a 'rhetoric of peace', achieved internally first, by crushing and defeating 'heretics' and secondly, by reaching a divinely inspired consensus.

Church Councils as Mass-gatherings

Religious mass gatherings, such as the Council of Chalcedon, comprised of both official representatives, i.e. bishops or their proxies, and of a large group of interested people. As already mentioned, the latter were not allowed to take an active part in the proceedings, but, with the exception of producing the occa-

---

71 See *The Role of the Imperial Establishment* starting on p. 122 below.
72 See *Dynamics of Disputation and Concord* starting on p. 144 below.
73 See *The Process of Boundary Marking* starting on p. 125 below.
74 Socrates, *HE* VII.29.5.

sional proclamations, were designated a passive role in the official judicial debate.[75] That these gatherings should become one of the main channels through which Byzantine and Western emperors alike chose to display their authority and power in prolonged and ostentatious imperial pageants is a fact which calls for attention and explanation on our part. Here is a case of two powerful establishments, the ecclesiastical and the imperial, accepting each other's authority and, especially from ecclesiastical perspectives, also, as shall be discussed and demonstrated further below,[76] *de facto* relinquishing authority, in order to maintain a certain consensual *status quo* and — if we allow ourselves a grain of naivety — perhaps even in order to achieve a true concord as the spiritual realisation of the ideals of one God and one church.

The Mechanics of Interpersonal Communication

As a social event the Council of Chalcedon attracted not only the most powerful and brilliant, but also a host of lesser ecclesiastical figures who came from all over the ancient world to take part, albeit mostly passively, in this display of concern for Christian dogmatic unity and social solidarity. An audience is by no means the primary addressee, yet its mere presence may affect the linguistic choices made by both *senders* and *receivers*, for example, the use of slang in a university lecture in which a large part of the audience is comprised of slang users.[77] In the case of the *Acts*, very little evidence of such accommodation on the part of the principal senders can be detected in the sessions which were closely analysed. The linguistic and social characteristics of those sitting in the audience must have been so variable, that any such accommodation would have proved to be ineffective.[78]

3. Chalcedon: Location and Narrative of Events

It goes without saying that the Emperor Marcian inherited the ecclesiastical unrest (or, perhaps, vitality and dynamism?) which typified the church during the reign of his predecessor and that, like Theodosius II, Marcian saw it as his duty to lend his imperial authority to try and restore ecclesiastical unity. The Council

---

75 The passivity of the audience was assumed and actively enforced on a number of occasions. Responding to unfavourable exclamations, the Egyptian bishops express their irritation as follows: '[…] why are the clerics now shouting? This is a council of bishops not of clerics. Drive out the supernumeraries [..]' (I.55).

76 See *The Role of the Imperial Establishment* starting on p. 122 below.

77 Ervin-Tripp, 'Sociolinguistics', p. 44.

78 For formal speech and cases of *lexical variation* see p. 86 below.

of Chalcedon, convened in 451, was in many crucial aspects a direct continuum of the previous two church Councils, discussed above. On this occasion, the adherents of the two-nature Christology, the followers of the Nestorian dogma of Mary the Virgin being *Christotokos*, sought to overturn the outcome of Ephesus II: to restore imperial and public recognition in their bruised doctrine and to exonerate the memory of the pillars of Antiochene, Dyophysite bishops, Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and more recently, of Flavian, and to rehabilitate the reputation of their present leaders, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa.

The Symbolic Meanings of the Location

The chosen setting for the gathering, the church of St Euphemia in Chalcedon, a suburb of Constantinople on the bank of the Bosporus, is no longer extant. The account of Evagrius Scholasticus describes the church as consisting of three parts: a large basilica, with an open atrium and a separate domed rotunda/martyrium containing the shrine of Euphemia ('three structures'),[79] perhaps in the fashion of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem:

> The precinct consists of three huge structures: one is open-air, adorned with a long court and columns on all sides, and another in turn after this is almost alike in breadth and length and columns but differing only in the roof above. On its northern side towards the rising sun there stands a circular dwelling with a rotunda, encircled on the interior with columns fashioned with great skill, alike in material

---

[79] Τρεῖς δ' ὑπερμεγέθεις οἶκοι τὸ τέμενος· εἷς μὲν ὑπαίθριος, ἐπιμήκει τῇ αὐλῇ καὶ κίοσι πάντοθεν κοσμούμενος, ἕτερός τ' αὖ μετὰ τοῦτον τό τε εὖρος τό τε μῆκος τούς τε κίονας μικροῦ παραπλήσιος, μόνῳ δὲ τῷ ἐπικειμένῳ ὀρόφῳ διαλλάττων· οὗ κατὰ τὴν βόρειονπλευρὰν πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα, οἶκος περιφερὴς ἐς θόλον, εὖ μάλα τεχνικῶς ἐξησκημένοις κίοσιν, ἴσοις τὴν ὕλην, ἴσοις τὰ μεγέθη καθεστῶσιν ἔνδοθεν κυκλούμενος. Ὑπὸ τούτοις ὑπερῷόν τι μετεωρίζεται ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν ὀροφήν, ὡς ἂν κἀντεῦθεν ἐξῇ τοῖς βουλομένοις ἱκετεύειν τε τὴν μάρτυρα καὶ τοῖς τελουμένοις παρεῖναι. Εἴσω δὲ τοῦ θόλου πρὸς τὰ ἑῷα εὐπρεπής ἐστι σηκός, ἔνθα τὰ πανάγια τῆς μάρτυρος ἀπόκειται λείψανα ἔν τινι σορῷ τῶν ἐπιμήκων—μακρὰν ἔνιοι καλοῦσιν—ἐξ ἀργύρου εὖ μάλα σοφῶς ἠσκημένη (Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE* II.3, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, *Évagre le scholastique. Histoire Ecclésiastique* (rev. ed.; Paris, 2011), pp. 228–229, reading μάκρα instead of their μακράν in the last line, with A. M. Schneider, 'Sankt Euphemia und das Konzil von Chalkedon', in: A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht (ed.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. 1 (Würzburg, 1951), pp. 291–302, esp. 298 n. 32).

Galleries were used in cases where the number of delegates and attendants exceeded the number of seating space. Assuming that senior-ranking delegates were given priority, it follows that some low-ranking people had to follow the proceeding from the galleries, while standing up (compare with seating arrangements in the Roman Senate throughout the ages, where the number of senators continued to increase, thus leaving lower-ranking senators, *senatores pedarii*, with no seating spaces; Cf. L. Ross Taylor and R. T. Scott, 'Seating Space in the Roman Senate and the *Senatores Pedarii*', *TAPA* 100 (1969), pp. 529–582.

and alike in magnitude. By these an upper part is raised aloft under the same roof, so that from there it is possible for those who wish both to supplicate the martyr and to be present at the services. Inside the rotunda, towards the east, is a well-proportioned shrine, where the all holy remains of the martyr lie in a lengthy coffin, which some call a 'sarcophagus' — which is very skilfully fashioned from silver (trans. with slight modifications after M. Whitby).

The galleries described by Evagrius are in the rotunda but he does not explicitly say that the council met in it. Resuming his account of the council and the events which surrounded it, Evagrius enigmatically states: 'There the council about which I spoke convenes', Ἐνταῦθα ἡ λελεγμένη μοι σύνοδος ἁλίζεται, without specifying to which of the buildings he is referring. The *Acts* themselves speak now of the ἐκκλησία and then of the μαρτύριον as meeting place.[80]

Much can be said in favour of the possibility that the rotunda or martyrium played at least an important role in the council meetings.[81] The first hint relates to Evagrius' affirmation regarding the sizable structure of the rotunda which can be clearly inferred from his description of all three structures being *huge* (ὑπερμεγέθεις) and the supporting colonades themselves being remarkable in terms of their *magnitude* (μεγέθη). So, the rotunda was most probably not a small shrine, but a big, round-shaped monument which, similarly, again, to the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, could and was intended to host large numbers of worshippers.

The second hint regarding the use of the rotunda as gathering place is not based on physical evidence, but on a literary analysis of Evagrius' description. Here, an appreciation of Evagrius' tempo and rhythm is paramount to our understanding of his intended emphases. It is as if Evagrius appreciated the manner in which the delegates were bound to be influenced by their physical environments, both in the way they spoke and in the way they acted.[82] It is this kind of appreciation and excitement that he conveyed in his own discourse, when he wrote his own narrative of past, as it was related to a specific and psychologically and spiritually meaningful locus. In this context, environmental psychology takes centre stage. According to Van Dijk, the following questions are relevant: how place categories define associated actions and identities; how the structure and properties of places control or facilitate people's actions.[83]

---

80 See the references in Schneider, 'Sankt Euphemia', 291 with nn. 2–3.

81 This is also underlined by P. Allen, who even sees the rotunda as the usual meeting place of the council Fathers (see *eadem*, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* (Leuven, 1981), pp. 100–101). However, she identifies the rotunda with 'the basilica proper', which I find problematic.

82 On types of places and how these might affect discourse and behaviour see Van Dijk, *Society and Discourse*, pp. 47–60.

83 The discussion of the seating arrangement on pp. 107f. below is carried out with this theoretical framework in mind.

Returning to Evagrius' account, on the whole, his church history is written as a succession of relatively small scaled units. He is not displaying the succinctness of a chronographer but still, a momentous event such as the Council of Chalcedon does not occupy more than one book, some 60 pages in the modern edition of Bidez and Parmentier. There, Evagrius dedicates a whole chapter to the description of the church in question and to the site in general — a description which occupies two pages in total, of which one and a half pages are dedicated to the description of the rotunda, or martyrion.

Evagrius' obvious emphasis on the rotunda, together with his personal and enthusiastic appreciation of the sacredness of that specific place, backed by a relatively prolonged hagiographical account on the proven powers of the saint, makes it more than probable that the historian not only thought that the delegates actually gathered in the rotunda, but that this very rotunda, owing to the relics of the saint buried there, was also the right place in or near which a church council of such importance should have taken place, and from which the delegates could have drawn immediate inspiration. Furthermore, Evagrius' description of the original church may have inspired the builders of the existing church of St Euphemia near the Hippodrome in Constantinople, built in the seventh century to host the remains of the Saint, as, indeed, a domed, galleried building.[84]

Session V probably shows us how things happened in practice. Here it is explicitly stated that the Fathers gathered in the church, after which a group of delegates is selected for a special consultation on a *definitio fidei*; their concluding statement is eventually read in the church after their return.[85] The rotunda or μαρτύριον itself may have been too small for all delegates, but its presence was considered crucial (hence the confusion in the *Acts*: the μαρτύριον is what gave the church its standing) and it was used for some consultations of major importance.

This short discussion of the physical environment in which the deliberations took place has an added value: it highlights the (legitimate) emphases of 'traditional' historians (or, for that matter, archaeologists) who wish to reconstruct a particular piece of knowledge for its own sake. At the same time, this discussion, or, if you will, exercise, highlights the emphases of the sociolinguist who needs to define the space in which a conversation takes place in order to know more about the conversation itself and the communication strategies employed by the participants. Examining Evagrius' account is a fine example of how both disciplines could and should complement each other.

---

84 See W. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls* (Tübingen, 1977), p. 122–125.

85 Compare Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.2, p. 121 with 123 and 125; see Schneider, 'Sankt Euphemia', p. 291. See also Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE* II.18e, ed. Bidez and Parmentier, pp. 360–363.

In summation of our discussion, whatever the actual meeting place may have been, it is also telling that the Emperor Marcian made Chalcedon the site of his choice. Initially he had opted for the city of Nicaea as the location of the ecumenical council which was to be convened under his auspices.[86] Chalcedon was a location closer to Constantinople, the imperial centre of power. Here Marcian revealed a marked propensity not only for Christian theology, but even more so for imperial propaganda, and imperial diplomacy which often manifested itself by seeking acceptable compromises.

Narrative of Events and Synopsis of the Sessions

In the previous councils at Ephesus, whose proceedings, now lost, are only partially reported and documented by the scribes who were employed at Chalcedon, Dioscorus was the dominant figure, not only among the bishops, but also in general. At Ephesus II, Dioscorus was the chairman and the person controlling the proceedings. However, at Chalcedon things changed: control over the proceedings was entrusted to the hands of an imperial official, Anatolius, *magister militum per orientem.* The superiority of the imperial administration, but also the symbiosis between church and empire came to the fore in a most ostentatious and theatrical manner.

The first session,[87] which launched a particularly heated debate between the rival parties, represented respectively by the sees of Antioch and Alexandria, was convened on 8 October to examine the proceedings of Ephesus II and, from a Dyophysite perspective, to review the measures taken in its aftermath against the proponents of the Dyophysite party, namely Bishop Flavian and Bishop Theodoret of Cyrrhus.

The second session was convened on 10 October. On this occasion the important task of formulating a new, compromising, Definition of Faith,[88] was entrusted to a selective committee of ecclesiastical figures. In this context, Cyril's *Twelve Chapters* and the *Tome of Leo*, intentionally ignored and overlooked at Ephesus II, were read aloud. The third session, convened on 13 October, saw the debate between the parties rapidly developing into an outright trial

---

86 See Marcian's letter to the bishops; Greek text: ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. 27–28 (and 52) and cf. the Latin versions in *ACO* 2.3.1, pp. 19–20, and *ACO* 2.2, p. 95. English translation from the Greek of *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. 27–28, by Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, 98–99.

87 A synopsis of the sessions is found in the introduction to the translation of Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, pp. 44–51. The Greek and Latin *Acts* differ in their numbering (see discussion in Price and Gaddis, *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. vii–viii). Though my starting point is the Greek *Acts*, for purposes of convenience, I am following the numbering indicated by Price and Gaddis, who, in turn, follow the numbering of the Latin *Acts*.

88 See discussion in *The Chalcedonian Compromise* starting on p. 43 below.

and condemnation of Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, and the chief proponent of Miaphysite doctrine.

At the fourth session, convened on 17–20 October, the *Tome of Leo* was acclaimed as commensurate with Nicaean doctrine, and individual petitions were submitted. At the fifth session, convened on 22 October, the new Definition of Faith was debated, modified, and approved by the delegates. The sixth session, convened on 25 October, hosted none other than the Emperor Marcian and the Empress Pulcheria. Following Marcian's bilingual speech,[89] and general acclaim by the delegates, the compromise Definition of Faith was reiterated and signed by the bishops who were present, or their representatives.

The following sessions dealt with cases (depositions, petitions) of individual bishops and members of the clergy: at the seventh session, convened on 26 October, the cases of Juvenal and Maximus, and subsequently of Theodoret, were discussed. At the eighth and ninth sessions, convened on 26 October, immediately after the closure of the previous session, the case of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, deposed in the Second Council of Ephesus, was discussed. The debate was concluded on the following day, 27 October (tenth session according to the Latin *Acts*, or eleventh according to the Greek *Acts*) with the restoration of Ibas to his see. On the same day, an unnumbered session discussing the case of Domnus, also took place. At the eleventh and twelfth sessions, convened on 27 and 29 October respectively, the cases of Stephen and Bassianus were discussed. Bassianus, the deposed Bishop of Ephesus, sought his restoration and the deposition of Stephen, his rival and the sitting Bishop of Ephesus.

At the thirteenth session, convened on 30 October, the cases of Eunomius of Nicomedia and Anastasius of Nicaea were discussed. The two bishops held a dispute over ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the city of Basilinopolis. Anastasius had assumed his jurisdiction over the city, whereas Eunomius contested this situation. At the fourteenth and fifteen sessions, both convened on 31 October, the cases of Athanasius, Bishop of Perrhe, and Sabinianus, who sought his reinstatement to that see, were discussed. In the same session, a reading of Pope *Leo's Tomos* to the council took place. At the sixteenth, and last, session, convened on 1 November, the delegates debated an important canon, later to be known as the twenty-eighth canon, which dealt with the status of the see of Constantinople, decreeing that the see of New Rome, namely Constantinople, should have equal status to that enjoyed by the see of Rome in respect of all matters ecclesiastical.

---

89 See discussion in *The New Constantine: Marcian in Chalcedon* starting on p. 174 below.

The Chalcedonian Compromise

As already mentioned above, the outcome of Chalcedon was decisive in that it seemed to have reflected the wish of its imperial and papal patrons to have a compromising formula put together and approved. The Alexandrian formula *from two natures* (ἐκ δύο φύσεων) was now introduced with the slight yet unquestionably significant change, now reading *in two natures* (ἐν δύο φύσεσιν). Whereas neither the 'Nestorians', nor the 'Eutychians', both representing the extreme ends of their opposing doctrines, were happy with the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith, the more moderate wing of the Antiochene, Dyophysite, party, supported by Pope Leo, was satisfied with the wording and sought a definite closure to the whole saga.

The more extreme Dyophysites could not yet come to terms with the Chalcedonian formula. A dispute arose which to this day typifies the rift between the Western church and the Syriac Church of the East. The 'Eutychians' in particular and the Alexandrians in general found themselves in an even greater dilemma, as the Definition of Faith which they approved of, coined only recently at the Council of Ephesus I, underwent a change which they deemed to be incommensurate with their Christology. The ensuing personal changes in the ecclesiastical order, namely the outright deposition of their chief proponent, Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, and the subsequent restoration of the Antiochene bishops, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, to their sees, spelled the utter annulment of the previous achievements of the Alexandrian party.

Thus, a council which had sought to end an ongoing and bitter doctrinal strife which had engulfed the entire Christian commonwealth came to be perceived, depending on the beholder's perspective, both as a formidable triumph (part of the Dyophysite party, but not the followers of Nestorius), and a disastrous, not to say, heretical, event (Miaphysites).[90]

4. Chalcedon: Procedure

The Mechanics of the Ecclesiastical Gathering

Typically, a session would open with a verbal announcement of the delegates in attendance, from the most senior ones to the most junior; every delegate, whether senior or junior, would be identified by his name and affiliation and those who were given the floor, would be addressed by formulaic, unchange-

---

90 Also the position of Alexandria became less important in comparison to the two Romes.

able titles which meticulously reflected the status of the addressee (for example, 'devout' or 'holy' when addressing clerics; 'glorious', 'exalted', or 'hallowed' when addressing imperial officials); with the junior clergy and imperial officials already seated, the senior delegates would take their seats in full view of the audience; the floor would be given by the senior imperial official to senior members of the clergy who, through their interest and direct involvement, had a part in the official agenda (for example, the papal representatives, Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus etc.).

Moreover, from time to time, the imperial secretary would be ordered by the senior imperial official to read a document (petitions, imperial decrees, minutes of former councils) aloud — after which the delegate in question would be ordered, again, by the senior imperial official to give his reply; outbursts of protest or cries of approval on the part of the crowd,[91] some substantially long and evidently orchestrated and some short and formulaic in nature, would be either checked and repressed, or allowed to be woven into the fabric of the debate without further interference from the senior official; speakers would take the floor standing and would go back to their seats at the command of the senior imperial official who, typically, would also close the session, while outlining the next points on the agenda and further steps which needed to be taken.[92]

The Imperial Stance

As in the Second Council of Ephesus, the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD), too, saw Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, and Theodoret, by then bishop of Cyrrhus, as the two major protagonists. A new actor in the unfolding drama was, of course, the Emperor Marcian, who had acceded to the imperial throne only a year earlier, and, so it seems, embarked on his plan to convene an ecumenical council almost immediately.

Chalcedon was preceded by a vigorous correspondence between Pope Leo, the incumbent of the see of Rome and thus, also of the Western church, the Emperor Marcian, and his spouse, the Empress Pulcheria.[93] The existence of such correspondence, let alone its content, is a vivid illustration of the dynamics of power, mutual interests and even common ideologies which ran through the different establishments, i.e. church and imperial administration, and between

---

91 See discussion on p. 88 below.

92 H. Amirav, 'Political and Social Networks in the Council of Chalcedon: The Imperial Commission', in: J. Baun *et al.* (ed.), *StPatr* 45 (Leuven, 2010), pp. 139–145.

93 Cf. Price and Gaddis, Appendix 1: 'The Documentary Collections', *The Acts*, vol. 3, pp. 157–192. Here it would also be worthwhile to sharpen the crucial distinction between imperial edicts, which were widely circulated and proclaimed in public places, and imperial letters, which naturally had a more restricted circulation.

the two parts of the Roman Empire.[94] Though Marcian has taken centre stage in the historical narratives of the Council of Chalcedon, Pope Leo was not less instrumental in realising the plan of the Eastern Emperor to convene an ecumenical church council which, again, would make the decisions made at the Second Council of Ephesus null and void (if taken from ecclesiastical perspective) by placing Dyophysite Christology at the heart of imperial policy and patronage.

At face value, Anatolius took on the role of a neutral judge. Accordingly the reading of all official documents was carefully entrusted to the hands of a supposedly neutral official, Constantine, rather than to the hands of a cleric. Taking the debate over Ephesus II (449) as a test case, we see, however, that Anatolius, like his emperor, did not take a neutral stance, but identified himself with those promoting a two-nature Christology, that is with the pro-Theodoret and anti-Dioscorus camp. This camp consisted of Pope Leo and the Antiochene and Oriental[95] bishops, who together took their stand against the Alexandrian and Palestinian bishops[96]. We shall now recapitulate some of the issues discussed in Chalcedon.

The Emperor Marcian, however, echoing a traditional imperial stance, sought to achieve a compromise, a formula which somehow would appease both Miaphysite and Dyophysite Christians. The Definition of Faith approved and acclaimed in Chalcedon was, in fact, a reinterpretation and refining of the Definition reached at the Council of Constantinople in 381. One can only speculate on the auditory impact which the public reading of this powerful and engaging text might have had on the delegates:

> Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all in harmony teach confession of one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood, truly God and the same truly man, of a rational soul and body, consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead, and the same consubstantial with us in respect of the manhood, like us in all things apart from sin, begotten from the Father before the ages in respect of the Godhead, and the same in the last days for us and for our salvation from the Virgin Mary the Theotokos in respect of the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, acknowledged in two natures without confusion, change, division, or separation

---

94 Cf. S.O. Horn, *Petrou Kathedra: Der Bischof von Rom und die Synoden von Ephesus (449) und Chalcedon* (Paderborn, 1982).

95 In contrast to its modern, possibly pejorative, connotations, I am using the word 'Orientals' throughout as a plain translation of the Greek word οἱ Ἀνατολικοί — which also reflects more faithfully the (modern) title of the Patriarch of Antioch, being 'Patriarch of Antioch and all the East' (Syriac Orthodox).

96 Cf. Letter of Pulcheria to Pope Leo, *Leonis Ep.* 76, ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, pp. 18–19; Letter of Pope Leo to Bishop Paschasinus, *Leonis Ep.* 88, ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.4, pp. 46–47. At the council, most notable in the first session is Anatolius' insistence that Dioscorus should be seated in the centre, as befitting a defendant (I.13), and that Theodoret should be admitted to the council (I.26).

(the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed by the union, but rather the distinctive character of each nature being preserved and coming together into one person and one hypothesis), not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same son, Only-begotten, God, Word, Lord, Jesus Christ, even as the prophets from of old and Jesus Christ himself taught us about him and the symbol of the fathers has handed down to us.[97]

The Definition of Faith cited above which was endorsed by the Emperor Marcian and his entourage, was aiming at a compromise because it disapproved of the extremities of both Eutychian and Nestorian teachings. On the one hand, the Chalcedonian formula went against the outright denial of the term *Theotokos* and the implication that the humanity of Christ is indeed separable from his divine nature. On the other hand, it excluded those who endorsed the confusion of Christ's divine and human natures in one. However, the ever-growing rift in the aftermath of Chalcedon may suggest that Marcian failed to impose his compromise in the long run.

Passing a judgement as to whether the Chalcedonian formula served its most immediate purpose of appeasing the rival parties largely depends on one's historical perspective and specific point of departure. Given the inherent complexities of the matters at hand, we have to leave the discussion about the aftermath of Chalcedon and its long-standing repercussions to specialized studies.[98]

---

97 Ἑπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῶι πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν κύριον μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηιρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωιζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ᾽ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν λόγον κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσεν καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον (V.34).

98 Grillmeier and Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. II.1–4, and Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East*.

5. Documentation of the Council

The Process of Conciliary Record Keeping

The proceedings of the council provide tangible evidence of the political and ecclesiastical demarcations which stood at the heart of public discourse throughout the later Roman Empire. As it touched upon sensitive issues of theology and ideology, but also of power and political influence, there is no wonder that the issue of record-keeping of live conversations[99] was given extraordinary attention as the events took place. Furthermore, the quest for accuracy on the part of the delegates and the overseeing parties reflected the societal importance that was attached to the very act of gathering and conversation rituals. The event itself was momentous and its perception as divinely inspired rendered in many ways the process of record-keeping part of the ritual.

A mechanical description of the process of record-keeping is lacking for the Council of Chalcedon. There are the occasional addresses to the *notarii*, requests to have certain documents read aloud etc.[100] but the process itself and what it may have involved needs to be reconstructed. Such a reconstruction may be possible on the basis of fuller descriptions which are available from the *Acts* of the Council of Carthage (431), where both patriarchal and imperial notaries — the latter having also been assigned the task of reading proceedings of earlier councils and other official documents — would document the proceedings in shorthand which would later be rendered into a formal version which would then be compared again with the bishops' notes. At each stage, at least in theory, the notaries and scribes of the rival parties would get the chance of verifying their rivals' versions against the formal version. In the final stage of authentication, the bishops would be required to sign the transcripts, *as well as* to ratify the veracity of their signatures by swearing on oath ceremonially and publicly.[101]

Taking the occasional references in the *Acts* of the Council of Chalcedon and the references in the *Acts* of the Council of Carthage into account, one may draw a reasonable analogy to the effect that in Chalcedon,[102] too, the final, official, product was a result of a careful process which involved comparing the versions of different scribes and reaching a consensual agreement over the final

---

99 See discussion in *The Scholarly Context* starting on p. 16 above.

100 For a vivid description of shorthand writing see p. 131 below.

101 See Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 75.

102 For other examples regarding the enactment and compilation of the proceedings of church councils in the West see A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden im Spiegel ihrer Akten* (Münster, 2008).

text. That was, at least, the ideal and professed goal.[103] The reality, however, is much more complex: versions in a number of languages and provenances do differ occasionally,[104] and the complex process of their textual transmission, points above all, to the importance which was attached to the Council of Chalcedon throughout Christian history.

But the *Acts* do not only include the content of live conversations, but also of a rich corpus of documents[105] which, in their quest for authoritative sources, the delegates came back to and demanded to be re-read in public in what was, again, part and parcel of the ritual which typified this group gathering.[106] We must remember that if it had not been for this blessed habit and almost manneristic insistence on accuracy, we would not have had available the documentation mostly from the First and Second Councils of Ephesus.[107] As Fergus Millar rightly points out, this habit of quoting and inserting old documents, to include also papal and imperial correspondence,[108] poses less of a problem today than several years ago, now that we have both Schwartz's complete edition and Price and Gaddis's corresponding translations at our disposal.[109]

The Textual History

Schwartz[110] prepared his edition of the Greek *Acts* on the basis of two manuscripts:[111] the Codex Venetus 555 (M) and the Codex Vindobonensis hist. gr. 27 (B), dated to the eleventh and twelfth centuries respectively.[112] The collection of letters, which either precedes or accompanies the *Acts* themselves, gives ample evidence as to the dating of the official Greek version, initiated by Marcian and

---

103 See *Promoting the Mystique of Consensus* on p. 75 below.

104 See *Textual History* starting below.

105 Thus Millar in his *A Greek Roman Empire*: 'But, as will be clear on almost every page of this book, the great revelation to me was the enormous wealth of material contained in the Acts of the great Church Councils […]' (see *ibid*., pp. xiii–xiv).

106 See *Reading Out Loud as an Authoritative Act* starting on p. 113 below.

107 Thus Fergus Millar: The Second Council of Ephesus and the Council of Chalcedon, called two years later, are inextricably linked, by their historical context, in their theological conclusions (in that the one was called with the deliberate intention of annulling measures taken at the other, and of having a new Definition of Faith adopted), and in the manuscripts tradition through which the record of most of their proceedings is preserved. (F. Millar, 'The Syriac Acts of the Second Council of Ephesus (449)', in: Chalcedon in Context, pp. 45–69, esp. 45).

108 For my use of auxiliary material, see discussion on p. 26 above.

109 Ibid.

110 See p. 16 above.

111 My summary is based on the overviews by Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, pp. 75–85, who themselves relied on Schwartz's introduction.

112 See Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. v–vi.

Anatolius, to the period between 454 and 455.[113] With Evagrius still using and citing the original version at the end of the sixth century, a new round of editing, triggered, as mentioned above, by the need for an abridged and accessible version,[114] ensued at the beginning of the seventh century.[115]

Due to Pope Leo's linguistic shortcomings, the *Acts*, initially available only in Greek, remained inaccessible to him[116] and to a succession of popes thereafter, at least until the early sixth century. According to Schwartz,[117] three editions of the Latin *Acts* were prepared in Constantinople, rather than in Rome, in the sixth century. The first edition, known as the *versio antiqua*, was probably prepared under the aegis of Pope Vigilius during his stay in Constantinople between 547 and 553. The second version, known as the *versio antiqua correcta* represents a revision of the first edition, prepared in the aftermath of the council of 553.

The last and most reliable version, the *versio Rustici*, was prepared by Rusticus, a nephew of Pope Vigilius, who, after completing a period of exile in Egypt on account of his defence of the Three Chapters, returned in 563 to Constantinople, where he embarked between 564 and 565 on the preparation of a comprehensive Latin edition. Presumably using fuller and more accurate Greek codices, Rusticus' version, preserved in the ninth-century Codex Parisinus 11611,[118] reflects a few intriguing twists and derivations from its extant Greek counterpart.[119]

Derivations and alterations are bound to provide the interested reader with ample material to conduct an independent study of the social and sociological principles which determine editorial choices — in themselves, never 'dry' choices. Having said that, however interesting these editorial choices may be and taking the Greek version as our basis, a study of the relevant changes and alterations is carried out in this study only to a limited degree, since our main focus here is the sociology of the actual process of the meetings, rather than the dynamics which affected the editorial processes of the different versions.

---

113 See discussion in Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, pp. 79–80, esp. notes 271 and 272 on the different letter and documentary collections relating to the council, as well as their Appendix 1, *ibid*., vol. 3, pp. 157–192.

114 See discussion in *Summary of Scope and Methodological Principles* above.

115 Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. vii–viii and 2.1.3, pp. xxix–xxx. Also see *idem, Über die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalkedon, Nicaea und Konstantinopel* (Abh. d. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Abt. N. F. 13; Munich, 1937), pp. xx.

116 See *Ep.* 113 (dated March 453, ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.4, pp. 65–67) of Pope Leo to Julian of Cos, a papal legate to the council, asking the latter to arrange for a full translation.

117 Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, pp. vii–xii.

118 *Ibid*., pp. xii–xviii.

119 See discussion in *Editorial Stategies* starting on p. 26 above.

C. The Convenor of Chalcedon:
Marcian and his Theodosian Heritage

1. Accession

The reign of Theodosius the Second began in 407 and ended in 450, when the emperor, mostly remembered for the massive legal codex bearing his name, was deprived of his life due to an accident while riding on horseback. The career and legacy of the Emperor Marcian is intertwined with and, certainly on Marcian's part, was presented as a direct continuation of the Theodosian dynasty.[120] This statement is made on the basis of the circumstances of Marcian's accession and the fact that he married Pulcheria,[121] the sister of Theodosius' II (408–450) and his direct predecessor. The fact that a relatively unimportant military officer, Marcian, ended up entering the highest echelons of the imperial circles, is astonishing indeed. According to sources which 'cover' Marcian's reign in general and this issue in particular (scant accounts by the church historians Evagrius Scholasticus and Socrates, as well as a few passages by the chroniclers Malalas and Theophanes),[122] Marcian's reign, which began in 450, was not recognized by his Western counterpart, the Emperor Valentinian III, until 457.[123]

In addition to their sheer scantiness, the accounts of Marcian's reign, where available, are given either in the specific context of the Council of Chalcedon, which the Emperor Marcian notoriously convened, or they are lacunose because of the restriction of the genre (for example, the chronicle).[124] Consequently,

---

120 This overview is largely based on the essay by A.D. Lee, 'The Eastern Empire', in: A. Cameron *et al.* (ed.), *CAH* 14, pp. 33–62, esp. pp. 34–45.

121 See K. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1982).

122 Malalas, *Chronographia,* ed. J. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (CFHB 35; Berlin, 2000); trans. E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (BAus 4; Melbourne, 1986). Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, *Theophanis Chronographia*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883–85, rp. Hildesheim, 1963); trans. C. Mango and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, A.D. 284–813* (Oxford, 1997).

123 See W. Burgess, 'The accession of Marcian in the light of Chalcedonian apologetic and Monophysite polemic', *BZ* 86/87 (1993–4), pp. 47–68.

124 Regarding genres in historical writing, Evagrius Scholasticus was a church historian and as such, was not primarily interested in the machinations of the Byzantine empire *per se* — a fact which might, if at all, explain his economical narrative when it comes to Marcian's accession etc. Malalas, on the other hand, was a chronicler, and as such was bound to the restrictions of the genre. However, curiously enough, Malalas, an 'economical' chronicler, does manage to provide extremely vivid accounts, anecdotal and digressive in nature, about other topics, for example, his report about the circumstances surrounding the choice of a bride for Theodosius II (Malalas, *Chronographia* XIV.1–4 (351–355), ed. Thurn, pp. 272–275; trans. Jeffreys, Jeffreys, and Scott, pp. 191–193).

scholarly reference to Marcian's reign is similarly scant, if not dismissive of his qualities as an emperor.[125]

The little 'factual information' that we have,[126] describing Marcian as an unassuming soldier and a mere dependent of Aspar, the all-powerful *magister militum per Orientem* (431–471, or even as early as 424),[127] does not, somehow, accord with the self-assured performance of Marcian at the council. According to Evagrius' positively biased and thus, somewhat oversimplified account,[128] Pulcheria, Theodosius II's sister and the most powerful woman in the Theodosian house,[129] merely remained indifferent to the prospect of Marcian, then an unknown figure and a man quite advanced in age, becoming her husband.

Evagrius' succinct, and yet, perhaps intentionally self-contradictory 'factual' narrative,[130] leaves the reader with more questions than answers: why did Aspar not become an emperor himself? Aspar, no doubt, belonged to the highest echelons of society. His father, Ardabur, *magister militum per Orientem* (424–425) and *consul* of 427,[131] was a staunch pillar of Theodosius II's regime.[132] Aspar himself could boast a long career in the Theodosian house.[133] Marcian was already

---

125 For example, the standard account of Marcian's reign by A. H. M. Jones seems to portray Marcian as a pragmatist, yet dependent and bland in nature (see Millar, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602. A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1964), pp. 217–221). Marcian's reign is briefly addressed by A. D. Lee, 'The Eastern Empire', pp. 42–45.

126 Ibid.

127 See 'Flavius Ardabur Aspar', *PLRE*, vol. 2, pp. 164–169.

128 For contradicting, anti-Chalcedonian, traditions see P. Allen, *Evagrius*, pp. 96–98. See also E. Watts, 'Theodosius II and Anti-Chalcedonian Communal Memory', in: Kelly, *Theodosius II*, pp. 269–284.

129 See also the discussion on page 57 below.

130 Thus, Marcian is like a Christian saint, the embodiment of apparent paradoxes: he is portrayed as a simple, unassuming *tribunus*, yet he is destined by virtue to greatness; he does not seek glory, yet it is bestowed on him; he is to become a grand Christian emperor, yet he has designated patrons. For a discussion of the so-called Christian 'rhetoric of paradox', see Cameron, *Rhetoric of Empire*, pp. 155–188.

131 See 'Flavius Ardabur 3', *PLRE*, vol. 2, pp. 137–138.

132 Ardabur led the Roman army in the East in a campaign against Persia which was concluded — by no means a trifling milestone in the history of these two traditional enemies — in the siege of Nisibis and a subsequent Roman victory in 421 (under Theodosius II, one highlight of which being Aspar's campaign against the ravaging Vandals and the somewhat disadvantageous treaty of 435. Yet neither Ardabur nor Aspar could resume the purple without being labelled usurpers, for in addition to their professed Arianism, they came from a barbarian, or more specifically, Alan stock, for whom the imperial throne was 'off limits'.

133 Theodosius I, the son of a *magister equitum*, was proclaimed Valens' successor and emperor of the East in 379 (see S. Williams and G. Friell, *The Empire at Bay* (London, 1994), pp. 23–26). That the Theodosian house was considered to be an established dynasty, despite a mere 78 years in power, is a telling fact about dynastic stability in fifth-century Byzantium.

a client, or *domesticus*, of Ardabur[134] and his entire career, including his modest military advancement, was dependent on these powerful Alans. For Aspar, then, the chance of assuming even greater power depended on his ability to place his long-time protégé on the imperial throne.

What about Marcian's marital ties with the Theodosian house? Still in Theodosius' lifetime, matters in his court were not tranquil. Eudocia,[135] Theodosius' wife, and Pulcheria, his sister, were not on amicable terms. Moreover, these two women professed their own respective religious agendas and their entourages reflected this fact. At face value, the rivalry between Eudocia and Pulcheria can be explained as a classic case of tension between a sister and a wife, yet the much later historian Theophanes (*c*.760–817) explicitly points in his *Chronographia* to Eudocia's affair with Paulinus[136] and her immediate clerical entourage, namely Severus and John the Deacon, as being great sources of annoyance to Theodosius.

In the aftermath of Theodosius II's death, and with Eudocia, Theodosius' wife, effectively exiled to the Holy Land,[137] Pulcheria, his sister, remained the only surviving kin eligible to claim the throne. Acceding on her own was not an option, for Pulcheria, being a woman, could not assume the imperial purple herself. Marriage was inevitable, yet since the young Pulcheria had taken vows of celibacy, as Malalas' Freudian observation goes, 'out of her love for her brother',[138] the marriage was condemned to sterility.[139]

Theophanes follows a similar line of stressing Pulcheria's role and squarely attributes Marcian's elevation to the throne to Pulcheria's own initiative and independent choice. Thus, according to Theophanes, having fallen for Marcian's exceptional personal qualities, Pulcheria had asked for Marcian's hand in person. Amongst the qualities listed, all modelled on the ideal of the Stoic sage, are Marcian's prudence, dignity, capability and advanced age — with the latter char-

---

134 Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, AM 5943, ed. de Boor, vol. 1, pp. 103–105; trans. Mango and Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes*, pp. 160–162.

135 See 'Aelia Eudocia' (Athenais) 2, *PLRE*, vol. 2, pp. 408–409.

136 See 'Paulinus' 8, *PLRE*, vol. 2, 846–847. Paulinus, a youthful companion of Theodosius II, a courtier who also introduced Eudocia to the emperor, was suspected of having an affair with the empress, or perhaps, with Pulcheria. He was consequently deposed, exiled, and later executed (440).

137 Theophanes AM 5942, ed. de Boor, vol. 1, p. 101–102; trans. Mango and Scott, pp. 158–160. Eudocia retained the title of 'Augusta' until her death in 460 — a title which she held together with Pulcheria.

138 […] ἥτις ὡς φιλοῦσα τὸν ἴδιον αὐτῆς ἀδελφὸν οὐχ εἵλατο γαμηθῆναί τινι· Malalas, *Chronographia* XIV.3 (352), ed. Thurn, p. 273; trans. Jeffreys, Jeffreys, and Scott, p. 191.

139 Marcian, on the other hand, was survived by his daughter from a previous marriage, Aelia Marcia Euphemia (see *PLRE*, vol. 2, 423–24) whom he married off in 453 to Anthemius, the future Emperor of the West (467–472).

acteristic being an extraordinary criterion indeed in respect of a more conventional choice of a groom in the aristocratic circles of the time.[140]

The only condition which Pulcheria placed on Marcian was that she should preserve her chastity:[141]

> Since the emperor has died and I have chosen you from the whole Senate for being a virtuous man, give me your word that you will guard my virginity, which I have dedicated to God, and I shall proclaim you emperor.

Malalas, on the other hand, represents a quasi-hereditary coronation: 'It was revealed to me that you (Marcian) must become emperor after me.'[142] These, according to Malalas, were Theodosius' last words in the presence of Aspar and the imperial entourage.

That Marcian, a humble *tribunus*, would be a habitué in Theodosius' household is highly unlikely. This and similar stories are less designed to present the historical facts than that they are intended to serve the political needs of the imperial house in power. Looking for proof texts for the existence of Divine Providence in the selection and elevation of particular individuals to the position of emperor was a common *topos* in coronation narratives throughout the Roman Empire, and by no means typical of Byzantine 'superstition'.[143] However, whether through divine Providence or not, Marcian acceded to the throne in 450,[144] and the race for the legitimization and consolidation of his reign could begin.

2. Marcian's Military and Foreign Problems

The historical impact of the Council of Chalcedon and its ample documentation may lead the reader to lose sight of the many other pressing issues, military and administrative, which the novice emperor and his more experienced administration had to attend to simultaneously, as the Emperor Marcian him-

---

140 Rhetoric can, at times, reflect reality as we may judge by Marcian's reported caution in financial matters and in executing the internal affairs of the empire.

141 Ἐπειδὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐτελεύτησεν, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἐξελεξάμην ἐκ πάσης τῆς συγκλήτου, ὡς ἐνάρετον, δός μοι λόγον, ὅτι φυλάττεις τὴν παρθενίαν μου, ἣν τῷ θεῷ ἀνεθέμην, καὶ ἀναγορεύω σε βασιλέα. Theophanes, AM 5942, ed. de Boor, vol. 1, p. 103; trans. Mango and Scott, pp. 158–160.

142 Ἐφάνη μοι, ὅτι σὲ δεῖ γενέσθαι βασιλέα μετ᾽ ἐμέ. Malalas, *Chronographia* XIV.27 (367), ed. Thurn, p. 288; trans. Jeffreys, Jeffreys, and Scott, p. 201.

143 Theophanes, AM 5931, ed. de Boor, vol. 1, p. 93–95; trans. Mango and Scott, pp. 146–148; Evagrius, *HE* II.1, ed. Bidez and Parmentier, vol. 1, pp. 212–215; Zonaras, *Epitome* XIII.24.12–16, ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst, *Epitomae historiarum libri XIII–XVIII* (Bonn, 1897). The accounts refer to an eagle. Interestingly, this ominous token was not replaced by these Christian authors with symbols associated with Christianity.

144 See 'Marcianus 8', *PLRE*, vol. 2, pp. 714–715.

self stressed before the delegates to the Council,[145] with the ecclesiastical crisis in hand. The main problems were the territorial tensions between the Sassanian Empire and his own Byzantine Empire over Armenia[146] (and the sensitive issues concerning Armenian Christianity which came with it),[147] and the continual invasions of Huns, with Attila being the most notorious of all, which put considerable pressure on a succession of Byzantine emperors.[148] Our understanding of the scale and urgency of these difficulties will help us in avoiding a simplified perception of Marcian as a one-dimensional, religion-stricken emperor who enjoyed meddling in church affairs as if he had no other care in the world.

Moreover, putting Marcian's reign into a wider historical perspective is essential to our understanding of his own religious drive and how, on his own admission, he saw the connection between the state of the Christian Church in terms of its unity and harmony between its members and the welfare of the empire as a whole. To be sure, ecclesiastical peace was a central ideal promoted by all Christian emperors, Marcian included. As is also revealed from the Emperor Marcian's rhetoric at the Council, the Christian emperors of the late antique and the Byzantine eras had a clear sense of mission of being *defensores fidei*, defenders of the faith[149] — which, in turn, resulted in a harmonised view of the close relationship between the spiritual well-being of the empire and its Christian inhabitants (i.e. unity of the church) and their physical well-being.

Taking into account the unique mental and psychological circumstances in which Christian emperors operated (and the first Christian emperor, Constantine, is a prime example of how Church historians, such as Eusebius of Caesarea, carefully carved and perpetuated the ideal of the Christian emperor as a perfect combination of spiritual and military leadership, which was applied also to

---

145 See pp. 190–191 below.

146 An overview of Armenian history is by R. W. Thomson, 'Armenia in the Fifth and Sixth Century', in: *CAH* 14, pp. 662–677. Also see B. Isaac, *The Limits of Empire: The Roman Army in the East* (Oxford, 1990); The unresolved problem of Armenia is further discussed by N. Adontz, *Armenia in the Period of Justinian: The Political Conditions Based on the Naxarar System*, trans. N. G. Garsoïan (Lisbon, 1970).

147 Armenian Christianity made its first debut in the arena of world politics in the uprising against Yazdgard II, the Sassanian king who, in 450, sought to impose Magism on his Christian Armenian protegés. This is the background for the Armenian, or more particularly, king Vardan's appeal to Marcian for help, which, according to Elishe (*fl.* 450) was promptly refused (see R. W. Thomson (trans.), *Elishe: History of Vardan and the Armenian War* (Cambridge, MA, 1982).

Perhaps in view of the military circumstances, the Council of Chalcedon hosted but a couple of Armenian delegates of low rank, yet the Armenian church remained quite persistent in its opposition to the creeds of Chalcedon, insisting on adhering to Nicaea (325) and Ephesus (431) and hence, on the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia's doctrine of the incarnation.

148 See M. Whitby, 'The Balkans and Greece 420–620', in: *CAH* 14, pp. 701–730, esp. pp. 704–712.

149 See discussion in *Marcian as a Custos Fidei* starting on p. 175 below.

non-Christian subjects), it should no longer surprise us, the modern readers, to learn that upon his accession in 450, Marcian embarked on preparations for the setting-up of a grand-scale ecumenical council simultaneously with equally rigorous efforts on his part to deal with the military challenges, presented, as mentioned above, by the Sassanian Empire and by the nomadic Huns.[150]

Judging from his actions prior to and after the council, the traditional scholarly picture of Marcian (which, paradoxically, may be influenced by anti-Chalcedonian sources, for example, with regard to his so-called poor education) as weak and inept,[151] may not be correct. Of all things, what Marcian did *not* do points to him being a political and military pragmatist: he declined to immerse himself in the Armenian problem, despite the tempting pleadings of the Christian subjects of the Sassanian Empire; he actively embarked on a series of diplomatic negotiations with Attila, trying, as had many of his predecessors, to avoid stretching his military resources to their limits; he cleverly took over the experienced administration of Theodosius II and used it to his advantage, only to dispose of many of its members shortly after his accession. And most of all, he identified the current ecclesiastical schism as his chance to make a bold propagandistic statement, which was also to serve as his own initiation rite as an emperor. In a sense he was right: if the Emperor Marcian is remembered in perpetuity, despite the brevity of his reign, it is thanks to the Council of Chalcedon.

3. Marcian as a Christian Emperor

Important to our understanding of Marcian's self-image as a Christian emperor are the propagandistic narratives, however scant these may be, concerning his accession, which a number of Christian historians and chroniclers, sympathetic to Marcian's person and reign, quite expectedly portrayed as divinely inspired, despite his humble origins.[152] Marcian was an outsider in many important respects: he was not a blood relative of the Theodosian household; had no well-grounded claim to the throne, apart from the facts that a few Theodosian functionaries pushed him to the fore and that the deceased emperor's sister, wished, for some reason, to marry him; his Western counterpart, Valentinian III, withheld his recognition.

---

150 Whitby, 'The Balkans', in: A. Cameron *et al.* (ed.), *CAH* 14, pp. 704–712.

151 See p. 51 above.

152 Thus Evagrius Scholasticus narrates Marcian's (Christian) compassion when, on his way to enlist in the army, he saw a slain body, approached the body out of a (Christian) compassion and only miraculously escaped from groundless charges of murder brought against him. Evagrius further highlights the subscribers' divinely inspired insight in that they chose for Marcian, the newly recruited soldier, the name of 'Augustus' (*idem*, *HE* II.1 ed. Bidez and Parmentier, pp. 212–215); Cf. P. Allen, *Evagrius*, pp. 96–97.

To be sure, under these circumstances, with no real affinity to the imperial throne and with only a modest military career behind him, Marcian's Christianity took centre stage in the retrospective attempts on the part of church historians and chroniclers at legitimating his reign. The accession narratives, presenting the elevation of Marcian as part of a divine plan and stressing Marcian's religious zeal and chastity, are important means by which the lacunae in Marcian's biography were filled.

Marcian, like many of his imperial peers,[153] tried to model himself as a new Constantine, the first 'Christian' emperor (d. 337). As we shall discuss below,[154] Marcian's imperial role model can be reconstructed by the nature of the acclamations and conclamations of which Marcian was the object and Marcian's own rhetoric, as it is revealed especially in his speeches to the delegates. Marcian, a Christian emperor but also an emperor who had yet to secure recognition in his rule, had a mission: to follow in the footsteps of Constantine, by restoring the unity of the Church (or rather, since such unity never existed, to create an illusion of such unity) which, according to Constantinian propagandists went amiss in the years following the first ecumenical council at Nicaea.[155]

A more recent exemplum of imperial patronage over the church was, of course, Theodosius II, Marcian's direct predecessor who convened the two councils at Ephesus and who, to this day, is mostly remembered for his codification enterprise, the *Codex Theodosianus*, a compilation of edicts and imperial promulgations from the time of Constantine until the time of Theodosius, thus marking another attempt at firstly restoring order and harmony of yet another kind and secondly at propagating the Constantinian heritage and establishing it as an imperial exemplum.

4. From Theodosius II to Marcian: A Heritage of Imperial Religious Activism

Theodosius took an active stance against pagan practices and against those whom he deemed to be heretics, most notably Arians and groups which were later dubbed 'Nestorian'. His legislation, or ruling, on these matters can be found in the form of both official imperial promulgation, and in the form of letters. Though Theodosius' religious policy was dubiously enforced in various

---

153 Cf. P. Magdalino (ed.), *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantine History, 4th-13th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1994).

154 See *The New Constantine* starting on p. 174 below.

155 See Eusebius of Caesarea's *Vita Constantini* III.4–24, for the author's assessment of the Council of Nicaea as a Constantinian achievement (ed. I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke*, Leipzig, 1902; trans. A. Cameron and S. Hall, *Eusebius Life of Constantine*, Oxford, 1999, pp. 122–131).

degrees of success,[156] it still remained a powerful propaganda tool which helped to perpetuate his reputation, modelled after the Emperor Constantine, of being a pious Christian emperor. In many respects, the main figures in the Theodosian religious saga continued to play a major role in Marcian's reign and long afterwards. Theodosius' formal endorsement of anti-Nestorian, Miaphysite theology, and Marcian's subsequent expression of Dyophysite sympathies entailed, in fact, a shift in imperial policy, which eventually prompted and led to the convening of a general council in Chalcedon.

Theodosius was not alone in cultivating an atmosphere of theological activism and spiritual engagement. As mentioned above, the Theodosian household included key female figures who personified the archetypal, and by then also historical, grand aristocratic Christian matrons, such as Jerome's or Theodoret's many female aristocratic admirers, who tended to church affairs and at times, even devoted their own lives to the cause, ridding themselves of personal wealth and in more extreme cases, even submitting themselves to an ascetic lifestyle.

In the case of the Theodosian household, more than just reinforcing the newly emerging model of the aristocratic Christian matron, the imperial women, echoing Empress Helena, the Emperor Constantine's mother, had a pivotal role, via their philanthropic activity and intense interest in ecclesiastical matters, in cementing the rhetorical claims propagated by the Theodosian House regarding their Constantinian heritage.[157] To be sure, royal women had some considerable influence in the imperial court, mainly as important vehicles through which imperial propaganda was cleverly and efficiently channelled. However important, though, the position of individual women might have been, this was doomed, not necessarily in fact but in ideology and later reception, to be eclipsed by that of their imperial male relatives.[158]

---

156 See Theodosius' condemnation of Nestorianism in 448 (*CJ*. 1.1.3), against the background of the promulgation of an earlier edict, issued in 428, ordering the suppression of heresies (*CTh*. XVI.5.65). Also see Millar, *A Greek Roman*, pp. 149–157.

157 Cf. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses*, pp. 215–216.

158 The role of Byzantine empresses has been the subject of a number of recent important studies which, on the whole, emphasize their centrality in the social and political spheres (e.g. C. Angelidi, *Pulcheria. La Castità al Potere* (Milan, 1998). While I raise no doubt in my study as to the fact that a number of empresses and other women in the imperial household exercised considerable influence, I wish to argue that in Christian contexts, this influence was largely carried out via the traditional channels reserved for the Christian matron, with its ideal being the personal embodiment of chastity and charity (as is argued, for example, by Angelidi, *ibid*., pp. 87–112). As Averil Cameron rightly pointed out to me, Pulcheria's independent correspondence with Pope Leo was unusual and certainly reflects her forceful personality. However, at the same time, it should be noted that on all occasions, the Empress Pulcheria was hailed as part of the imperial couple and in the emperor's presence, and never in her own right (for a further evaluation of Pulcheria's range of influence see J. Harris, 'Men Without Women: Theodosius' Consistory and the Business of Government', in: Kelly (ed.), *Theodosius II*, pp. 67–89. See also the discussion of her acclamation starting on p. 119 below).

5. The Two Romes: Byzantine and Roman Identities

> At the heart of religion lies a kind
> of quest for identity.
>
> Ninian Smart, *Beyond Ideology*

The frail façade of a single Roman empire, stretching from the west to the east, came to an end with its division in 395 between the two sons of Theodosius I, Arcadius (the father of Theodosius II) and Honorius. To be sure, politically and administratively, let alone ideologically, the two designated parts of the Western and Eastern Roman empire did not cease to relate to each other, whether in terms of mutual military assistance (usually flowing from East to West rather than the other way round), or in terms of conjoined promulgation.

One important step in the *cursus honorum* of any imperial novice was to seek the official confirmation of the colleague in the other part of the Roman realm. Rome and Constantinople were constantly engaged in polite struggle, with the latter acknowledging its slightly inferior position 'on paper', if not *ipso facto*. For what is the coining of the name 'New Rome', if not a blatant claim to continuity and the preserving of old traditions?[159]

Yet whereas the golden image of the Old Rome was hardly tarnished in the eyes of the Constantinopolitans, life in the East, certainly as a consequence of the sackings of Rome in the fifth century, was a much better prospect. From a modern perspective, conceiving of the East as more progressive, more sophisticated, and grander than the West is hardly imaginable,[160] yet we may confidently assume that, despite the occasional military and natural calamities, the residents of the Eastern Roman Empire throughout the fifth century[161] could still hold their heads very high, politically, militarily, and culturally.[162]

What can be inferred from the reading of the *Acts* of Chalcedon, or for that matter, of the surviving *Acts* of any other ancient council, about the Romanitas of the delegates? Were those people who called their city 'New Rome', in

---

159 See G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1974), pp. 43–47.

160 As it remains unimaginable for many West Europeans to picture, for example, the cultural magnet that King Farouk's (reigned 1936–1952) Cairo was.

161 Taking Theodosius II as a bench-mark, this picture of cultural vitality and material prosperity is often limited by modern scholars to the early part of the fifth century (see A. Cameron, 'Education and Literary Culture', in: A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (ed.), *CAH* 13. *The Late Empire A. D. 337–425* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 665–707.

162 W. Treadgold includes the reign of Marcian in the list of successful Byzantine reigns (see *A Concise History of Byzantium* (New York, 2001), pp. 36–43, esp. 36).

their own eyes, fully Roman? In other words, is there any point in us trying to outline the traits of an independent Byzantine identity? Is 'Byzantium' a modern construct imposed retrospectively on citizens of an empire which they themselves regarded as 'Roman'? Can 'Byzantine' be considered synonymous with 'Christian', or could it also be applied to the non-Christian residents of the empire?[163] In the section below we will point out the relevance of these questions (and their respective answers) to the issue of the Emperor Marcian's own identity.

6. Features in Marcian's Identity

Again, examples of traditional historiographical accounts modelled on those of the great classicizing historians are lacking for Marcian's reign (as much as for any fifth-century Byzantine emperor).[164] However, in our attempt to answer the questions stated above, one could positively affirm that Marcian's legacy contains ample documentation, the *Acts* of Chalcedon being, perhaps, the most important and full of all. This corpus enables us to discern the subtleties of rhetoric and how it might relate to questions of identity and self-perception. Thus, as we see,[165] Marcian is undoubtedly a devoted Christian, associated, so he wished to be seen, with a long succession of Christian emperors and also, for that matter, to the long succession of Roman emperors, whose language he cultivated and whose recognition he sought to gain.

The three most dominant features of Byzantine, or Eastern Roman, identity were the Greek language,[166] the religious legacy of Constantine including its physical mirroring in the form of the city of Constantinople, and the eastern government.[167] To be sure, Constantinople too, as opposed to 'pagan' Rome, came to be associated with the ideal of a Christian city *par excellence*.[168] With these ideals in mind, no wonder that Marcian, a newly installed emperor, still seeking the recognition of the Western emperor, and hence, in possession of a marked propa-

---

163 See W. Goffart, *Barbarians and Romans, A. D. 418–584: The Techniques of Accommodation* (Princeton, 1980).

164 See discussion of the sources on Marcian's reign starting on p. 50 above.

165 See *The New Constantine* starting on p. 174 below.

166 The issue of language as an important identity marker is indeed Fergus Millar's magisterial study of the reign of Theodosius (see Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*, esp. pp. 84–107).

167 A triad of 'great cultural unifiers' succinctly discussed by Treadgold, *A Concise History*, pp. 43–50.

168 Dagron summarizes the complexities of Byzantine identity or rather, identities, as follows: 'Romain, certes, le peuple est malgré tout défini comme peuple de la ville de Constantinople' (see Dagron, *Naissance*, pp. 299–304, esp. 300).

gandistic agenda,[169] would promote a self-image of a 'new Constantine',[170] a 'new Paul', and a 'new David',[171] rather than that of a 'new Augustus'.[172]

The consolidation of Byzantine self-identity became an even more poignant issue in cases where the emperor had yet to exercise his authority in his new capacity and where the emperor did not possess the aura of dynastic prestige. In his dealings with the West, we see that ecclesiastical disputes were to Marcian a means to consolidate his relationships with both the papal and the imperial courts of the West.[173] Thus turning his gaze to the West, Marcian, heavily involving himself in ecclesiastical matters, insisted via his imperial representatives that the draft Definition of Faith, agreed upon in the second session of the council, be brought into line with the *Tome of Leo*, the Pope's confession of faith, and without reopening its articles for further deliberations in the council.[174]

We have discussed above the psychological importance of physical environments.[175] To be sure, by insisting on convening a church council on Byzantine soil, initially and significantly choosing Nicaea as the host city,[176] Marcian made it clear for all to see whose show it was: the council, Marcian's council, held eventually in Chalcedon, was opened in pomp and circumstance with the newly chosen Marcian, flanked by his entourage, participating personally in the sixth session and throwing in all his imperial weight to ensure the slippery success of the gathering. In addressing the delegates, Marcian exhibited linguistic virtuos-

---

169 Unsurprisingly, this agenda comes to the fore also through visual media, most notably Marcian's column, erected in Constantinople in honour of the emperor by Tatian, Prefect of the city of Constantinople (450–452) (cf. 'Tatianus 1', *PLRE*, vol. 2, pp. 1053–1054).

170 As will be further discussed below, this agenda coincides well with Marcian's initial choice of Nicaea, the host city of the council held under the aegis of Constantine, as the host city of the council in question.

171 The title of 'New Constantine' is part of a triptych of attributives, arranged in an increasing order of importance, and merging together imperial and biblical *exempla*: 'to Marcian, (our) new Constantine, our new Paul, and our new David': Μαρκιανῷ νέῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ νέῳ Παύλῳ νέῳ Δαυίδ; *Marciano novo Constantino, novo Paulo, novo David* (see for instance Session VI.11).

172 The use of historical *exempla* seems to be associated with oral acclamations and, perhaps, only in the presence of the emperor himself: the *Acts* of the Council of Ephesus, for example, are not recorded as addressing the emperors, here Theodosius II and Valentinian, explicitly as 'new Constantines'. However, the attributives applied to their names (see, for example, *Collectio Vaticana* nos. 81, 87, ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 1.1.3: εὐσεβέστατοι, very pious; θεοφιλέστατοι, God-loving; τροπαίουχοι, triumphant; ἀεὶ αὔγουστοι, forever Augusti; φιλόχριστοι, friends of Christ) still highlight their imperial grandeur in the context of Christian piety (also see discussion of the emperors as *custodes* and *defensores fidei* starting on p. 226 below).

173 At the time of the council, Marcian had yet to obtain the acknowledgement of the Western emperor.

174 Session V.22–25.

175 See discussion on pp. 38f. above.

176 See p. 26 above.

ity by addressing the council first in Latin and then, in Greek.[177] Language is an important *identity marker* which is greatly enhanced when the speaker enacts, as it is always the case, a specific and clear *social role*. It is one thing when, say, a banker chooses to switch from German to French in discussions with clients, and another when an emperor addresses his subjects and guests in different languages and at a comparable level of proficiency.[178]

Interestingly enough, in the Eastern Roman empire, Latin continued to be used in legal contexts up until the mid-sixth century,[179] whereas communication with the public at large, clerics included, was carried out in Greek.[180]

Marcian, for that matter, could have equally addressed his Latin speech to a deaf audience, for the vast majority of the attending bishops and clerics came either from the Diocese of Oriens (where both Greek and Aramaic were spoken),[181] or predominantly from other Greek-speaking regions, and neither of these groups possessed any knowledge of Latin.[182] The latter point is corroborated by the fact that, after addressing the council in Latin, Marcian himself went on to deliver a Greek version of his speech.[183] Thus, in a nutshell, Marcian's own bilingualism[184] touches upon issues which were, and still are, crucial to the understanding of our own identities and those of others: linguistic competition, language use, linguistic choices, and the space one language is allowed at the expense of another in a given context and cultural framework.[185]

---

177 See the discussion of Session VI in ch. IV below. Taking Marcian's military background into account, Marcian's fluency in Latin can be explained, perhaps, by his participation in campaigns in the West and in Vandal Africa.

178 Cf. Van Dijk, *Society and Discourse,* pp. 129–130.

179 Averil Cameron, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity* (rev. ed.; London, 2011), pp. 27–28.

180 It is notable, though, that *Theodosius' Codex* was written in Latin, whereas the Justinianic *Novels*, promulgated some one hundred years later, were written fully in Greek. Fergus Millar captures the linguistic situation under Theodosius II as follows: 'Latin was clearly essential for anyone, of any rank, performing a public function, even though all exchanges and communications with the public, whether groups or individuals, took place in Greek' (Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*, pp. 84–107, esp. 89).

181 Cf. map in Millar, *Greek Roman Empire*, p. 272 (figure XI).

182 See S. Brock, 'Greek into Syriac and Syriac into Greek' in: *idem*, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London, 1984), ch. II.

183 Session VI.2: He delivered the following address to the council first in Latin and after the address in Latin then in Greek.

184 See discussion in *The New Constantine: Marcian at Chalcedon* on p. 174 below.

185 Thus Millar on the Eastern empire under Theodosius II: […] for all the real, and very significant, commitment to the unity of the Roman Empire, the reality was that, not of two separate Empires, but of twin Empires, in one of which, that which Theodosius ruled from Constantinople, the normal language of the vast majority of the population was Greek. It is this 'Greek Roman Empire' which is the subject of this book (see Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire,* p. 2). One may add that the Empire, in effect, was always called 'Roman' in Greek and Syriac, and in Arabic 'Rum'.

D. Socio-Anthropological Perspectives
in Reading Ancient Texts

1. Method and Approach

> The real world […] is messy and imperfectly
> documented; yet theory claims pattern and
> perfection. The match can never be exact.
>
> Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*
>
> Language lives in a social world.
>
> Gillian Sankoff, *The Social Life of Language*

This book essentially and primarily focuses on the study of ancient ecumenical gatherings as social events.[186] Here, we would like to draw the readers' attention to the communicative strategies of the delegates and the societal significance of these strategies to our understanding of issues such as the distribution and application of power, social stratification, group dynamics, and the factors which play a role in decision-making in official and performative contexts. The proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon are of special interest to us: as already mentioned, they are presented (and perceived) as verbatim narrative accounts (rather than summaries of decisions made),[187] their analysis as a real-life piece of theatre staged in several acts forms the basis for this study. In this context, the study of ceremony and ceremonial behaviour is of great relevance. Indeed, on the level of *micro-history,* that which is concerned with individuals and their personal relations, the *Acts* remain a unique source, incomparable in its wealth of detail and its claim to juridical exactness and precision.[188] However, in this case, we would like to rely on this professed precision on the part of church and state officials not necessarily in order to achieve a higher degree of 'accuracy' in respect of historical 'facts', but rather, in order to reconstruct the social and societal dynamics which were at play.

---

186 Also see discussion in *Scope and Methodological Principles* starting on p. 19 above.

187 For this statement, please see discussion above (*ibid.*). A similar distinction made in modern anthropological studies between real-life speech and the evidence of written documents is discussed by D. Parkin as follows: 'The first thing to say about Bailey's analysis is that it is intentionally based on chunks of real-life speech set in a social context but on three prepared, written texts distributed by different Indian pre-independence political parties' (Parkin, 'The Rhetoric of Responsibility', in: Bloch (ed.), *Political Language*, pp. 113–139, esp. p. 114).

188 A precision which described by Price and Gaddis as being a late antique obsession with textuality, and with the authentication of texts, as a basis for legitimate authority in both religious and secular spheres (see Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 2).

This study, then, focuses on the dynamics of social processes, on how a public decision is made, rather than on the decision itself. The sociologically oriented historian (and conversely, the historically oriented sociologist), then, would rejoice at the opportunity to study processes of decision-making in an ancient and ritualistic society for which the only contact points remaining are written records, which, thanks to their level of detail and vividness, even if we have to account for the occasional embellishment and manipulation,[189] still bring us, using discourse analysis and the observations of key socio-anthropologists, as close as possible to a reliable reconstruction of the social dynamics which were at play.

Approaches to Socio-Anthropological Research:
Flies on the Wall

Taking the stance of the observer-sociologist, an onlooker who sits passively in a corner of the room, observing and analysing people's behaviour, while trying to keep his own involvement to a minimum, is, perhaps, the most suitable model which can be applied in a socio-anthropological study of ancient societies.[190] Studying the *Acts* as a coherent corpus, the ancient historian, though unable to confront his subjects of investigation in person, is given the chance, perhaps for the first time since scholars have become interested in ancient gatherings, to peer from the outside through an open window at what is happening — to reflect upon the relationship between language and space[191] — inside a *locus*, exploding with emotions and tensions, but which is also highly regulated by official etiquette and decorous ceremonial.

What is the role of theological disputation in the public discourse of the early Byzantines? What is the relation between state officials and senior clerics; how do social bonds translate themselves into ecclesiastical politics? How are the *personae* of the Christian emperor and his spouse perceived by his subjects; how does a Byzantine emperor perceive his own role in a religious context? Can we speak at all of 'secularism' in relation to Byzantine societies? How does the Byzantine emperor use religious discourse, when it comes to forging his policies vis-à-vis the Western part of the Empire?

The discourse analysis offered below[192] will demonstrate how these and such similar 'soft' issues, which by now have become indispensable to modern histor-

---

189 See discussion in *Scope and Methodological Principles* starting on p. 19 above.

190 For non-invasive approaches to fieldwork and observational methods in anthropological research see H. Russell Bernard (ed.), *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology* (Walnut Creek, CA/Lanham, MD/Oxford/New York, 1998, rev. ed. 2000), esp. Part II: *Acquiring Information*, pp. 259–411.

191 See discussion on p. 107 below.

192 The relevant chapters are mainly chapters III and IV.

ical research,[193] can be approached and discussed with positive results. To name but one example, many a scholar has wondered about the relationship between the Byzantine emperor and the clerical establishments. Previous scholarly discourse about this question not only yielded the term *Caesaropapism*,[194] but, to this day, also branded Byzantine society in our collective psyche as being fanatical, corrupt, and generally imbalanced. Assuming for a while the position of the 'fly on the wall',[195] the sociologically oriented historian is able to observe the behaviour of the delegates as they respond to, and interact with, each other. He or she is able to witness the dynamics of the conversation, albeit frozen in its own particular juridical genre, as this unfolds.

The Acts as Records of 'Performative' Utterances

As is suggested by their Latin name, the proceedings, or the *Acts* of the Council of Chalcedon, were perceived by their respective actors as deeds. They are examples of what Austin branded as 'performatives', utterances which take the form of actions.[196] To be sure, the delegates to the Council of Chalcedon did much talking and debating, yet in their minds, all this debating amounted to doing. The *Acts* of Chalcedon document long and, to modern taste, even tedious, deliberations. Language and its use in specific social circumstances become the key factors in unlocking the mysteries of a society, distant not only in chronological terms, but also, and mainly, in respect of its public discourse and distinctive ceremonial.[197]

Societies 'Worthy' of Socio-Anthropological Investigations

This section has an apologetic function in that it should explain why, also in my view, 'dead' societies are worthy of socio-anthropological investigation.[198] Maurice Bloch, a leading social anthropologist, defines the essence of his field as

---

193 Cf. Averil Cameron, 'The Writing of History', in: *eadem*, *History as Text*, pp. 1–10.

194 For a refutation of the concept, see G. Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le 'césaropapisme' byzantin* (Paris, 1996), pp. 290–322.

195 This is my own metaphor, used to denote non-invasive methods.

196 Discussing, for example, the phrase 'I salute you', J.L. Austin describes how this utterance might pass over into a pure performative, when the gesture itself is lacking: '"I salute you" [without actually saluting] may become a substitute for the salute and thus a pure performative utterance. To say "I salute you now" is to salute you' (see Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (rev. ed.; Oxford, 1976), p. 81).

197 For concrete examples see *Dramatic Climaxes* on p. 135 below.

198 As mentioned above, Mary Douglas, taking the biblical corpus of the Old Testament as her new pasture grounds, has defended this approach quite successfully in her *Leviticus as Literature* and *Purity and Danger*.

the raising of questions of a particularly fundamental nature which would not normally be considered within a culture, but arise as a result of the confrontation of totally foreign cultures.[199]

Bloch's definition of 'traditional anthropology' seems to highlight the extraordinary and the divisive in human cultures. Bloch is obviously critical of this approach, yet he too is careful not to identify the specific culture which, according to this definition, stands above those 'questions of a particularly fundamental nature', but is implicit in our own 'modern' culture(s), thus making a clear-cut distinction between 'exotic' and Western-European cultures.[200]

True, sociologists, including sociolinguists, and anthropologists, initially embarked on the cultivation of their relatively young disciplines while studying 'tribal', non-European societies. However, it has not taken long for these students of human societies to come to realise that the knowledge amassed in Africa is also applicable to their own modern, urban societies, be it parts of Northern Ireland, or suburban neighbourhoods in New York City.[201] The sciences of sociology and anthropology have become more inclusive in that more societies and sub-societies have invited socio-anthropological investigation. Subsequently, the question which should forever remain open is: are we all that different? Could we possibly apply our sociological and psychological knowledge vertically, to the linear depths of history, as much as we now apply it horizontally, to remote tribes and urban communities alike?

---

199 See the introduction by M. Bloch to his edited volume, *Political Language and Oratory in Traditional Society* (London, 1975), pp. 1–28, esp. p. 1.

200 A sense of the 'new' line of anthropological research which Bloch wishes to take is given in his subsequent discussion of the background to his study of Merina political oratory in Madagascar (*ibid.*, p. 5), where he makes the following interesting comparison: 'In studying the process of socialization I soon became aware that what was stressed […] in the correcting and directing of the behaviour of children in Madagascar was not so much the content of what can be said, but the manner in which it can be said. This is a familiar phenomenon since in England (of the mid-seventies), too, what seems to concern parents to an intense degree is that their children should use such words as "please" and "thank-you" as well as suitable intonations of the voice which are thought of as respectful and not cheeky.'

201 In this context, note A. Kuper's conclusive remark: '[…] the history of the theory of primitive society is the history of an illusion. […] anthropologists have busied themselves for over a hundred years with the manipulation of a myth that was constructed by speculative lawyers in the late nineteenth century' (Kuper, *The Reinvention of Primitive Society: Transformations of a Myth* (2nd ed.; London/New York, 2005), p. 10). Trying, however, to characterize ethnic minorities according to their speech, may carry racist overtones, as is exemplified in the following quotation on 'black' speech: 'Blacks do indeed speak differently than whites. Here I do not refer to the phonological and morphological differences much discussed in the literature of Black English, but rather to the ways in which Blacks use talk as part of their daily lives' (R. D. Abrahams 'Black Talking on the Streets', in: Bauman and Sherzer (ed.), Explorations, pp. 240–262, esp. p. 240).

Dating to the first quarter of the twentieth century, early studies in modern sociolinguistics and the philosophy of language in the US, Britain, and France reflect the growing interest over the years in what now seems to be the indissoluble knot between language and society.[202] Taking things a step forward, one could ask oneself why we do not look at 'dead', 'historical' societies in the same way as we look at, and study, living societies. The limitations imposed by having to rely on 'filtered' evidence — for each and every 'source' material is, by nature, 'filtered' in the sense of it being 'reworked' by its author — are obvious. Nevertheless, despite the lack of direct contact with the subjects of one's investigation, the historian still has much to gain from applying a sociological-analytical approach in the study of the society of his choice, ancient or more recent.

2. Grounds for Comparing Ancient and Modern Societies

> The Pauline antithesis of blood and water, nature and grace, freedom and necessity, or the Old Testament idea of godhead can be illuminated by the Polynesian or central African treatment of closely related themes.
>
> Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger*

> The symbolic language of culture is public […]. The symbolic function is universal, and human beings could not manage without this second code, which operates alongside the generic code itself. Indeed, to be human is to be cultured. But there is no point in pursuing (with the structuralists or formalists) universal principles that might underlie all cognition, for the key fact is that all cultures are different.
>
> Adam Kuper, *Culture. The Anthropologists' Account*

This section comes by way of an apology as to why I think that ancient and modern societies, or, for that matter, seemingly different societies which occupy the same time frame, are at all comparable. Taking language as a social marker, it can be assumed that all people, although sharing fundamental common psycho-

---

202 Cf. W. M. O'Barr, *Linguistic Evidence. Language, Power, and Strategy in the Courtroom* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), p. 7 n. 6, citing Whorf, Malinowski, Tambiah, Ardener, Bloch, Levi-Strauss, and the work of the pioneering philosophers who recognized the fact that language operates within identifiable culture frames. For the latter, see the studies of F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique generale* (Paris-Lausanne, 1916, 5e éd. 1968); J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Cambridge, MA, 1962); J. R. Searle, *Speech Acts* (Cambridge, 1969).

logical and behavioural traits, also have specific ways of using a language in spe-cific social (and textual) circumstances.[203] The question in need of an answer is how people in general and the delegates to the Council of Chalcedon in particu-lar use, or used, language in ritualistic and ceremonial contexts.

In many repects, the science of comparable sociolinguistics is based on the assumption that as far as the function of language is concerned, different societies and their respective individual members display some universal traits which render such a comparison viable. These traits enable us to draw analo-gies from one society to another, to predict human behaviour in a given social context, regardless of the obvious geographical, historical, and also *linguistic boundaries*.[204] Below is an outline of a few major themes which I think are rele-vant to this study. However, rather than attempting to offer an exhaustive out-line of the relevant socio-anthropological research my aim here is to clarify my approach, to highlight the themes and to point to the obvious, in part historical, bench-marks in this field.

Language Use in Different Social Contexts

It is now common knowledge that 'Western', 'non-tribal' societies also re-flect highly regulated patterns of expression in *variable social contexts*: differ-ent modes of language use are employed to convey a wide and almost limitless range of sub-texts in which issues, such as social stratification and group iden-tity, are constantly re-addressed and re-confirmed.[205] Is there a way of applying sociolinguistic observations to the study of ancient texts? A positive answer to

---

203 In a similar vein, the fields of cognitive psychology, literary criticism, linguistics, and rhetoric conceptualize human understanding and knowledge transfer in terms of architec-tures of minds and specific mental processes which involve generalisation of patterns and principles across texts and/or discourses; see P. Stockwell, *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction* (London, 2002), esp. pp. 1–11, 91–104 on discourse worlds and mental spaces, 135–149 on text worlds; J. Gavins, *Text World Theory: An Introduction* (Edinburgh, 2007).

204 The question has roots in modern anthropological scholarship. Trying to justify anal-ogies from 'primitive' to 'modern' societies Mary Douglas in the 1960s adopts the following apologetic tone when discussing the Roman Catholic Eucharist (somewhat forgetting that the Eucharist, albeit still performed in modernity, can hardly be described as a modern rite): '[…] I wish to show that modern examples are as susceptible to the modes of analysis we em-ploy as primitive ones. Why not? The only difficulty hitherto has been the lack of a frame of analysis for comparing ourselves and tribal societies along the series from high magicality to low. In the 1960s Bernstein's work on ourselves and Turnbull's work on the pygmies enables this framework to be set up. The discussion can begin' (see *eadem*, *Natural Symbols. Explora-tions in Cosmology* (rev. ed.; New York, 1973), p. 68).

205 An illuminating introduction to the subject, stressing the sociological aspect is by S. Romaine, *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Oxford, 1994). On p. viii she observes: 'Prevailing trends in linguistics have marginalized the study of the social role of language.'

this question opens up a new range of research possibilities. Paying heed to the limitations imposed on us through having to rely on the seemingly static testimonials of texts (as opposed to the liveliness of recorded conversations and interviews), the socio-anthropological sciences provide the ancient historian with a fresh look at the evidence left to us by 'dead' societies.

Noam Chomsky's Deep Structure

In modern sociolinguistics the debate about 'universals' began, most evidently, with Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*, where the author sets out to prove that all human languages are modelled on one pattern, determined by a certain innate human inclination to learn certain types of language.[206] According to Chomsky, a basic unity reflected in the structure across languages, and a basic similarity of grammar, constitute the *deep structure* of any given language. Following Chomsky, sociolinguistics could also be taken as a study of universals.[207] In this context, subsequent studies were carried out by sociolinguists who sought to discover regularities within language variation, and to explain how these are related to social factors which, in turn, determine how *patterns of variation* work.[208]

Ferdinand de Saussure's Language Use

In his pioneering work, Ferdinand de Saussure was the first to make a clear distinction between language and *language use*.[209] Following De Saussure's footsteps, Hymes observes that social information is coded in language use, rather

---

206 On the common grammatical qualities of 'natural languages' see the following statement by N. Chomsky: 'I […] consider a language to be a set (finite or infinite) of sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements. All natural languages in their spoken or written form are languages in this sense, since each natural language has a finite number of phonemes (or letters in its alphabet) and each sentence is representable as a finite sequence of these phonemes (or letters), though there are infinitely many sentences. Similarly the set of "sentences" of some formalized system of mathematics can be considered a language' (Cf. Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague, 1957), p. 13).

207 On the immediate impact of Chomsky see N. Smith and D. Wilson, *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution* (Bloomington, 1979), esp. the introduction. Historically speaking, Chomsky's notion of universalism was far from new and date back to pre-Modern Europe, with universal linguistic theories being promoted by theologically motivated linguists, and in early modernity, from Leibniz and beyond (cf. H. Amirav and H.-M. Kirn, 'Notes on the Reformation, Humanism, and the Study of Hebrew in the Sixteenth Century: The Case of Theodore Bibliander (1505–1564)', *CHRC* 87 (2007), pp. 161–171).

208 Cf. O'Barr, *Linguistic Evidence,* p. 8.

209 Amongst De Saussure's important and enduring observations is the following distinction: 'La langue n'est pas une fonction du sujet parlant, elle est le produit que l'individue enregistre passivement […] La parole est au contraire un acte individuel de volonté et d'intel-

than in its grammatical categories.[210] The new generation of sociolinguists, which included, for example, Labov,[211] asked itself one central question: 'how do social facts explain linguistic patterns?'[212] This approach yielded a number of areas of investigation: (a) Studying the political, economic, and historical events that affect the place of a language in social life (e.g. migration, official legislation aiming at regulating language use); (b) Examining social situations of language use and stressing the evolution of language in situations of face-to-face interaction. The first type of face-to-face interactions constitute order management (e.g. the allocation and organisation of turns, opening and closing of occasions of speaking, regulating sequence structures, such as questions and answers, exchange of greetings, apologies and acceptances). The second type of face-to-face interactions consists of expressions of relationships among participants which, as Sankoff observes, 'are often designed to create, build up, and maintain the understanding among participants that relationships exist'.[213]

Linguistic Manipulation: Echos from Chalcedon

A further contribution towards the formation of a coherent sociolinguistic theory is the distinction between *referential* and *social functions* of language. The first relates to the factual information conveyed in a discourse, the latter to the speaker's attitude towards the content of his communication, as well as to the other conversant. This line of research poses two main questions: (a) How is social information coded linguistically? (b) What are the mechanisms by which *social categories* affect the communication process?[214] Thus, a teacher's command to his pupils to 'sit down' has both referential and social meaning: a straightforward request, but also an indication of the speaker's social

---

ligence, dans lequel il convient de distinguer (1) les combinaisons par lesquelles le sujet parlant utilise le code de la langue en vue d'exprimer sa pensée personnelle; (2) le mécanisme psycho-physique qui lui permet d'extérioriser ces combinaisons' (De Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, pp. 30–31) ; see also W. P. Lehmann, 'Saussure's Dichotomy between Descriptive and Historical Linguistics', in: W. P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (ed.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics* (Austin, 1968), pp. 3–20.

210 D. H. Hymes, 'The Ethnography of Speaking', in: T. Gladwin and W. C. Sturtevant (ed.), *Anthropology and Human Behaviour* (Washington, D. C., 1962), pp. 13–53.

211 W. Labov, 'Phonological Correlates of Social Stratification', in: *American Anthropologist* 66 (1964), pp. 164–176.

212 Two ground-breaking articles are C. Geertz, 'Linguistic Etiquette', in: J. Pride and J. Holmes (ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (rep. Middlesex, 1960), pp. 167–175 and R. Brown and A. Gilman, 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity', in: T. A. Sebok (ed.), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, MA, 1960), pp. 253–276.

213 G. Sankoff, *The Social Life of Language* (Pennsylvania, 1986), pp. XVI–XXII, esp. p. XIX.

214 Cf. J. J. Gumperz, *Language in Social Groups* (Stanford, 1971), esp. pp. 220–229.

status.[215] Similarly, when Anatolius, the *magister militum* and the chairman, overseeing many of the sessions, tells members of the senior clergy to calm down, he is also making clear to them 'who is boss'.[216] To be sure, the proceedings of the *Acts* contain an array of such and similar social information. It is up to us to decode it.

My questions, again, are concerned with how people, or rather the actors in the Council of Chalcedon, explore and stretch further the boundaries set by the wishes of their conversation partner against their own; how do they manipulate and let themselves be manipulated through language? The ceremony and linguistic ritual reflected in the *Acts* of the Council of Chalcedon provide us with ample opportunity to delve into these questions.

3. The Purpose of Group Gatherings: Contributions from Social Anthropology

> Agreed belief in taboos or fishing magic, sin or sacraments, one God or Three-in-One: How do they establish their collective church with its peculiar doctrines instead of each losing it all in destructive heresy hunting?
>
> Mary Douglas, *How Institutions Think*

We have pointed out that ecumenical church gatherings became an established tradition, unique to the cultural climate of the Christian religion.[217] But there remains the question of how we could explain the very need to make decisions over pragmatic, let alone ideological, issues in this ostentatious, public manner and not another? To answer this question, we ought to ask ourselves why people gather together in the first place.

If fact, in the short passage quoted above, Mary Douglas seems to associate religious *linguistic sanctioning*, i.e. the setting of norms as to what should or should not be said, and the manner people communicate their ideas, with the attempts to establish *normative rules* — rules which, in turn, dictate the individual's conduct within the boundaries of his or her (religious) community.[218] In the same vein, we can assert that the proclaimed purpose of an ecumenical church gathering is to regulate belief, or better still, to 'unearth' it in a divinely guided

---

215 Compare with the more elaborate syntactic expression 'won't you have a seat?' in, Gumperz, *ibid.*, p. 221.

216 See discussion on p. 121 below.

217 See discussion on p. 30 above.

218 See *eadem, How Institutions Think*, p. 36.

and spontaneous process. Yet since belief is not easy to control, all that remains is to try and control its tangible expressions, namely oral and written discourse. Dogmatic thought and dogmatic behaviour are, therefore, two sides of the same coin:[219] in ecclesiastical contexts, these two elements are the building bricks of *social control*, by which religious discourse is monitored and regulated. An ecumenical church council, with its totalizing claims to universality, offers the ideal physical framework in which linguistic sanctioning is carried out, followed by an obsessive urge to document, record, and thus to capture, moments of consensus, whether real or staged, as they were frozen in formulaic *credos*, for generations to come.[220]

Functional versus Ceremonial Purposes of Group Gatherings

Reflecting on the factor of size, Bailey posits as follows:

> A unanimous decision in a council of one hundred men is, in fact, an act of acclamation or legitimation: the actual decision has been taken elsewhere.[221]

Bailey's subjects of investigation are village councils in modern India — yet how easy would it be for us to use his observations in order to understand better the acclamatory nature of ancient church gatherings, and the constant pursuit of emperors to legitimize their reigns, precisely in those religious mass-gatherings?

What are, then, the characteristics which underline group gatherings as sociological phenomena? In other words, if not always[222] 'functional' (i.e. discussing a problem and reaching a decision), what are group gatherings for? In order

---

219 Pioneering studies of ideological dogmatism were carried out in the 1950s and 1960s by M. Rokeach, who understands this phenomenon as comprising of the following three elements: '(a) a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, (b) organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, (c) provides a framework for patterns in tolerance and qualified tolerance towards others' (see Rokeach, 'The nature and meaning of dogmatism', *PR* 61(1954), pp. 194–204; see also *idem*, *The Open and Closed Mind* (New York, 1960), and the general overview by K.M. Goldstein and S. Blackman of conceptual dogmatism, detached from its immediate ideological and political contexts: *Cognitive Style. Five Approaches and Relevant Research* (New York, 1978), pp. 62–102). Compare with the study by T.W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswick *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York, 1950) — a study which reflects the earlier focus on authoritarianism and personality theories which concentrated on the content of the thought, rather than on its structure and cognitive characteristics).

220 Unsurprisingly, this 'totalizing', or, perhaps, totalitarian, approach, motivated by a naïve ambition to 'settle matters once and for all', has always provoked subsequent ecclesiastical controversies.

221 See F.G. Bailey, 'Decisions in Councils and Committees', in: M. Banton (ed.), *Political Systems and the Distribution of Power* (London, 1965), pp. 1–20, esp. p. 2.

222 The outcome of the 'Robbers' Council', for example, shows that decisions were not necessarily pre-fixed and predictable from the start.

to even remotely be able to answer this complex question, we ought to consider the value attached to group gatherings from both perspectives: the individual's and that of the group as a whole. Why do individuals participate in group gatherings?

Radcliffe-Brown's Solidarity-enhancing Functions of Gatherings

Putting social bonding to the fore, Radcliffe-Brown argues that, at least when it comes to gatherings of ritualistic and ceremonial natures, these exercise a *solidarity-enhancing* function.[223] This idea seems so faithfully descriptive of the social realities that we all imagine ourselves to be familiar with, that laymen, including myself, would be almost automatically inclined to explain the individual's motivation in this light.

Mary Douglas's Critique of Radcliffe-Brown

Yet Radcliffe-Brown's supposition met with criticism on the part of his sociologist colleagues: 'Hasn't anyone ever been bored in church?', asks Mary Douglas, while stating that 'the case for ritual stimulating the emotions is weak'.[224] Douglas clearly senses that something in Radcliffe-Brown's supposition does not add up, in the sense that it is not applicable to *all* conceivable social realities. Again, I would say that there is nothing wrong with flawed theories: after all, this is what theories are for, to try and grasp the ungraspable. This statement may also be correct for Mary Douglas, whose perception of human solidarity, which she seems to associate with emotional excitement, led her, in turn, to criticize Radcliffe-Brown's theory regarding the solidarity-enhancing function of group gatherings. True, people do at times get bored while attending regular church services, yet for some reason, they still wish to attend the service in person. They do 'show their faces' despite their occasionally masked, or manifested, boredom.[225]

---

223 Thus, according to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, […] in attempting to understand a religion it is on the rites rather than on the beliefs that we should first concentrate our attention (see Radcliffe-Brown, 'Religion and Society', in: idem (ed.), Structure and Function in Primitive Society (London, 1945), pp 153–177, esp. p. 155).

224 Douglas, *How Institutions Think*, p. 34.

225 In Late Antiquity, large and, sometimes, illiterate publics attended sermons which were highly refined and which often presupposed prior knowledge of the scriptural texts (see my *Rhetoric and Tradition: John Chrysostom on Noah and the Flood* (Leuven, 2003), pp. 30–31).

Durkheim on Emotional Excitement

Douglas is essentially correct in maintaining that the ritualistic is not necessarily synonymous with emotional excitement. In this respect, she seems to cast a healthy critical eye also on Durkheim who, at the end of the nineteenth century, explained ritual and ceremonial as stemming from the emotional excitement of great gatherings,[226] thus ruling out the possibility, as Erving Goffman maintains, of some rituals being small-scale, functional, and, to some extent, non-emotional.[227] However, in the same vein, Douglas should have equally allowed for the possibility of social bonding occurring in more neutral and less charged emotional atmospheres.

The Council of Chalcedon as a (Religious) Group Gathering

The Council of Chalcedon was far from being emotionally neutral: some shouted, others shouted back,[228] yet not all the delegates were emotionally committed: the state officials present, despite performing a major ritualistic role, and perhaps because of that, ostentatiously distanced themselves from the 'madding crowd', monitoring and regulating the exchange of communications between the parties.[229]

A group gathering, then, is a social microcosm in that it is never homogeneous in terms of the social standing, function, and interests of the individuals who take part in it. Participants often wish to give the illusion of homogeneity, which they often convey in external codes, such as dressing in uniforms etc., yet in reality an army of troops on parade, seeming homogeneous to the onlooker

---

226 E. Durkheim seems to attach great importance to the 'irrational' and emotional elements in group behaviour. In explaining the rules of human collective behaviour, he seems to make no distinction between the 'transitory outbursts' [sic] of an enraged crowd, the adoption of fashion in, for example, clothes and housing, and finally, more *sustainable* phenomena, such as the emergence and evolution of new religions (see Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, trans. S. A. Solovay and J. H. Mueller (8th ed.; Glencoe, 1938), p. 5ff, and references to collective irrationality and emotional behaviour throughout his *Rules*.

227 In his study of interaction ritual, Goffman argues for the existence of ritual in a wide range of behavioural materials, such as glances, gestures, positionings, and indeed, verbal statements (with which this study is mostly engaged). In Goffman's view, no social interaction, however small (that is, a one-to-one conversation), let alone a group gathering, is devoid of ritual (see Goffman, *Interaction Ritual*, Chicago, 1967).

228 See, for example, Session I.44–46.

229 Long before Durkheim, the nineteenth-century Scottish journalist, Charles Mackay, made a bold attempt at analysing people's 'irrationality' when placed in the context of a group. The latter famously analysed market behaviour, but he also drew on examples taken from the world of (Christian) religion, such as the adulation of relics and the impact of ecclesiastical hair and dress fashion (see Mackay, *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (London, 1841, repr. Ware, 1995).

from afar, becomes less so from a closer distance, when the different ranks of the parading soldiers and the arrangement of the latter within the group become ever more visible.

In many respects, however, by force of its nature and societal function, a ritual setting, such as a church service, creates unity and helps to suppress for some moment the awareness of difference. The delegates to the Council of Chalcedon could and did resort to countless expressions of unity: praising the Christian faith, the emperor, the metropolitan cities etc.,[230] yet social and intellectual gaps between laymen and clergy, Miaphysites and Dyophysites, bishops and state officials, remained a visible social reality. However, as Douglas observed and questioned,[231] people do, occasionally, agree on things, some of which, such as issues of Christian doctrine, are intellectually quite complex. Are these cases of agreement also an illusion? Following the Thomas theorem, when we define situations as real they become real in their consequences. The fact that we are now able to discuss them, after fifteen hundred years, proves that cases of agreement, too, can evolve into social realities.

Bailey on the Functions of Consensus

Bailey makes the following distinction:

> Councils lean towards consensus when they have one of the following characteristics: an administrative function, especially when they lack sanctions, or an elite position in opposition to their public, or concern with external relationships.

And at the other end of the spectrum:

> Councils proceed readily to majority voting when they are policy making, or arena councils, or concerned with internal relationships.[232]

Returning to the proceedings of Chalcedon, the most alarming indication of the complexity of the phenomenon of social grouping is given, in our case, in the delegates' plea to the emperor to put an end to the gathering, and in the emperor's resolute and consistent refusal to do so.[233] Assuming that socialising and bonding were equally forceful motives in the minds of most of the delegates who had shown up in Chalcedon, how was it that halting the debate then and there, when the discussion had barely began, came to serve as a consensual point of reference between the rival parties? With most of the delegates travelling a long distance, why would they not extend the opportunity to socialise for a few more days?

---

230 See discussions starting on pp. 144–146 and on p. 198 below.
231 See p. 70 above.
232 Bailey, 'Decision in Councils', in: Banton (ed.), *Political Systems*, pp. 9–13.
233 See discussion on p. 200 below.

Promoting the Mystique of Consensus in Chalcedon

Achieving consensus is a reasonable purpose and the ideal outcome of any group gathering. In Chalcedon (and other similar gatherings) the process en route to consensus had in itself a mystical aura, pregnant with theological implications. As we progress in the reading of the Acts it is clear that both Marcian, personally and as represented by the members of his imperial entourage, as well as the proponents of ecclesiastical ideology — all encourage the mystique of consensus. Now, if this ideology were to reflect a matching reality of consensus, our discussion could and should have ended right here. However, when analysing the ecclesiastical ideal of consensual decision-making, we must also take into account factors, such as ideological frictions and personal animosities, which were not always functional or pragmatic.

Coser on the Functions of an Open Debate

The delegates are obviously expressing their fears that more debate would enhance the friction rather than secure consensus. This brings us to the question of the terms and circumstances under which a debate might have a positive, bonding, or a destructive, devisive, function. In other words, does conflict always re-establish unity, or does this happen only under specific sets of circumstances? Coser addresses this question by stressing the need to make a clear distinction

> between conflicts which concern the very basis of a relationship and those which concern less central issues. Conflicts arising within the same consensual framework are likely to have a very different impact upon the relationship than those which put the basic consensus in question. Thus, within a marriage relationship, a conflict over whether or not to have children involves the basic consensual agreement about the very purposes of the relationship.[234]

In the specific context of theological debates, also taking into account the particular political and personal issues which typified them individually, the question of what constituted that *basic consensual agreement* for delegates to an ecumenical council is important, as much as it is impossible to answer in definite terms. Did the said consensus constitute, among other things, a shared belief in Christ, the Christian canon, shared principles of interpretation, or did it come down to the minute details of the nature of Christ, or, later on, whether icons should be allowed or not?

Building on the sociological theories mentioned above, in the analytical discussion, I will try to demonstrate that ecumenical church councils had an obviously unifying function, creating a shared historical memory and adding abun-

---

234 L. A. Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict* (London, 1956), pp. 72–81, esp. 73.

dantly to the Christian communal narrative.[235] At the same time, they also propagated the divisions, in much the same way as they perpetuated the building blocks of the consensual agreement upon which Christianity, any Christianity, thrived as a living religion and culture.[236] Whatever our answer may be, it is important to bear in mind that the function of consensus, again, remains the key word for our understanding of elite gatherings, such as the one under discussion. The appearance of the emperor provided the delegates with a perfect opportunity to seal the consensus achieved with the authorial and ceremonial stamp of the emperor.[237] Marcian's refusal to co-operate in ordering the closure of the council prematurely is another important chapter in the unfolding social saga.

Goffman's Performative Consciousness

The ceremonial or performative nature of an ancient church gathering, with its unmistakable emphasis on the observance of specific and well-defined social and behavioural codes, is our key to analysing the events from a socio-anthropological perspective, mostly as regards language use, but also, and as far as the evidence allows us to do so, as regards *performance*, namely *gesture* and *tonality*.

Geertz makes the important observation that 'as acts, both speaking and behaving are spontaneous performances fed from underground springs'.[238] While I would leave the issue of spontaneity open for debate, for me, too, the concentration on ceremonial implies the study of ritualistic behaviour, as it is reflected in every aspect of our daily lives, most predominantly in the way people communicate and establish hierarchies in the most subtle of ways, albeit in various degrees of 'consciousness'.[239] *Performative consciousness*—presumed when ritual is carried out in theatrical contexts or contexts which mimic theatrical situations, is largely displayed in overt ceremonial, such as royal pageants and a vast array of performative rituals—is made almost insignificant in the light of people's *internalisation of cultural codes*.[240]

---

235 See *Church Gatherings as Formal Speech Events* on p. 82 below.

236 See further discussion on p. 198 below.

237 See *Marcian as a Custos Fidei* on p. 175 below.

238 C. Geertz, 'The Cerebral Savage', in: *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973; rev. ed. London, 1993), pp. 345–359, esp. 354.

239 In this context, see, for example, the excellent study by S.G. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1981) and her stress on imperial *adventus*, accession, and the handling of the emperor's legacy by panegyrics and artists.

240 Averil Cameron has prompted me to ask what actually falls under the definition of ceremony or performance and what degree of consciousness could be attributed to the actors on the scene. My point is just that, ritual is found in every aspect of our societal lives, even in cases when we are not aware of the fact that we are engaged in ritual or performance. Answering politely to the teacher while doing what is expected of us (for instance, in verbally recognizing his or her authority and going back to our seat, is a form of ritual). Coming back to the

As shall be further demonstrated and discussed below,[241] the delegates to the Council of Chalcedon reflect several degrees of performative consciousness: high in the presence of an official dignitary or an important, albeit rival, bishop, low (in the sense of 'automatic' and unaccounted for) in the engagement with peers. Erving Goffman describes the seemingly unconscious ritual, or ceremonial behaviour, via the prism of the *actor,* who, in our case, is synonymous with the individual delegate:

> In fact, most actions which are guided by rules of conduct are performed unthinkingly, the actor questioned saying he performs 'for no reason' or because he 'felt like doing so'. Only when his routines are blocked may he discover that his neutral little actions have all along been consonant with the proprieties of his group and that his failure to perform them can become a matter of shame and humiliation.[242]

4. Non-verbal Gestures:
Gesticulation and Tonality in Chalcedon

> [In the Malagasy custom] not only is the orator strictly limited in what he can say, but freedom of intonation and loudness which he would have in ordinary conversation is almost totally non-existent. His choice of gesture and also of posture is fixed for him by the rules of oratory.
>
> Maurice Bloch, *Political Language and Oratory*

The title of this study stresses language *and* ceremonial, or performance, as inseparable pairings of human public expression and communication. Michael Mann, echoing Bloch, cleverly asserts that *aesthetic practices* including song, dance, visual dance forms, and rituals, are the third leg in the formation of ideological power.[243] These are the ostentatious aspects in the exercise of ideological power which are of the most interest to us here.

---

question of 'consciousness', the basic assumption is that people engaged in speech acts 'have internalised not only rules of grammar, but also rules of appropriate speech usage which are broadly shared by other members of their society, and which they apply in their speech behaviour' (cf. G. Sankoff, 'A Quantitative Paradigm for the Study of Communicative Competence', in: *Explorations*, ed. Bauman and Sherzer, pp. 18–49, esp. 18).

241 See *Formal Language as a Boundary Marker* on p. 84 below.

242 E. Goffman, *Interaction Ritual* (Chicago, 1967), p. 49.

243 The other two components are *categories of meaning* and the *monopolization of norms* (see M. Mann, *A History of Power from the Beginning to A. D. 1760*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 22–23). A brave attempt at generalising human societies from antiquity to modern times, Mann's book is, nonetheless, scattered with occasional inaccuracies (for example, the classification of 'classical' Greece as 'secular').

A reconstruction of the visual evidence, as it is transmitted via the occasional authorial testimonials — the fixed seating arrangements, the tight control over the right to speak, the obligation to stand up while addressing the council — indicates to us beyond any doubt that a church council was a ceremonial occasion. Leaving aside, for the moment, the minute details of posture and tonality, most of which are lost to posterity, it would be safe enough to assume that the gathering of many people in a specific *locus* and at a specific time is, in itself, the most evident non-verbal gesture of all.

Gesticulation

Gesticulation, too, is important in imbuing social gatherings with the natural characteristics of a living organ, whose communication depends on what it does, or intends to do, as much as on whatever it emits vocally. Given that the consolidation of personal and dogmatic authority is one of the most crucial elements underlining the purposes and goals of ecumenical gatherings, many physical, bodily, gestures that can be reconstructed have much to do with conveying to an argument (and its presenter) an authoritative stance even *before* it has actually been laid down. To be sure, the *Acts* provide evidence not only of what has been said but also of the specific manner it has been said.[244]

Tonality

Tonality is another important factor in assessing interpersonal communication and group dynamics. When analysing ancient proceedings tonality is obviously not something which we could reconstruct, though we can still be receptive and tuned in to the many references to tonality in the text itself. The passage discussed above obviously reflects a heated debate to which, Anatolius, the senior officer present at this session, was tolerant because he sympathized with those who acknowledged their previous 'errors' and now wished to have the decisions of the second council of Ephesus abolished. As will be discussed further below, a breach of communal decorum is often not tolerated by the people assuming authority over a specific community.[245]

We have seen how, as shown above, Anatolius, the senior officer who presided over the proceedings, gave his tacit agreement to a commotion instigated by del-

---

244 See *Communication Strategies* starting on p. 153 below.

245 Criticism and reproach on the part of the authoritative figure are far from being the outcome of a neutral, objective process: we have seen that Anatolius, for example, is in no hurry to suppress the cries of his favourite party. In a similar vein, a harsher and uncompromising tone can be undeservedly applied when the addressees are perceived as less privileged (e.g. the college Dean in the example discussed below repeatedly addresses the objects of his criticism as *junior members*).

egates wishing to change their dogmatic position. In this context, Anatolius continued to lend his sympathy even when excited declarations of faith turned into outright expressions of anger and a trading of insults. He was less sympathetic, though, towards people who broke the *rules of the community* which Anatolius instinctively perceived as being the keeping of decorum (*polite deference*) even in disagreement, the maintenance and execution of formalistic codes (e.g. taking appropriate *turns* in speaking, or keeping to one's seat), and, most important, contributing to the fostering of consensus.

Books as Fetishes

In the context of *bodily language*, many gestures — for whose recording we remain dependent on the narrator, who deems them important enough to merit a disruption in the recording of the debate itself — are concerned with books, most notably the Bible and more specifically, the Gospels, or even and most notably, some writings of authoritative Fathers of the Church — books which were, on occasion, treated almost as *fetishes*, that is objects with a surplus, supernatural, meaning. Analysing the Eucharist in the Roman Catholic Church, Mary Douglas defines fetishistic symbolism as the belief that

> the deity is located in a specific object, place and time and under control of a specific formula. To make the deity inhabit a material object, whether shrine, mask, juju or piece of bread, is ritualism at its starkest[246]

In our specific context specific books were physically placed in the centre, and, as we shall see, were perceived by the delegates as bearing witness to the event and lending its divine authority to it.[247]

The Body as a Communicative Tool

Making a symbolic use of objects is one thing. Making a symbolic use of one's own body is another. The delegates wasted no time in venting their real feelings. Already in the first session, polite *decorum* had made way for the exchange of a succession of insults which the delegates also displayed in their very own bodies, by placing themselves in their newly chosen group, thus expressing their alienation from the decisions made at the previous council.

---

246 See *eadem*, *Natural Symbols*, pp. 69–73.
247 See further discussion in *Books as Special Delegates* starting on p. 109 below.

White and Breiger's 'Cleavages'

More recent studies also rely on anthropological observation, rather than solely on a retrospective analysis of historical phenomena. One such observation, made by White and Breiger,[248] postulates that it is the very mechanism of grouping together that also dictates and influences the dynamics of splitting and of schismatic behaviour. In other words, the manner in which groups are formed can most certainly predict the manner in which they might split up. A subgroup, sub-network, or clique, will usually break off from the *mother group* along lines of weak attachments, or *cleavages*. White and Breiger, who studied cases of religious dissent within modern monastic communities, claim that schism is most likely to occur along lines of cleavage.

Nicholas's Conflict Groups

Naturally, breaking off from one group to join another presupposes an initial alignment with, and commitment to, a faction. Based, again, on studies of 'primitive' tribal groups and village settlements (with Japanese political parties representing the most 'modern' and 'cultured' social units in the exotic collection of Pygmies, African hunters, and Indian peasants), Nicholas identifies factions as *conflict groups*, struggling for the accumulation of public power, whose members associate themselves with a particular leader (who may, or may not, actively recruit the members of his faction).[249]

Bourdieu's Turns

When discussing the qualities of authoritative and ritualistic discourse, Pierre Bourdieu refers to the Homeric custom of granting the prospective speaker the right of speech by handing him the ceremonial sceptre.[250] In sociolinguistic jargon, 'turns are utterances produced by the speaker, and a conversation consists of two or more turns produced by different speakers.' Thus,

> turn-taking in conversation is a linguistic variable that is determined very considerably by social factors, especially power. The conventions of turn-taking are

---

248 H. C. White, L. Breiger et al., 'Social Structure from Multiple Networks', *AJS* 81 (1976), pp. 730–780; *eadem*, 'Pattern Across Networks', *Society* (1975), pp. 68–73.

249 R. W. Nicholas, 'Factions: a Comparative Analysis', in: Banton (ed.), *Political Systems*, pp. 21–61, esp. pp. 27–28. Nicholas's 1960s study would be much more acceptable today (and more applicable to the study of religious schisms, past and present), if his seemingly restricted notion of 'political' power had been expanded to all forms of public power, including the struggle over public discourse and the 'right' to shape public ideology.

250 See P. Bourdieu, *Langage et pouvoir symbolique* (rev. ed.; Paris, 2001), pp. 159–173, esp. pp. 161, 163.

so strongly embedded within any given speech community that power can be asserted, maintained or relinquished by the organisation of turn-taking in conversation.[251]

The proceedings show us an Anatolius, second only to the Emperor in terms of seniority and authoritative aura, who, if one is allowed to elaborate further on Bourdieu's imagery, holds the Homeric sceptre almost exclusively: he is evidently far from being intimidated by the massive presence of ecclesiastical dignitaries. He controls the deliberations forcefully and without any reservations. He grants or refuses bishops the right to speak (i.e. exercises control over the turns). He shouts at them, and at times interrupts them abruptly.[252] There are cases, however, when he listens attentively and meekly without disclosing any hint of the regal anger reserved for the less fortunate.[253]

5. Speech Acts as Performatives

As already discussed,[254] Austin identified some speech acts as *performatives,* that is, utterances that perform actions. As such, their importance lies less in their 'meaning' (*locutionary force)* than in their ability to perform actions, or in their 'force' (both *illocutionary,* the force of the action the words are intended to perform, and *perlocutionary*, the force of the actual effect of the words on listeners).[255] Hence, to follow Jones' example, asking 'do you have a pencil?' is also a performative in that it is, in fact, a request, directed at the receiver and intended to make him or her perform a specific action ('give me a pen'), rather than just supplying the speaker with some information.

In its broader sense, a *speech act* (not to be confused with a *speech event* discussed further below) may be described as a case of focused interaction, marked by discourse stages, or sets of utterances with a common topic focus.[256] As Van Dijk points out 'social power may be manifested in specific (directive) speech

---

251 See P. Stockwell, *Sociolinguistics. A Resource Book for Students* (2nd ed.; London, 2007), pp. 31–32.

252 By the fifth century, bishops had become important vehicles for communication and advancing the interests of their respective cities vis-à-vis the emperor and his court. However, the advantageous position of the imperial court is poignantly exemplified in that the bishop, however influential and senior, would always occupy the role of a petitioner and go-between whatever the circumstances might have been (see C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2005), pp. 262–267).

253 On the characteristics of powerful versus powerless styles, see O'Barr, *Linguistic Evidence*, pp. 61–75.

254 See further discussion on pp. 64–67 above and 88 below.

255 Cf. Jones, *Discourse Analysis*, pp. 55–57 and 102–105.

256 *Ibid.*, p. 37.

acts',[257] i.e. requests, orders, and commands, but also apologies. In the *Acts* too *speech acts*, for example, one-to-one conversations between the presiding officer and the ecclesiastical delegate, are recognizable through the following set of *repetitive rules*: summons sequence and identification, invitation sets, narratives (to include orientation, complication, and evaluation), and resolution or coda.[258] These repeated routines, which often boil down to the preservation of even the same wording, take centre stage in anthropological studies of religious ceremonies and religious texts, such as *The Book of Common Prayer.* Yet the dominance of such routines in somewhat more mundane conversations, such as telephone calls, is no less recognizable. In our analysis of the text below, we will come to identify *discourse units* and recognize their routines.

Church Gatherings as Formal Speech Events

By definition and practice, a church gathering is indeed a *formal speech event*, in our case, a public ecclesiastical debate, in which expressions of familiarity and spontaneity (including humour)[259] are highly unwelcome, and where tokens of politeness are often exaggerated.[260] Where then lies the social value of such gatherings? The functions of speech are manifold and are expressed in a wide range of *speech acts*. The latter may include *pathetic communication* (expression of solidarity), *pragmatic efficiency* (accompanying work), planning and guidance, addresses, greetings, farewells, adjustment of relation, acts of commitment (promises and oaths at court), and so forth.[261] Thus, in that communication may reflect a pragmatic agenda, the social value of communication is enormous. In group and mass gatherings the quest for *token cohesiveness* and affirmation of *group identity* are constantly at play.

Rules of the Community

With the abstract and physical ideal of the (Christian) community and the individual's operation within its boundaries (here, Christian orthodoxy) resonating throughout the proceedings, we may wish to illustrate this important point with an episode drawn from the world of an Oxford college, a decanal announcement whose top-down, almost judicial, tone does not leave any doubt in the minds of the readers as to how, according to the author, the *rules of the community* should be observed, preserved, and displayed:

---

257 Cf. Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context,* p. 202.
258 *Ibid.*, pp. 34–36.
259 For the absence of humour in formal events, see Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context*, pp. 113–114.
260 *Ibid.* pp. 114–115.
261 *Ibid.*, p. 56.

a) Of Promptness: It has come to my attention that increasing numbers of Junior Members (and guests) are arriving increasingly late for Formal Hall. Quite apart from the inconveniences this presents to College Staff, it is ill-mannered and fails to respect the purpose of Formal Hall, namely, communal dining. That is dining together as a community. Hall is not a restaurant, an assembly of private parties who merely happen to be co-located. It is a communal event; and it is essential part of such an event that the meal commences, for everyone, together, at the given time (7.15 pm). Junior Members are therefore reminded that they should be sure to be in good time for dinner (those arriving late will not be admitted) and are reminded also (community again) that they are required to wear gowns.

b) Of Pyjamas: In a somewhat similar vein, it has come to my attention that some Junior Members have been coming to breakfast dressed in their pyjamas. This practice evinces a failure to distinguish between public and private spaces in College. There is a clear distinction between dress appropriate for public rooms and for public residence; there is clear distinction between daywear (public) and nightwear (private). I trust that this slovenly practice will cease forthwith.

The author underlines in a distant, impersonal manner ('it has come to my attention'), what rules should be applied in a College, communal, meal. Here it is not about what people *say,* but rather, about what they *do* (i.e. coming late to Hall, sometimes dressed in their pyjamas). The author clearly perceives Formal Hall as a communal ceremony and protests about the fact that some College students, Junior Members, seem to have not internalised the College's cultural and *social codes* properly. Again, the students are not expected to treat Formal Halls as *formalistic* events, but still, some degree of formality and appreciation of the ceremony which underlines those Formal Halls are clear demands. As at the Council of Chalcedon, the students engage in a communal performance which they are expected to enact together, in a manner commensurate with the proprieties of the group, and in a prescribed time and a prescribed location.

Languages as Markers of Social Cohesiveness

To be sure, in mass gatherings, the process is no less important, or even more so, than the end result. Why otherwise would ecclesiastical dignitaries agree to submit themselves to this great imperial display of power willingly and of their own accord? In addition to their divisive potential, public debates have great potential also for producing *markers of cohesiveness*. Such important markers which also testify to strong *social ties* are the evolution of *distinctive semantic and lexical systems*, and in other words, vocabulary.[262]

Christians formed their own specialized vocabulary within the range of ancient languages which they cleverly appropriated, namely Greek, but also Syriac,

---

262 *Ibid.*, p. 74.

Latin, Armenian, and a host of other languages. This was an important *marker of social cohesiveness*. However, what seems to be more important is the fact that those ancient Christians came up not only with new vocabularies, but also with a new set of conceptual categories which transcended any given language in use, and which reflected a profound cultural revolution, carried out by them. Categorization of the world by linguistic means is, then, an ongoing social activity:[263] the Trinity, for example, is a cultural and social concept, as much as the seven days of the week are.

6. The Ceremonial Functions of Language

To point out a few of the limitations mentioned above, the area of *macro-linguistics*, or the relationship between language and the organization of communities, as is reflected in the modern study of social dialects, bilingualism, and style, might prove to be quite difficult to apply to the study of the *Acts*. On the other hand, the field of *micro-linguistics*, investigating the influence of social forces on the structure and use of languages, seems to be a far more promising approach for any further study of church proceedings. These, being records of official public proceedings, are formalized, controlled, and reworked. By their very nature, the *Acts* reflect a 'frozen' reality: on the one hand, the ceremonial gravity of the occasion commanded 'standardization' of the Greek language — a second or acquired language to many of the participants — thus eradicating any traces of local or sectarian usages. On the other hand, the attempts of the official copyists, or rather, their imperial commissioners, at exercising full control over the recording and production of the *Acts* inevitably coincided with their wish to exhibit to posterity a homogenised text, both dogmatically and stylistically.

In short, in a study of the *Acts*, the *sociolinguistic patterns*, namely the regular correlation between language and external factors, such as social class, style, gender, and age, are bound to become blurred. Yet the curbing of the sociolinguistic patterns and the insistence on a formalistic scheme are in themselves declarative and telling choices.

Formal Language as a Boundary Marker

A whole language, or even a particular style, can be used as a *boundary marker*.[264] In our case, the boundary marker lies in the polite and formalistic style, or, in other words, the *formal register*.[265] It corresponds with the ceremonial na-

---

263 Romaine, *Language in Society*, p. 20.
264 *Ibid.*, p. 78.
265 Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context*, p. 151.

ture of the occasion[266] and, most importantly, attempts to blur any traces of social networks in that the speakers consistently adopt a polite and deferential tone when addressing one another.[267] The latter point is significant, for the apparent minimization of personal relationships, combined with the consistent application of *linguistic restrictions*, gave the gatherings the allure of a juridical, non-partial procedure.[268] *Linguistic politeness* is double-sided, for it can indicate deference (for example, of clerics to each other, or to imperial officials), but also authority and control,[269] as they are exemplified time and again by the *polite formality* of the senior imperial official.[270]

Formality is designed here to mark not one, but several boundaries: the religious and the secular, the inferior and the superior, the ecclesiastical and the imperial. It is most reflected in the observation of *co-occurrence rules*, namely rules which ensure *structural and lexical predictability*. These restrictions, found in their most extreme forms in ritualised religious speech in traditional societies,[271] are strictly observed in the *Acts*: each ecclesiastical delegate, however senior, does not take the floor, unless he is allowed to do so by the senior imperial official. Furthermore, all participating delegates have official titles attached to their names which they are expected to use when addressing another participant without altering or shortening the title. In such controlled conditions,

---

266 *Politeness strategies*, including, indirectness, elaboration, and deferential address may have a ritualistic character (see F. Coulmas, *Sociolinguistics. The Study of Speakers' Choices* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 101; S. C. Levinson, *Pragmatics* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 273–274; Goffman, *Interaction Ritual*, pp. 47–95.

267 S. M. Ervin-Tripp, 'Sociolinguistics', in: J. A. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, vol. 1 (The Hague, 1971), pp. 23, 48–49. In his discussion of the element of politeness in political oratory in Malagasy villages, Bloch observes in his *Political Language* that 'This sort of speech-making seems at first very removed by what has been meant by political. It seems that if power is exercised at all it is done very nicely and if decisions are reached they are reached almost mechanically and there is hardly ever a come back' (See *ibid.*, p. 8).

268 The characteristics of written and spoken legal language, used in modern English-speaking courtrooms, are discussed in O'Barr, *Linguistic Evidence*, pp. 15–31. Attempts at extreme linguistic precision, frequent use of formal expressions, reverting to professional argot, use of archaic language, as well as Latin and French — are all abundantly reflected in the close environment of the courtroom (see D. Mellinkoff, *The Language of the Law* (Boston, 1963), pp. 11–22).

269 On polite distance through impersonalisation (e.g. 'the management reserves the right to refuse admission'), see Stockwell, *Sociolinguistics*, pp. 27–29. See also Coulmas, *Sociolinguistics*, p. 101. See also the discussion of directives and polite requests in Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context,* pp. 203 and 214–215.

270 Alas, the Greek does not differentiate singular and plural second person, known in sociolinguistics as *T/V system* (see Stockwell, *Sociolinguistics*, pp. 27–28). However, in the light of the consistent deferential politeness on the part of the senior state officials, one could not expect to find many cases of asymmetrical T/V usage, even if ancient Greek were to display these functions.

271 Ervin-Tripp, 'Sociolinguistics', pp. 38–39.

switching of style to denote different nuances of familiarity or hostility, and allowance for *linguistic diversity* or, as discussed by Van Dijk,[272] *lexical variation,* are unlikely.[273] For example, abusing an opponent's title by shortening or altering it is not an option, for this would amount to breaking the co-occurrence rules.[274] Similarly, addressing a favourite by using an affectionate or more prestigious title is also not recorded in those sessions of the *Acts* which were analysed closely.

Honorific Titles as Criteria for Social Stratification

With Marcian making his appearance only in the sixth session, the most senior and distinguished imperial official present was Anatolius, the Eastern *magister militum*, who also presided over the proceedings. Anatolius, representing the body of the Constantinopolitan senate, is always spoken of in the regal plural form as 'the most magnificent and glorious officials and the exalted senate', οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος, this title stressing the seniority, magnificence, and superiority of its holder. Moreover, in mockery of our tendency to project the modern distinction between 'secular' and 'religious' onto Late Antique institutions, Anatolius' honorific title — formulaic, ceremoniously long, and repetitive — makes it clearly apparent that in fifth-century Constantinople, the juridical power over ecclesiastical matters lay uncompromisingly in the hands of the emperor and his senior officials.

The Formal Linguistic Arsenal: Honorific Titles

Indeed, the fixed honorary titles which predominate in the delegates' discourse are the most distinctive *marker of formality*. The semantic values of the titles and their hierarchical values are further discussed below. These titles are firmly connected to the speaker's social identity and more specifically, to the speaker's ecclesiastical or imperial rank.[275] In terms of social interaction, honorific titles may amount to giving and receiving *compliments* (hitherto extensively studied by sociolinguists in the context of gender and ethnicity), which, in turn, 'are intended to protect each others' (positive and negative) *face needs*'.[276]

In the context of church gatherings, establishing a delegate's rank becomes an extremely interesting issue especially in relation to determining the forces

---

272 Cf. Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context,* p. 134.

273 Ervin-Tripp., 'Sociolinguistics', pp. 62–63.

274 See MacMullen, *Voting about God*, pp. 81–82.

275 Thus, Ervin-Tripp, ibid., on p. 19: 'Status marked situations are settings […] where status is clearly specified, speech style is rigidly prescribed, and the form of address of each person is derived from his social identity.'

276 Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context*, p. 213.

behind church procedures, or in other words, in relation to assessing the relationship between church and state. This issue is examined from different perspectives throughout this study. For example, in chapter four we have examined this issue in the context of gesture and ceremonial behaviour. In this chapter, we wish to use language as an equally informative source in addressing questions of hierarchy and *social stratification*.

Titles form the backbone of any type of *address system*. We address each other all the time, while employing different social selectors, such as race, occupational rank (in our case, ecclesiastical hierarchy), marital status, or age. Every social system displays its own criteria of address selection. Therefore, a stranger entering a new system, such as a modern scholar trying to get to grips with ancient ecclesiastical procedures, may well have to learn new sociolinguistic rules.[277]

Senders and Receivers as Criteria for Measuring Social Control

Titles and other *honorific vocabulary*, however informative, are only one pivotal element in determining one's social status.[278] Another important indicator is the amount of talking each participant may perform. If any communication comprises *senders* and *receivers*, the first take the initiative in speaking (addressors) and the latter are engaged in responding (addressees)[279]. The question of whether one is to be classified as a sender or as a receiver depends on the situation at hand, as well as on the participant's *social status*. In some cases the allocation of the role of the sender is initially determined by the nature of the *speech event*, for example, a court room session, a college lecture, or a board room gathering would all be presided over by a predominant sender. In our case, the presiding imperial official has an unmistakable dominance over the proceedings, both in terms of the amount of speaking he does, as well as in terms of his commanding tone, pitch, gestures, and other paralinguistic and nonverbal features.

When a person is uttering a sentence, he or she is engaged in both a *locutionary act,* i.e. the act of vocalising a sentence with a certain sense and preference, as well as an *illocutionary act,* also known as *speech acts,* such as making a request.[280] Moreover, there seems to be a close connection between the performing of speech acts, that is, seemingly descriptive utterances which take the place of actions (for example, 'I order you to sit down; I now promote you to the rank

---

277 *Ibid.*, p. 29.

278 For a historical overview of 'vocabulary of privilege' in general and honorific titles in particular, see P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*, esp. pp. 221–259.

279 *Ibid.*, p. 46.

280 An overview and critique of speech act theory is found in M. L. Geis, *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction* (Cambridge, 1998), esp. pp. 3–32.

of Sergeant'), and the exertion of *social control*.[281] Austin who initially identified speech acts as *performatives*, also pointed to their frequent use in legal material and other *authoritative texts*.[282] What is often attributed to the role of the *principal sender* — greetings, self-identification, invitation, rejection, apologies, and such routines — is clearly recognizable in the function of the imperial official heading the sessions of the council. Moreover, the dominant participant is recognizable in his efforts to impose on the other participants the principles of continuity and relevance, thus ensuring unity of topic and message.[283]

It is suggested that

the functions of communication in cohesive networks necessarily include a high frequency of requests for social reinforcement and of expressive speech,

and that

the social group may or may not be concerned with information and with the exchange of opinions for their own sake.[284]

The pragmatic agendas of the council in question are clear for all to see: looking into the unlawful deposition of one bishop here, clarifying important theological issues there. Yet the manner in which the proceedings were carried out, with the almost totalitarian control by imperial officials over purely ecclesiastical matters and their clear attempts at imposing an imperial compromise, proves that beyond the theological substance lay the emperor's supreme will to impose his wish and to make it clear for all to see.[285]

The Audience as Senders or Receivers

The first question that springs to mind in discussing the audience attending the sessions of the council concerns its knowledge of the Greek language,[286] and if any existed, its degree of competence in bilingual or multilingual con-

---

281 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
282 Cf. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, p. 85.
283 Ervin-Tripp, 'Sociolinguistics', p. 54.
284 Ervin-Tripp, 'Sociolinguistics', p. 70.
285 Mann's 1986 work indicates the growing interest in the role of symbolic or ideological power among sociologists, see Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*, vol. 1.
286 To this one may add Latin, the language chosen by the emperor in the sixth session to address the delegates of the council. Marcian's choice of language is a subject worthy of further deliberation: officially, Latin was still the language of choice in imperial litigation. Marcian may have also directed his address to the delegates of Pope Leo. From a sociological perspective, however, the use of Latin may come across as a 'marked', i.e. unusual, choice, for it did not concur with the language choice of the other participants (see Coulmas, *Sociolinguistics*, p. 24).

texts.[287] The occasional outbursts on the part of the audience[288] testify to a fair degree of comprehension and—provided that such remarks were indeed made in competent Greek and were not 'translated' or 'smoothed' over later on by the transcribers of the *Acts*—of its ability to produce Greek in addition to comprehending it.[289] At this point we may safely assume that, with the exception of episodes of acclamations, the prevalent social conventions generally imposed silence on lower-ranking clergy. We may also explain the seeming asymmetry between the principal participants and the audience at large (including bishops and unlisted members of lower clergy) against the background of semibilingualism which presupposes comprehension of a given language, but not its spontaneous active production.[290]

With their occasional outbursts, the members of the audience, switching from passive presence to active participation, assume various *communication roles* (e.g. bystanders, onlookers, or participants), by which various *degrees* of participation could be detected.[291] Confining their communication strategy to shouting and exclaiming, the members of the audience clearly distinguish themselves from the more intellectual and elitist litigants and heads of the ecclesiastical sees.[292] In their passionate commitment, the members of the audience are not afraid to break the rules of formality which dictate not only the orderly exchange of information between senders and receivers, but also the genteel address to ecclesiastical foes.[293] Educated or not, the members of the audience realise intuitively the magnitude of the occasion as being a great and ostentatious display of ecclesiastical power under imperial aegis.

---

287 The complex issues of bilingualism and language choice are extensively dealt with by Millar in his *A Greek Roman Empire*, esp. pp. 84–123.

288 Theodoret's entry in the first session provoked many such outbursts.

289 Linguistic competence and performance are two notions discussed by N. Smith and D. Wilson, *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution* (Bloomington, 1979), pp. 44–45.

290 Ervin-Smith, 'Sociolinguistics', pp. 66–67.

291 Cf. Van Dijk, *Society and Discourse,* pp. 130–135.

292 Most notable are the charges against Dioscorus for being a 'Pharaoh'. The conventions of formal style clearly reject the use of metaphorical language, while embracing a more 'neutral' and uncharged style.

293 Also see *Larson's Communication Test* on p. 197 below.

II. Political and Social Networks

> Relationships are often designed to create, build up, and maintain the understanding among participants that relationships exist.
>
> Gillian Sankoff, *The Social Life of Language*

> The Late Roman bureaucracy was larger, with a more complex structure and an elaborate hierarchy. Elements of rationality were present, but the system never overgrew its patrimonial origins.
>
> Peter Garnsey & Caroline Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World*

A. The Social Importance of Networking

In his study of power relations in human societies, Michael Mann underlines his main methodological rule as being the supposition that 'societies are constituted of multiple overlapping and intersecting socio-spatial networks of power.'[1] Whereas one cannot easily refute Mann's view of human societies as complex and non-homogeneous entities, it would be equally hard to explain how decisions are eventually made and executed at any given particular time and a particular space if it were not for the existence of centralized forces, which, like forceful swirls in open water, are able to neutralize contradicting currents and to enforce their will.

The refined and, sometimes, suppressed personal and ideological connections between delegates to a church council correspond to Mann's view of the complexity of the social factors which lie behind a socially homogeneous façade, though it may be an illusion. The powerful swirl embodied here by the emperor and his entourage could be considered as *determining factors* — those factors that have a role in either stirring social currents in the desired direction, or eliminating them altogether.

Ecclesiastical networking, which, for want of space and because of the existence of specialized works dedicated to the subject, will be discussed here only

---

1 See Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*, vol. 1, p. 1.

very partially,[2] is a field deserving much attention in our attempts both at creating a prosopographical corpus,[3] as well as in using it wisely to unlock the social secrets of the early church. Daily contacts and intense correspondence must have played their role in bringing together the vast numbers of ecclesiastical figures to form tight social and dogmatic clusters. Inaccurate though the lists of attendance may be, the grouping of the ecclesiastical delegates into their designated group is in itself a social statement which is intended to reflect, albeit occasionally in a faulty manner, a concrete reality. As mentioned earlier, the ecclesiastical lists are, in most cases, secondary to the imperial lists. Moreover, in these, too, one can observe a strict hierarchical order, whereby the delegates seem to have been listed in accordance with the relative importance of both their persons, as well as the sees they were associated with.[4]

Our prime points of departure and interest cannot be fully comprehended as social phenomena without understanding the dynamic mechanisms of their corresponding opposites, namely religious dissent and schism. The causes of the latter have long been the subject of sociological investigation.[5] As early as in the 1920s, Niebuhr, studying the history of Protestant Christianity, raised the important question of how sects are created and transformed, and how this transformation might affect their re-formation.[6] His theory, perhaps somewhat too 'materialistic' for modern tastes, pointed to an apparent dissatisfaction with the parent body on account of the latter's accommodating approach towards the world it once condemned.[7]

B. Networks of Delegates in Chalcedon

We now return to the composition of the social networks in question (or more specifically, to the composition of the imperial delegation, discussed below). Documenting a mixture of senior church and imperial officials, the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon allow us a rare glimpse into the political and social dynamics of an ecclesiastical gathering. A close prosopographical examination of the analysed sessions is essential to map the social and political networks in which the delegates operated, and through which they promoted their

---

2 For studies dedicated to ecclesiastical networking, including A. Schor's recent study, see notes to pp. 27 and 28 above.

3 See discussion in the *Role of Prosopography* on p. 27 above.

4 The names of the subsequent delegates are listed according to their geographical provenance (see Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, pp. 124, note 40).

5 For an overview, see R. Stark and W. Sims Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion. Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation* (Berkeley, 1985), esp. pp. 99–125.

6 H. R. Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York, 1929).

7 *Ibid.*, p. 19.

personal and ideological agendas. Furthermore, the proceedings, with their detailed attendance lists, bring us closer than ever to a true understanding of this important question. First, we will draw an overall picture of the delegates' social and ideological affiliations, as revealed by the description of the delegates' seating arrangement. Second, we will concentrate on the imperial commission, its composition and function.

It has been suggested that the attendance lists adorning the beginning of each session at the synod are partially the fruit of the stenographers' imagination.[8] This is a serious *caveat* which demands verification of the facts in respect of each individual name.[9] In order to achieve a clearer picture, it will be necessary to collate the lists of signatories to the Definition with the lists of attendants. For now, we will be content with the crude hypothesis that the participation of higher-ranking imperial officials and their clerical counterparts would have been less easy to tamper with than that of lower-ranking clerics. The availability of the auxiliary material,[10] Martindale's *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* and Destephen's recently published series, *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, Delmaire's *Études prosopographiques* and his 'Les dignitaires laïcs'[11] have significantly advanced the study networks, whether in Chalcedon, or in the context of ecclesiastical networks in general.[12]

---

8 Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 43; vol. 3, pp. 193–203.

9 E. Honigmann's study refers only to ecclesiastical delegates (see Honigmann, 'The Original Lists', *Byzantion* 16 (1942–43), pp. 20–80, esp. 41–80.

10 See p. 26 above.

11 A valuable addition to the study of social networks and the personal careers of individual officials in Asia is the work by S. Destephen, *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, vol. 3: *Diocèse d'Asie* (Paris, 2008). Other works in the series are by A. Mandouze (ed.), *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire* (*PCBE*): *Prosopographie de l'Afrique Chrétienne* (303–533) (Paris, 1982); *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire: Prosopographie de l'Italie Chrétienne*, 2 vols. (Paris, 2000). In studying ecclesiastical prosopography the work of J. R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1980); R. Delmaire, 'Les dignitaires laïcs au concile de Chalcédoine', *Byzantion* 54 (1984), 141–75; *idem*, *Les institutions du Bas-Empire romain* (Paris, 1995); *idem*, *Les responsables des finances impériales* (Brussels, 1989). Furthermore, we may occasionally still need to rely partially on general reference books, such as F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford, 1997), and on internal evidence provided by the *Acts*.

12 Also see R. MacMullen, *Voting about God in Early Church Councils* (New Haven and London, 2006); a pioneering study possibly aimed at exploring the social factors which played a role in church council, yet without making use of sociological and linguistic theories; an important exercise, albeit of — as put by Richard Price — a *woolly* character.

1. The First Session:
The Composition of the Imperial Delegation

In his *Greek Roman Empire*, Fergus Millar has offered an important and detailed prosopographical study of the delegates, to include a full list of the auxiliary sources relating to the Opening Session, which serves as the basis for this overview of the imperial delegation.[13] The number of imperial delegates present at the opening session amounted to nineteen individuals. Listed in a descending order of importance, almost all the names[14] appear in the opening lists of only four sessions: Oct. 8 (opening session), Oct. 10 (debate about Faith), Oct. 17 (discussion of the Tome of Leo), Oct. 25 (promulgation of the Definition attended by Marcian). All the other sessions, apparently less ceremonial and too technical, record the faithful attendance of only three officials: Anatolius, Palladius, and Vincomalus, marking the surprising absence of Tatian, the prefect of Constantinople, whose presence in the capital may have been necessary in anticipation of riots and unrest.

All the delegates formed the backbone of Theodosius' regime which preceded Marcian's. Marcian, still a newcomer in 451, must have needed the individuals listed in view of their experience in both foreign and internal affairs. In foreign affairs, one link which tied together Anatolius, Senator, Nomus, and Martialis was the negotiations of the Byzantine Empire with Attila the Hun. These were headed by these four individuals on separate occasions under both Theodosius and Marcian[15]. Marcian inherited the turbulent eastern front from Theodosius, and on this matter he was advised — again by Anatolius, together with Florentius — not to meddle in the Armenian revolt against the Persians.[16]

The great majority of the imperial delegates, we observe, attended the council as titular officials. Taking Theodosius' administration as a paradigm, we see that many influential figures operated outside the official administration: Florentius, Senator, Zoilus are but a few examples. These ex-officials may have preferred to retain their status as private individuals.[17] The blurring between the private and the official spheres is most accentuated in the career of Vincoma-

---

13 Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*, pp. 192–234, esp. pp. 198–199. The following discussion is based on an earlier paper of mine, 'Political and Social Networks'.

14 With the exception of Palladius who attended more sessions, and Florentius who only attended the first session.

15 Priscus of Panium, *Fragments* 7–8, 13–14, in: C. Mueller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. IV (Paris, 1851), p. 91.

16 Elisha Vardapet, *History of Vardan and the War of the Armenians*, trans. V. Langlois, vol. II (Paris, 1869), 207.

17 Following Symmachus' example of snubbing the imperial service, it is suggested that remaining outside the official administrative circle was, in fact, preferred by many of the members of the top echelons of Late Roman society (for discussion see P. Garnsey and C. Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 43.

lus, who retired to a monastery in 446, but continued to attend the senate, only to re-enter the official ranks at Marcian's request.

Yet there remains the issue of the official delegates who, with the exception of Palladius and Vincomalus, all met with an abrupt discontinuation of their careers in 451 or 452 at the latest. It is of course possible that they all retired on personal grounds. Another explanation may lie in Marcian's wish to dispose of Theodosius' entourage as soon as it was no longer needed. Take Tatian, for example: his name was implicated in the myths surrounding the accession of Marcian, who even addressed his protégé as *filius meus*, yet even Tatian did not survive politically beyond the consulate of 452; he was restored to power only under Emperor Leo, who in 466 raised him to the consulate for the second time.

The delegates' previous involvement in ecclesiastical affairs is a core issue in the present discussion. In this context, the figure of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus, is overwhelmingly dominant in the biographies of quite a number of imperial delegates. In fact, it would be no exaggeration to say that Theodoret's vast correspondence is essential to our understanding of fifth-century ecclesiastical politics. In a letter of 448, Theodoret requested Anatolius, then a *patricius*, to lift the restrictions which had been imposed on his movements as a result of the Second Council of Ephesus.[18] Like Anatolius, Johannes Vincomalus, fourth in rank amongst the imperial commissioners to the council, was also the addressee of a letter from Theodoret of Cyrrhus: in early 451, and thus prior to the council, Theodoret thanked the *magister officiorum* for his part in commuting a sentence of exile, brought against Theodoret in the aftermath of the Second Council of Ephesus.[19]

Martialis, the only non-acting officer who ranked above other acting imperial officers, is mentioned in a letter of 449 from the governor of Osrhoene, concerning Bishop Ibas of Edessa,[20] who, as we know, was later implicated together with Theodore of Mopsuestia in the affair of the Three Chapters. Martialis was also a member of the committee set up in 449 to discuss Eutyches' appeal.[21] Another official, Florentius, was appointed in Nov. 448 by Theodosius II to attend the enquiry at Constantinople into the views of Eutyches,[22] and in April 449 to investigate the trial of Eutyches.[23] He corresponded with Theodoret of Cyrrhus on the matter of an episcopal candidate,[24] and is mentioned in an affectionate manner.[25]

---

18 Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Epistulae* 79, 92, 111, 119, 121, 139, ed. Y. Azéma, SC 98, 111 (Paris,, 1964, 1965), vol. II, pp. 182–189, 242–245; vol. III, pp. 42–47, 76–85, 142–147.

19 Theodoret, *Ep.* 141, ed. Azéma, vol. III, pp. 150–153.

20 *AGWG,* NF XV 1, p. 33

21 Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. 177–179.

22 Session I.468, ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, p. 138.

23 *Ibid*., p. 148.

24 Theodoret, *Ep.* 5, ed. Azéma, vol. I, (Paris, 1955), pp. 77–78.

25 Theodoret, *Ep.* 89, ed. Azéma, vol. II, pp. 236–239.

And again, Senator also appears as an addressee of Theodoret of Cyrrhus.[26] In this letter, Theodoret's appeal to Senator to lend his support to a delegation going to Constantinople to plead Theodoret's theological cause. Another official, Nomus, was an addressee of a number of Theodoret's letters. On one occasion, a mundane affair, an appeal for tax alleviation, is brought forward.[27] Other letters, which were not always answered immediately,[28] concerned matters of dogma. In these letters the bishop defended himself against charges of heresy.[29] It is also attested that Nomus was a supporter of Eutyches, and that he played a dominant role in convincing Theodosius to summon the Council of Ephesus.[30] And, to conclude the list, Protogenes in his capacity as *praefectus praetorio* of the Orient, was the addressee of a letter from Theodoret, dated to 448–449, in which the bishop pleads for a fair hearing for his case.[31]

2. Imperial Officials at the Sixth Session

The attendance of the imperial couple at the sixth session ensured its place as the highlight of the council. Marcian was no Constantine and one would have, perhaps, preferred being left with a text documenting Constantine's presence at Nicaea than Marcian's at Chalcedon. Marcian, however, was an emperor, whose short reign and restricted legacy could not have been envisaged then. Much like the US presidency, the Roman, or Byzantine emperor, albeit having prescribed and important functional roles, was also perceived as a ceremonial institution, whose importance as such far exceeded the importance of the emperor as a person.[32] The presence of any emperor in an ecumenical council commanded enormous attention which ensured the presence of the entire imperial entourage. The attendance list of the sixth session boasts some nineteen additional names of imperial delegates.[33] The list conforms with the principles of imperial hierarchy, though, as shall be further discussed,[34] it also displays a curious inversion

---

26 Cf. Theodoret, *Ep.* 93, ed. Azéma, vol. II, pp. 244–245
27 Theodoret, *Ep.* 16, ed. Azéma, vol. I, pp. 88–89.
28 See Theodoret's subsequent complaints in *Ep.* 96, ed. Azéma, vol. III, pp. 10–13.
29 Theodoret, *Ep.* 58, *Ep.* 81, ed. Azéma, vol. II, pp. 134–137, 192–199.
30 Schwartz, *ACO* 2.6, p. 5.
31 Theodoret, *Ep.* 94, ed. Azéma, vol. II, pp. 246–247.
32 Showing how hands-on Roman emperors actually were, Fergus Millar also emphasizes their ceremonial function. The latter may be inferred, among other things, by the overall expectation that the emperor should possess *eloquentia*, or rhetorical eloquence, which, in turn, he was expected to demonstrate on public occasions (see Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (2nd ed.; London, 1992), pp. 203–272.
33 Delmaire, 'Les dignitaires', *Byzantion* 54 (1984), pp. 141–185, esp. p. 143.
34 See chapter IV below.

in that the members of the clergy are mentioned prior to the members of the im-
perial retinue, headed by the imperial couple.

Another modification is attested in the placement of Romanus who is here
ranked above Zoilus, Theodorus, and Apollonius.[35] Delmaire suggests a sim-
ple error in the recording of a possible second period of Romanus as *Praepositus
Sacri Cubiculi,* 'provost of the sacred bedchamber', yet he does not explain why
this error could not be corrected retrospectively by the stenographers. In view
of Romanus' anti-Cyrillian stance, reflected in his refusal to accept a bribe from
Cyril's agent,[36] it is possible that Romanus was promoted suddenly and un-
expectedly, perhaps between the sessions, that is between 17th-25th October,
and that this promotion was never recorded.

Another newcomer to the imperial retinue was Aetius, who in 451 held an
active office and whose career continued to flourish well into the second half of
Marcian's reign. Aetius actively led the 452 campaign against Attila the Hun and
as a reward for his success was appointed consul of 454.[37] The Western front,
so it seems, continued to play a crucial role in the consolidation of the imperial
entourage, while the flourishing careers of 'new people', such as Aetius, reflect
the gradual removal of key Theodosian figures, such as Anatolius, Martialis,
Senator, and Nomus, from positions of power. The name of Antiochus opens a
long list of additional ex-officials, and supernumerary, or senatorial, representa-
tives, who attended the sixth session.[38] He is mentioned, together with Senator,
among those who in 448 were approached by Theodoret to ensure the favour-
able reception of a delegation which made its way to Constantinople on his be-
half.[39] Two other illustrious former officials are Apollodorus and Theodore who
were among the compilers of the *Theodosian Code.*

3. State Officials as Religious Figures

The surprising dominance of 'secular' officials in ecclesiastical affairs can
hardly be ascertained solely on the basis of their job description. Imperial offi-
cials, the emperor included, bore distinctive religious attributives which leave

---

35 Delmaire, 'Les dignitaires', *ibid.*, p. 168.

36 *ACO* 1.4, pp. 223–224.

37 Hydatius Lemicensis, *Chronicon* 154 (s.c. 452), ed. A. Tranoy, SC 218 (1974).

38 A distinction must be made between high-ranking ex-officials and those who had
never held an active post, but joined the emperor's entourage as 'supernumerary', or honor-
ary, officials, whose status may be associated with their membership in the Constantinopol-
itan senate (see Dagron, *Naissance*, pp. 119–210, esp. pp. 154–163). Such a degree of involve-
ment of honorary office-holders in public life points to the social and subsequently, financial
gain in demonstrating proximity to the emperor. For further discussion, see Garnsey and
Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World*, p. 41.

39 Theodoret, *Ep.* 95, ed. Azéma, vol. II, pp. 248–249.

no doubt as to the role of religion and religious discourse in the political culture of the time. Reading Marcian's titles, one could easily think the subject was a bishop, rather than an emperor leading armies to the battle fields: 'our most divine and pious master': ὁ θειότατος καὶ εὐσεβέστατος ἡμῶν δεσπότης (VI.12, 16, 23). More importantly, the Emperor Marcian's words, tone, and focus are the best proof that Christian and imperial discourses were synonymous:

> If we have imposed labour and trials on your devotedness, we express the greatest thanks to God the saviour of all, that with the ending of discord due to many being in error over the faith we have all come together in unanimity in one and the same religion, hoping that because of your prayers to the Almighty a peace that is both swift and universal will be granted to us by God.[40]

Beyond homage paid by means of religiously coloured honorific titles, imperial officials were also expected to show concrete evidence of their religious zeal, whether genuine or not. We witness various such endeavours: Senator, for example, went in for church-building;[41] Vincomalus showed his zeal by choosing the monastic life (for a time, at least),[42] whereas Florentius successfully campaigned for the closure of Constantinopolitan brothels at his own expense.[43] This was a reflection of antipathy or sympathy for either camp (Nomus lending money to Cyril of Alexandria's nephews at extortionate rates of interest; Evagrius Scholasticus' testimony concerning Zoilus' anti-Nestorianism),[44] and the straightforward testimony of a grateful bishop (Theodoret's dedication of an entire work to Sporacius in celebration of the latter's religious devotion).[45]

A demarcation between church and state is hardly applicable in this case, where many of the officials listed were engaged in the aftermath of Chalcedon, which amounted to negotiations with the papal see (Tatian corresponding with Pope Leo) and the enforcement of the decision taken in Chalcedon. The latter point is further illustrated by the fact that only acting officials, such as Tatian, Vincomalus, Palladius, and Valentinian, the *praetorian prefect* of Illyricum of 452 who did not actually attend the council, held exclusively the power to control proceedings at the Council. Moreover, these officials were expected to carry

---

40 Κεκμήκατε τῶι καλῶι διαστήματι σκυλμὸν ὑπομείναντες· ἀναμείνατε δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἢ τέσσαρας ἔτι καὶ παρόντων τῶν μεγαλοπρεπεστάτων ἡμῶν ἀρχόντων ἕκαστα ὧν βούλεσθε, κινήσατε, τῆς προσηκούσης βοηθείας ἀξιωθησόμενοι. Μηδεὶς δὲ ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ τελείους τύπους πάντων δοθῆναι τῆς ἁγίας ἀναχωρήσηι συνόδου.(VI.12)

41 Procipius of Caesarea, *De aedificiis* I.3.14, ed. J. Haury.

42 Theophanes, *Chronographia*, AM 5957, ed. de Boor, vol. 1, p. 114; trans. Mango and R. Scott, pp. 177–178.

43 *CTh* XV.8.2.

44 Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE* I.18, ed. Bidez and Parmentier, vol. 1, pp. 182–185.

45 See Theodoret's *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, *PG* 83.336–556.

out the decisions of the council, for they were the addressees of the promulgation concerning Chalcedon and its main figures, Bishop Flavian and Eutyches.

In this mesh of administrators and soldiers playing bishops, one thing is clear: the officials were 'secular' only in that they were expected to execute the divinely inspired policy of the emperor. To be sure, in the exalted spheres of the heavenly kingdom the bishops were to be held as conceptually loftier than their administrative counterparts; but on earth all power of execution still rested in the hands of Anatolius and his friends.

C. The Formation of 'Cleavages' in Chalcedon

Returning to White and Breiger's theory of *cleavages,*[46] the first group, or faction, which I have identified as affected by a cleavage is the group of the Greek delegates who changed their allegiances during the proceedings of the first session. In my discussion, I will try to identify the members of the targeted group as members of a distinctive social network, and secondly, to portray the relationship between the 'parent' and the dissenting group, thus marking and characterizing the 'line of weakness', or cleavage. In this section, I would like to put White and Breiger's claim to the test, not only as an exercise of applying sociological theories to the study of ancient texts, but also as a means of restricting the scope of my discussion by focusing on a targeted, well-defined group, leaving the mapping of the vast social networks which are at the base of the ecclesiastical establishments in Late Antiquity for a separate study.[47]

The *mother group*, or faction, under discussion is the group of Alexandrian clerics, with Dioscorus singled out as their leader. Already in the first session, a clear cleavage can be identified comprising bishops who, on their own admission, were not present at the Council of Ephesus II, and as a consequence, had erroneously condemned Bishop Flavian and supported his deposition. In geographical terms, the ideological, and even personal, crack was created between the Alexandrian see and bishops from Palestine, Illyricum, Greece and more remarkably, several Egyptian bishops stationed in the rural countryside outside Alexandria (the latter attesting to an internal cleavage within the group under the formal jurisdiction and authority of the bishop of Alexandria).

Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, and his fellow Palestinian bishops, Peter, Bishop of Corinth, Irenaeus, Bishop of Naupactus in southern Greece, and a contingent of Greek bishops, Bishops Quintillus and Sozon and a contingent of bish-

---

46 See discussion starting on p. 80 above.

47 One may remember that the number of delegates proclaimed to have been present in the council amounts to hundreds. In these circumstances, establishing sociological criteria for examining their social networks is an obligation, rather than a recommendation.

ops from Macedonia and Crete, Nicholas, Bishop of Stobi in Macedonia, Athanasius, Bishop of Busiris of Tripolis in Egypt, Auxonius, Bishop of Sebennytus, Nestorius, Bishop of Flabonis, Macarius, Bishop of Casaba, Constantine, Bishop of Demetrias in Thessaly, Eutychius, Bishop of Hadrianopolis in Epirus Vetus, Claudius, Bishop of Anchiasmus, Mark, Bishop of Euroea, Peregrinus, Bishop of Phoenice, Sotericus, Bishop of Corcyra — 'all crossed over to the other side': καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸ ἄλλο μέρος μετῆλθον (I.298).

The desertion process could in itself be identified as a sequence of *ceremonial acts* both in terms of their content and internal dynamics, as well as in terms of the formulas used by the narrator in his description of the unfolding drama. And drama it was: the council had barely convened when less than half-way through the first session some bishops decided to discard their former allegiances in favour of new ones. The background to the unfolding drama was the reading from the minutes of the Council of Constantinople in which Bishop Flavian is cited *verbatim*.

Triggering, or reviving, an existing cleavage was Anatolius, the *magister militum*. He, rather than nurturing and exhibiting a 'neutral' stance, did not hesitate, at times, to interrupt (or stir) the proceedings by confronting the delegates with direct questions:

> During the reading the most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'What say the most devout bishops of the present holy council? In so expounding the faith did Flavian of sacred memory preserve the orthodox and catholic religion, or did he make some mistake in its regard?'[48]

Rather than asking a question Anatolius was, in fact, making a statement to the immediate audience, the sympathetic crowd of Flavian's supporters. We could actually imagine Anatolius turning his gaze and attention to the Roman delegates, thus inviting them to lend him their support and ecclesiastical authority, albeit at the cost of their interrupting the natural flow of the deliberations, otherwise held in Greek. The subsequent pauses (two in number) taken to translate the statements of the Roman delegates open the floor for Flavian's Greek-speaking supporters to stage a succession of affirmative statements in favour of Flavian, culminating in a public ceremonial exclamation by the Oriental bishops: 'The martyr Flavian gave a fine exposition of the faith. Archbishop Flavian gave a fine exposition of the faith': Ὁ μάρτυς Θλαβιανὸς τὴν πίστιν καλῶς ἐξέθετο (I.280).

---

48 Καὶ ἐν τῶι ἀναγινώσκεσθαι οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον. Τί λέγουσιν οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τῆς παρούσης ἁγίας συνόδου; οὕτως ἐκθέμηνος τὴν πίστιν ὁ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης Φλαβιανὸς ἔσωσεν τὴν ὀρθόδοξον καὶ καθολικὴν θρησκείαν ἤ τι περὶ αὐτὴν ἐσφάλη; (I.272).

Serving as Anatolius' prime antagonist was Dioscorus who, at this point, tried to deprive the Oriental bishops of the spoils of their unexpected rhetorical triumph. Assuming an air of sober firmness and in clear defiance of Anatolius, Dioscorus made a counter demand:

> Let the rest of his words be heard, and then I will answer. He will be found in what follows to contradict himself and speak of two natures after the union.[49]

It was at this point that the evidence of an existing cleavage became clear: Juvenal, Bishop of Palestine, still seated, openly contradicted Dioscorus, his former ally, and despite declaring his wish to listen to the rest of the reading, abruptly stood up and crossed to the other side of the designated space, to the cheering of the Oriental bishops: 'God has led you well, orthodox one. You are welcome': Ὁ θεὸς καλῶς ἤνεγκέν σε, ὀρθόδοξε. καλῶς ἦλθες (I.285).

A flair of revolution and excitement welled up, as bishops began to desert one by one, first apologizing for their former ignorance. Here follows, for example, the apology of Peter, bishop of Corinth: 'I was not present at the Council of Ephesus …', Ἐγὼ μὲν τὸ τηνικαῦτα οὐ παρήμην τῆι συνόδωι τῆι κατὰ Ἔφεσον […] (I.286), then declaring their sobriety and neutrality by expressing their wish (which remained declarative) to have the rest of the proceedings read aloud, and finally crossing over to the other side. The apparent cause for disengagement from the 'mother' group was the cleansing of Flavian's name, and the reconfirmation of the latter as a follower of Cyrillian dogma. From Chalcedon onwards, the teachings of Cyril and Pope Leo came to be the undisputed test of orthodoxy. The demand was for an exact emulation of, and obedience to, an acceptable and established code. The argument, then, seemed not to be over the sources of authority, but rather over their interpretation and accommodation.

The causes for our suspicion that cleavage was created because of social or political—as the term addresses the prospects of accumulation of power—reasons, and not only because of theological misunderstandings and confusions, are as follows: apologies and excuses for changing sides were made against claims of personal ignorance ('I did not know'), combined with an objective hindrance ('I wasn't there'). At the primary level, these claims seem superficial and even childish: the deserters' absence from previous councils did not prevent them from initially subscribing to Dioscorus' camp, in spite of their self-admitted ignorance of Flavian's theological stances — a shortcoming which also presents difficult questions in respect of the circulation of ecclesiastical acts in general, and of Flavian's writings in particular.[50]

---

49 Ἀναγνωσθήτω τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοῦ ῥήματα, καὶ οὕτως ἀποκρίνομαι. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἑξῆς εὑρίσκεται διαμαχόμενος ἑαυτῶι καὶ λέγων μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν δύο φύσεις (I.281).

50 By contrast, none of the delegates confessed to a similar difficulty in accessing the teachings of Cyril of Alexandria and of Pope Leo.

Sustaining this line of schoolboy *rhetoric of deferral*, Peter, Bishop of Corinth, cited above, even blames his absence from Ephesus II on his previous lowly social position: '[…] for I had not yet [by the grace of Jesus Christ] been appointed a bishop', οὐδέπω γὰρ ἤμην [χάριτι Χριστοῦ] χειροτονηθεὶς ἐπίσκοπος (I.286), whereas we know that a high ecclesiastical rank was, perhaps, a prerequisite for actively participating in the debates, but not for attending ecumenical councils, and certainly not for attaining ecclesiastical and *social authority*.[51] That the deserters sought to distance themselves, even somewhat childishly, from their previous decisions is quite self-evident. However, what is even more remarkable is the fact that they did not, at any stage of their apology, point to any defined collective authority as the cause of their error. The deserters highlighted the errors and shortcomings of their own individual personas, rather than those of their respective groups or designated leaders.[52]

Returning to Peter, ignorance, then, had not prevented him (or the other deserters, such as Nicholas, Bishop of Stobi in Macedonia and Irenaeus, Bishop of Naupactus in Greece) in the past from joining in Dioscorus' camp, nor does it seem to have prevented him now from making yet another ill-informed decision. Conveying a sense of haste and eagerness, Peter made his ostentatious and declarative move of desertion even before the relevant minutes of the previous council had been fully read and despite his explicit wish to make a rational decision,[53] based on full and comprehensive data:

---

51 Many such authoritative figures did not rise high on the ecclesiastical and public ladder. For example, Origen's theology remained bitterly disputed, but his exegetical authority is yet unsurpassed; Jerome was a mere deacon and so was his rival, Rufinus.

52 As Christians, the delegates were expected to live as members of a collective, yet the equal stress on individuality stands at the heart of the ceremonial of setting individual signatures, also of low-ranking figures, approving each motion of the council. Constantine, Bishop of Demetrias in Thessaly, seems to loosen the tension between authority and individuality as he casually exclaims: 'My metropolitan is sick and therefore still at Helenopolis. As for me, I share the faith of the 318 [i.e., that of the Nicene fathers] and agree with the statements of the blessed Cyril […]': Ὁ μὲν μητροπολίτης μου νόσωι κατεχόμενος ἔτι ἐστὶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλενούπολιν, ἐγὼ δὲ κατὰ τὸ φρόνημα τῶν τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ φρονῶ καὶ συναινῶ τοῖς ἀναγνωσθεῖσιν ἀρτίως τοῦ μακαρίου Κυρίλλου (I.297). A similar claim for independency is made by even more obscure names: Eutychius, Bishop of Hadrianopolis in Epirus Vetus, Claudius, Bishop of Anchiasmus, Mark, Bishop of Euroea, Peregrinus, Bishop of Phoenice, and Soterichus, Bishop of Corcyra made the following forceful stance: 'Our most holy father Atticus bishop of the metropolis of Nicopolis left a short time ago when he felt extremely unwell. As for ourselves, we testify that the blessed Flavian spoke in harmony with the letters that have been read of our father, the blessed Cyril': Ὁ μὲν ἁγιώτατος πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀττικὸς ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος Νικοπόλεως πρὸ ὀλίγου ἀνεχώρησεν ἀρρωστήσας ἰσχυρῶς. ἡμεῖς δὲ τοσοῦτον κατατιθέμεθα ὅτι ταῖς ἀναγνωθείσαις ἐπιστολαῖς ταῖς τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κυρίλλου σύμφωνα καὶ ὁ μακάριος Φλαβιανὸς διελάησεν (I.298).

53 Claims for rationality are typical of elite (as opposed to 'arena') councils and committees (see Bailey, 'Decisions in Councils', in: Banton (ed.), *Political Systems*, p. 11).

'[…] but from what has been read I find that the words of Flavian of blessed memory emulate the teaching of Cyril of holy memory, and so I hesitate to criticize them. The reading of the rest will instruct me more fully.' Standing up, he too, crossed over to the other side.[54]

The rush of the would-be deserters to change their allegiances may, though not necessarily so, reflect sincere ideological doubts, but it may equally serve as an indication of opportunism and personal disengagements — the materials of which cleavages are made. As historians, we remain forever handicapped by the frozen qualities of the text, unable to peer through feelings and intentions of people who are no longer with us.[55] Sooner rather than later, our ability to reconstruct reaches a barrier which often forces us to play in the grey shadows of circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial is one issue, viable is another.

Would it be a viable claim, I ask, to suggest that bishops originating from areas prone to hostile attacks and politically unstable would be more inclined to change their minds with a view to not losing imperial support? In other words, would the weaker, more dependent bishops, such as the Illyrian bishops, not be more likely candidates to form and create social cleavages than bishops in charge of more prosperous and stable areas? In support of this line of argument, one could point to Marcian's presence in Illyricum in an attempt to stop the Hunnish invasions, while the first sessions of the council were being held.[56] In these circumstances, the Illyrian bishops would have been outright foolish not to comply with the wishes of their new emperor.

Ecclesiastical politics and personal ambitions also played an evident and important role in the formation of cleavages. In this chapter of ecclesiastical history, Bishop Juvenal, in pursuit of imperial support for his plans to raise the status of the see of Jerusalem,[57] became the epitome of ideological and theological elasticity, teaming up with Dioscorus in Ephesus, only to abandon him in Chalcedon. In this maze of ecclesiastical networks, power, politics, and persuasion were the materials of which cleavages were made and sustained, with the imperial throne serving as a powerful magnet which eventually determined their rupture.

---

54 […] ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀναγινωσκομένων εὑρὼν τὰ εἰρημένα παρὰ τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Φλαβιανοῦ ζῆλον ἔχοντα πρὸς τὰ ἐκτεθέντα παρὰ τοῦ τῆς ἁγίας μνήμης Κυρίλλου ὀκνῶ ἐπιλαβέσθαι, τὰ δὲ ὑπόλοιπα ἀναγινωσκόμενα τελεώτερόν με διδάξει. Καὶ ἀναστὰς καὶ αὐτὸς μετῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ἄλλο μέρος (I.286).

55 On the other hand, even testimonies made by living people about their feelings and intentions are no less dependent on circumstantial evidence. In other words, the question is about when it is reasonable to *believe* someone and what this belief actually entails, even if self-confessions deserve equal suspicion as far as *intent* and self-knowledge are concerned.

56 Cf. Marcian and Valentinian's third letter to the delegates of the council preserved in Latin, Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, pp. 20–21.

57 E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *DOP* 5 (1950), pp. 209–279.

III. Language and Ceremonial

> A lot of the magic lies in [a child's] language. Grown-up people do very little and say a great deal […] Toddlers say very little and do a great deal. […] With a toddler you cannot explain, you have to show; you cannot send, you have to take; you cannot control with words, you have to use your body.
>
> Penelope Leach, *Baby and Child*

> In the Malagasy case the connection between politeness and political oratory is obvious at an empirical level since those very rules of communication which are imposed on children, whether intonation rules, syntactical rules, vocabulary rules, or rules relating to bodily posture, are precisely the ones which are stressed again as being of importance in political oratory.
>
> Maurice Bloch, *Political Language and Oratory*

A. Discourse Analysis of Session I

An uninformed reader may imagine a church council as a heated gathering where all the participants could shout out their theological differences. The truth is that this picture has hardly ever reflected the reality of ecclesiastical debates held up until the early modern period.[1] The Council of Chalcedon is no different in that its delegates were bound by strict procedural and social conventions more often associated with imperial audiences and juridical litigation, than with the seemingly freer style of modern forms of discourse.

When describing the relationship between political oratory and village councils in Madagascar, Bloch adds further:

---

1 Order, procedure, and *decorum* typified both ecumenical gatherings and public theological debates. Averil Cameron discusses a series of formal, ceremonial theological debates, held in the sixth century under imperial auspices between rival Christian groups (*eadem*, 'Disputation, Polemical Literature and the Formation of Opinion', in: Reinink and H. L. J. Vanstiphout (ed.), *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Medieval Near East* (Leuven, 1991), pp. 91–108, esp. pp. 102–103).

It was only when I had tried to find how a political element could be isolated on these ritual and ceremonial occasions that I realised that it was precisely in these elaborate forms of speech-making with their fixed formal styles, their endless quotations and proverbs, that social control was exercised.[2]

Bloch is not alone among social anthropologists in stressing the fact that in modern societies, too, language use,[3] particularly in public contexts, is anything but free and casual,[4] and has the primary function of drawing social boundaries.[5] As we proceed to examine the societal function of formal language, we will begin our discussion with a detailed analysis of the honorific titles attached to each delegate. If we only listened to our own conversation carefully we would realise that we, too, are using them quite often.

1. The Use of Honorific Titles in the First Session

Honorific titles encode a wealth of social knowledge.[6] To begin with the imperial title, it is composed of two parts. The first or 'Christian' part addresses Marcian's moral qualities and reads 'most divine and pious Lord': τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου δεσπότου. To be sure, one would expect honorific titles of Christian emperors to include a reference to moral qualities, such as piety and righteousness. The second part reads 'Marcian perpetual Augustus, magnificent and glorious'. These attributives, and especially the formula 'perpetual Augustus' (τοῦ αἰωνίου αὐγούστου) which is repeated here twice, are more intriguing in that they mimic pagan honorific titles.[7] They allude to the emperor's future deification and highlight the traditional image of the Roman emperor as a general and a designated leader.

With Marcian heading the list, the status of the other delegates can be further discerned by the careful arrangement of their names as well as by their corre-

---

2 M. Bloch, *Political Oratory*, p. 6.

3 For a discussion of language use in these contexts see p. 67 above.

4 For a collection of studies dedicated to language use and ritual in contemporaneous 'tribal' societies, see A. Richards and A. Kuper (ed.), *Councils in Action* (Cambridge, 1971), with a special reference to Bloch's study 'Decision-making in councils among the Merina of Madagascar', pp. 29–62.

5 See *Formal Language as a Boundary Marker* on p. 84 above.

6 See also *Honorific Titles as Criteria for Social Stratification* starting on p. 86 above.

7 See, for example, the following statement: 'Entre la position des souverains dans le paganisme, et celle de Dieu, des rois et du Christ dans le judaïsme et le christianisme, on constate donc de nombreuses relations de ressemblence: formules, titres, conceptions, ceremonial, enchaînement de formules' (see L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation Gréco-Romaine* (Turnhout, 1956), pp. 441ff.

sponding attributives. Thus, the most senior state officials,[8] Anatolius (who also presided over the proceedings *de facto*), Palladius, Tatian, and Vincomalus are all referred to as 'most magnificent and glorious': τοῦ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτου καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτου. Officials of a lesser status, Martialis, Sporacius, and Genethlius, are referred to as merely 'most magnificent': τοῦ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτου. The honorific title 'most magnificent and glorious' is attached again to former senior state officials who, at the time of the convening of the council, served as senators. These were Florentius, Senator, Nomus, Protogenes, Zoilus, Theodore, Apollonius, Romanus, Theodore, Constantine, Artaxes, and Eulogius. The attributive in question is mentioned repeatedly in conjunction with the name and rank of the individual delegates. This repetitive indication of honorific titles may remind us of more modern ceremonial occasions in which the names and titles of guests are announced loudly upon the grand entrance of each individual.

An event imbued with pomp and circumstance would be described and conveyed through an elaborate system of attributives, applied not only to people but also to objects and abstract entities, such as cities,[9] the Scriptures, and the Christian faith. The extraordinary nature of the event is stressed throughout the first session of the council, as much as it is stressed in the consecutive sessions. Thus, the council which is about to gather is not just a council or even an ecumenical council, τῆς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου, but a *holy* council, convoked by *divine decree* (τῆς κατὰ θεῖον θέπισμα […] συναθροισθείσης). It is important to note, though, that the ecclesiastical delegates were indeed introduced to the readers, but only after their imperial counterparts.

If the attributives of Marcian's court officials mainly stressed qualities such as glory and imperial magnificence (but also their Christian orthodoxy), the attending clergy are described in terms of devotion and holiness. However, these qualities are conveyed in a manner which would indicate the hierarchical position of the delegates in question. Thus bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius gain the title 'most devout' (τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων) in their own right, whereas Boniface, a mere presbyter, is adorned with precisely the same attributive on account of his being the representative of 'the most sacred and beloved of God' (τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου καὶ θεοφιλεστάτου) Archbishop Leo.[10] The latter formula is repeated

---

8 See detailed discussion of individuals in the preceding chapter about political and social networks.

9 See p. 106 below.

10 The minutes of Ephesus address the Papal absence from the council, oddly explaining it as mere custom: 'As your holinesses know well, the pope of the most holy see did not attend the holy councils at Nicaea or Ephesus or any such holy assembly' (I.83). According to Price and Gaddis (*The Acts*, p. 11), since the ecumenical council came to be traditionally held near centres of imperial control in the East, Popes, Pope Leo among them, made a point out of not attending councils held in the East.

as the attributive of all other attending bishops, namely Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople and Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria.

The greatness of the major sees is also illustrated through the careful choice of attributives. Rome is not just Rome but 'senior Rome': τῆς πρεσβυτέρας ʽΡώμης — an attributive which stresses both Rome's antiquity and ecclesiastical prestige. Constantinople, on the other hand, gains the epithets 'renowned' (τῆς μεγαλωνύμου) and 'New Rome' (νέας ʽΡώμης), thus creating an unbreakable link between the two capitals and the two parts of the empire. The last and here indeed the least of the three major sees is Alexandria which is described as merely 'great': τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως. The text continues with a list of lesser ecclesiastical participants who are all presented as 'most sacred and devout' (ὁσιωτάτων καὶ εὐλαβεστάτων). The relatively low hierarchical status of these delegates is stressed further not only through the choice of simpler attributives without the elevating 'beloved of God', but also through their collective application and attachment to a group of people, rather than to individuals.

The proceedings of the council enable us to examine the question of the relationship between church and state from a fresh angle, quite remote from the traditional scholarly emphasis on confrontations between emperors and powerful bishops. In the first session we observe the procedural etiquette and the dynamics of formal discourse as criteria for assessing social power.[11] One of the most striking attributives is the one used to describe the entire body of the senate: 'the most magnificent and glorious officials and the exalted senate were seated': […] καὶ καθεσθέντων τῶν μεγαλοπρεπεστάτων καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτων ἀρχόντων καὶ τῆς ὑπερφυοῦς συγκλήτου. It suggests that the imperial officials present embodied the Constantinopolitan senate as a whole which, in turn, signified the control of the Byzantine secular, or rather, imperial authorities over the proceedings of a church council.

Authoritative vs. Corrosive Discourses

Authoritative discourses are fundamentally different from *corrosive discourses* in that both types of discourses are delivered in distinctly different physical spaces: the language used in settings such as the pulpit, the podium, or the judge's bench, are miles apart from what people utilise, often anonymously, in 'low places', such as back alleys, servant's quarters, toilets, and locker rooms.[12] The delegates to the Council of Chalcedon certainly perceived the occasion as lofty, ceremonial, and even, judicial.[13] The 'juridical' style of the proceedings is especially notable in the first session of the council, if only because it was

---

11 See also *Honorific Titles as Criteria for Social Stratification* starting on p. 86 above.
12 See Lincoln, *Authority*, pp. 87–89.
13 See *Formal Language as a Boundary Marker* starting on p. 84 above.

indeed staged as a trial or more precisely, the trial of Bishop Dioscorus. The physical setting is like a modern court room, where the judges, clad in outlandish garments and seated on an elevated podium, strike reverence into the hearts of the litigants and their attentive audience.[14]

2. Seating Games: Rhetoric and its Practice

The church named after the *holy martyr* Euphemia in Chalcedon provided the delegates with exactly such a formal setting, for all the parties and individuals took their designated seats following the dictates of a formal protocol. The recorder of the proceedings could have been equally satisfied with faithfully transmitting the content of the debates. Instead, the scribe, assuming the position of the all-knowing narrator, provides his readers with a meticulous description of the seating order of the delegates. The description is so vivid and detailed, that we are actually able to reconstruct the scene of the debates as it unfolds before us like a great theatrical stage.[15]

With Marcian not yet present,[16] the most senior and distinguished participant was Anatolius who, together with other members of the senate, 'were seated in the centre in front of the rails of the most holy sanctuary'. On Anatolius' left

> were seated the most sacred representatives of the most beloved of God and holy Archbishop Leo of Senior Rome, Anatolius the most religious Archbishop of imperial Constantinople, Maximus the most devout Bishop of Antioch, Thalassius the most devout Bishop of Caesarea, Stephen the most devout Bishop of Ephesus, and the other most devout bishops of the dioceses of the Orient, Pontus, Asia, and Thracia, except those of Palestine. On (Anatolius' right) were seated likewise Dioscorus the most devout archbishop of Alexandria, Juvenal the most devout bishop of Jerusalem, the most devout bishop Quintillus, representing Anastasius the most devout bishop of Thessalonica, Peter the most devout bishop of Corinth, and the other most devout bishops of the dioceses of Egypt and Illyricum, and also the most devout bishops of Palestine. In the centre was placed the most holy and immaculate book of the Gospels.[17]

---

14 Discussing iconic emblems, Lincoln observes that, 'in addition to their practical usages [...] the judge's gravel is functionally identical to the doctor's stethoscope or the athletic coach's whistle and clipboard. All of these items (and countless others) announce the authority of their bearer for a given audience and within a circumscribed context or sphere of activity' (see Lincoln, *Authority*, p. 7).

15 For a comparative survey of the physical settings used for ecumenical church councils, see MacMullen, *Voting about God*, pp. 78–84.

16 The first appearance of Marcian was in the sixth session.

17 καὶ καθεσθέντων τῶν μεγαλοπρεπεστάτων καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτων ἀρχόντων καὶ τῆς ὑπερφυοῦς συγκλήτου ἐν τῶι μέσωι πρὸ τῶν καυκέλλων τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ ἐκ μὲν τοῦ εὐωνύμου αὐτῶν μέρους καθεσθέντων τῶν ὁσιωτάτων τοποτηρητῶν τοῦ

The litigants, then, were divided and seated according to their theological position in respect of the Second Council of Ephesus and the *Tome of Leo*. The ideological and political differences between the delegates were further accentuated and made clear for all to see. The bishops were not allowed to sit wherever they wished, nor were they allowed to wander randomly across the hall, but were asked to sit down in the most physical sense of the word. Thus, on Anatolius' left we have Leo and his supporting clergy from Constantinople, Antioch and the Oriental sees and on his right we have Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria and Leo's chief advocate, Juvenal bishop of Jerusalem and an assortment of bishops from Egypt and Palestine. The author stresses the logic behind the seating arrangement of the delegates by clearly indicating the exclusion of the Palestinian delegates from Leo's entourage.

Thus we witness a visible concord between the great sees of Constantinople and Rome, with the divide running not between the two parts of the empire, but between the regions of Palestine and Egypt on one hand and the rest of the Christian world on the other.[18] Throughout the first session of the *Acts* the leaders of the said two parties are singled out through the rhetorical choice of attributives: 'The most devout Egyptian bishops, and those with them', Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι, marking Egypt as the epicentre of anti-Nestorianism, and 'The most devout Oriental bishops, and those with them', οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι, referring to the bishops of Constantinople, Antioch, Caesarea (in Cappadocia), Ephesus on one hand, and the bishops of the sees of the Pontus, Asia, and Thrace on the other.

θεοφιλεστάτου καὶ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης Λέοντος καὶ Ἀνατολίου τοῦ θεοσεβεστάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Ἀντιοχείας καὶ Θαλασσίου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Καισαρείας καὶ Στεφάνου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Ἐφέσου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων τῆς τε Ἀνατολικῆς καὶ Ποντικῆς καὶ Ἀσιανῆς καὶ Θραικικῆς τῶν διοικήσεων ἄνευ τῶν Παλαιστηνῶν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δεξιοῦ αὐτῶν μέρους ὁμοίως καθεσθέντων Διοσκόρου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἰουβεναλίου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Κυντίλλου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου τοποτηροῦντος Ἀναστασίωι τῶι εὐλαβεστάτωι ἐπισκόπωι Θεσσαλονίκης καὶ Πέτρου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Κορίνθου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν τε τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς διοικήσεως καὶ τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, ἔτι μὲν καὶ τῶν Παλαιστηνῶν εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων, προκειμένου ἐν τῶι μέσωι τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου καὶ ἀχράντου εὐαγγελίου (I.4).

18 See discussion of White and Breiger's *cleavages,* or weak links, starting on p. 80 above.

Books as Special Delegates

To seal the catalogue of participants, an important and most extraordinary object was added to the arrangement of the litigation scene, that is the 'most holy and immaculate book of the Gospels'. The gospel was not just a book, but a full participant, totally and wholly present at the scene, bestowing inspiration and lending authority to the delegates. The physical sight of the Scriptural book gave the occasion its proper *aura*.[19] In sociological terms, it functioned as a religious fetish whose presence was to ensure the right judgement of the delegates.[20]

In such a religiously charged atmosphere, the exclusion of the corpus of the Old Testament from the copy presented in the scene of the deliberations is telling. The unity and homogeneous nature of the Scriptural corpus — a fundamental theme in the annals of Christian 'Orthodoxy'— is both overlooked and ignored in Chalcedon, for by succumbing to the sole authority of the 'holy and immaculate Gospel', τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου καὶ ἀχράντου εὐαγγελίου, the delegates acknowledge that the answer to their theological perplexities in respect of the nature of Christ lies in the gospels alone, and not in the combination of both the Old and New Testaments.

Rather than embarking on the theological points in hand, the proceedings of the council actually open with the recording of a charged argument about the ceremonial surrounding the seating arrangement. Thus Paschasinus, Leo's representative, demanded on behalf of his master that

> Dioscorus should not take a seat at the assembly, and that if he has the effrontery to attempt to do so, he should be expelled […] either he must leave, or we shall leave.[21]

The physical manner in which rival delegates would be allowed to address the council is expressed even more poignantly in the Latin text, translated as fol-

---

19 The status of the Bible as a powerful ceremonial token continued to be felt in a variety of contexts and settings. What is erroneously described as the King James Bible is a staggering example which shaped early modern Europe and the emerging New World: 'The Bible, and increasingly the King James Version, had shown its power. It had been used with deadly effect. It was to go on to assume many shapes, one of which was to become the language of the politics and the lawmaking of the day. Though it was in all the churches, in another sense it had left the Church. It was no longer chained to the lectern, it was out in the streets. It was a torch' (M. Bragg, *The Book of Books. The Radical Impact of the King James Bible 1611–2011* (London, 2011), p. 78).

A more contemporaneous use of the Scriptures as a religious *fetish* is the ceremonial presentation of the Torah scroll during the celebration of the Jewish High Holidays, when the audience present strive to kiss and touch it. This has an identical sociological function.

20 See discussion in *Books as Fetishes* on p. 79 above.

21 Διόσκορος μὴ συγκαθεσθῆι τῶι συνεδρίωι, εἰ δὲ ἐπιχειρήσοι τοῦτο τολμῆσαι, ἐκβηθείη; ἢ ἐκεῖνος ἐξέλθηι ἢ ἡμεῖς ἔξιμεν (I.5).

lows: 'Dioscorus', it reads, 'should not sit in the council but should be admitted in order to be heard' (as a defendant).[22]

The Latin text makes it very clear that whoever took a designated seat held the position of a judge, whereas anyone who did not possess one was considered to be an onlooker or, worse still, a defendant. Anatolius, the chairman of the proceedings, realised instantly what Leo's representatives were getting at, for he questioned their demand to reduce Dioscorus to the position of a defendant,[23] asking while honourably retaining the bishop's official attributive:[24]

What particular charge do you bring against Dioscorus, the most devout bishop?[25]

Paschasinus' answer squarely rests on Dioscorus' supposedly unlawful presence in the council as a judge: 'His entrance', he says, 'makes it necessary to oppose him'.[26] The dialogue which followed between Anatolius and the Papal representatives is illuminating not only in respect of the official roles (e.g. defendant, judge, prosecutor) assumed by delegates to an ecumenical council, but also in respect of the theatrical dynamics of the episode. In enacting the original vividness of the occasion, the modern reader might wish to read this passage aloud, like a theatre script:

Paschasinus the most devout bishop, representing the apostolic see said: 'We cannot go against the instructions of the most blessed and apostolic bishop who occupies the apostolic see, nor against the ecclesiastical canons or the traditions of the fathers'. The most illustrious officials and the most eminent senators said: 'You need to make clear his specific offence'. Lucentius, the most devout bishop, representing the apostolic see, said: 'We will not tolerate so great an outrage both to you and to us as to have this person taking his seat when he has been summoned to judgement.' The most illustrious officials and the most eminent senators said: 'If you are taking the role of a judge, you cannot in that capacity plead your cause'.

When at the bidding of the most glorious officials and of the holy senate Dioscorus, the most devout Bishop of Alexandria had taken a seat in the centre, and the most devout Roman bishops had also sat down in their proper places and had ceased speaking, Eusebius the most devout Bishop of the city of Dorylaeum came to the centre and said: 'By the preservation of the masters of the world, order my petition to be read. In accordance with the wishes of our most pious emperor: I have been wronged by Dioscorus; the faith has been wronged; Bi-

---

22 Latin: … *ut Dioscorus nun sedeat in concilio, sed audiendus intromittatur* (I.5; ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 40).

23 In a modern courthouse the defendant and his lawyer are both required to stand up when addressing the judge.

24 See *Formal Language as a Boundary Marker*, starting on p. 84 above.

25 Ποία γὰρ ἰδικὴ μέμψις ἐπάγεται Διοσκόρωι τῶι εὐλαβεστάτωι ἐπισκόπωι; (I.6).

26 Αὐτοῦ εἰσελθόντος ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν ἐκείνωι ἀντιτεθῆναι (I.7).

shop Flavian was murdered. He together with me was unjustly deposed by Dioscorus. Order my petition to be read.' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'Let the petition be read.' When at the bidding of all Eusebius the most devout bishop had taken a seat in the centre, Veronicianus the hallowed secretary of the divine (imperial) consistory received his petition from him and read out […][27]

Sources of Authority

Paschasinus, the Papal representative, knew to cite his sources of 'orthodox' authority in a descending order of importance:[28] the instructions of Leo, the ecclesiastical canons and finally, the traditions of the fathers. Pope Leo, 'the most blessed apostolic bishop', τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ ἐπισκόπου, and the 'occupant of the apostolic see', χειρίζοντος τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον, also described by the said Paschasinus as 'the head of all the churches', ὑπάρχοντος πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, constituted for Paschasinus the highest instance of authority, superior to the canons of the church and even to the legacy of the church fathers. Still debating the nature of Dioscorus' offence another Papal representative, Lucentius provided the answer:

We will not tolerate so great an outrage […] to have this person taking his seat when he has been summoned to judgement.[29]

---

27 Πασκασῖνος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος ἐπέχων τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον εἶπεν·
Ἡμεῖς ὑπεναντίον τῶν προσταγμάτων τοῦ πακαριωτάτου καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ χειρίζοντος τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον ἐλθεῖν οὗ δυνάμεθα οὔτε μὴν ὑπεναντίον τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν κανόνων ἢ πατρικῶν πραραδόσεων. Οἱ λαμπρότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ περιφανέστατοι συγκλητικοὶ εἶπον· Ἁρμόζει ὑμᾶς ἰδικῶς τί ἔπταισεν, σαφηνίσαι.
Λουκίνσιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος καὶ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον ἐπέχων ἔφη. Οὐχ ὑπομένομεν τοσαύτην ὕβριν γενέσθαι ὑμῖν τε καὶ ἡμῖν, ὥστε καθεσθῆναι τοῦτον τὸν ἐπὶ κρίσει παραγενόμενον. Οἱ λαμπρότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ περιφανέστατοι συγκλητικοὶ εἶπον· Εἰ δικαστοῦ ἐπέχεις πρόσωπον, ὡς δικαζόμενος οὐκ ὀφείλεις δικαιολογεῖσθαι.
Καὶ Διοσκόρου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας κατὰ κέλευσιν τῶν ἐνδοξοτάτων ἀρχόντων καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς συγκλήτου καθεσθέντος ἐν τῶι μέσωι καὶ καθεσθέντων τῶν Ῥωμαίων εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις τόποις καὶ ἡσυχασάντων, Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Δορυλαέων πόλεως παρελθὼν ἐν τῶι μέσωι εἶπεν· Τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑμῖν τῶν δεσποτῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης, κελεύσατε τὰς δεήσεις τὰς ἐμὰς ἀναγνωσθῆναι, καθὼς παρέστη τῶι εὐσεβεστάτωι βασιλεῖ. ἠδίκημαι παρὰ Διοσκόρου. ἠδίκηται ἡ πίστις. ἐφονεύθη Φλαβιανὸς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος. ἅ ἐμοὶ καθηιρέθη ἀδίκως παρ' αὐτοῦ. κελεύσατε τὰς δεήσεις μου ἀναγνωσθῆναι. Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Ἀναγινωσκέσθωσαν αἱ δεήσεις. Καὶ καθεσθέντος ἐν τῶι μέσωι Εὐσεβίου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου κατὰ κέλευσιν πάντων Βερονικιανὸς ὁ καθοσιωμένος σηκρητάριος τοῦ θείου κονσιστωρίου λαβὼν παρ' αὐτοῦ τὰς δεήσεις ἀνέγνω (Ι.10–15).
28 Also see *Marcian's Sources of Authority* starting on p. 192 below.
29 Οὐχ ὑπομένομεν τοσαύτην ὕβριν γενέσθαι ὑμῖν τε καὶ ἡμῖν, ὥστε καθεσθῆναι τοῦτον τὸν ἐπὶ κρίσει παραγενόμενον (Ι.12).

One ought mentally to add 'with the delegates' after 'taking his seat', for, as already mentioned earlier, in the heart of the argument lay Dioscorus' position in the present council — an issue which would, of course, have implications for the retrospective judgement of Dioscorus' actions in the context of the Council of Ephesus.

Going back to the description of the delegates' initial seating arrangement, now that the Egyptian delegates, or judges, were seated at Anatolius' right hand side and the Papal delegates at his left hand side, the latter now demanded the installation of Dioscorus as befitting a defendant, that is, in the centre of the assembly, probably directly opposite Anatolius. Anatolius responded swiftly and decisively:

> If you are taking the role of a judge, you cannot in that capacity plead your cause.[30]

Yet there remains the issue of Anatolius' addressee: was it Lucentius or was it Dioscorus? Considering the fact that Anatolius' order was followed by the bidding of the 'holy senate', τῆς ἱερᾶς συγκλήτου, and that Dioscorus 'had taken a seat in the centre', [Διοσκόρου] καθεσθέντος ἐν τῶι μέσωι, it seems obvious that Anatolius was speaking to Dioscorus rather than to Lucentius, the Papal representative.

The confusion in identifying Anatolius' addressee arises from a certain oddity in the manner in which Anatolius had formed his statement. As mentioned above, Anatolius says: 'If you are taking the role of a judge, you cannot in that capacity plead your cause,' whereas logic would dictate the arrangement of the sentence in the reverse order, namely 'If you plead your cause, you cannot in that capacity take the role of a judge.'

The episode which followed clarifies further the ceremonial surrounding the litigation procedure, for we know that Dioscorus conceded and 'had taken a seat in the centre', that, subsequently,

> the most devout Roman bishops had also sat down in their proper places and had ceased speaking,[31]

and that

> Eusebius the most devout Bishop of the city of Dorylaeum came to the centre […][32]

---

30 Εἰ δικαστοῦ ἐπέχεις πρόσωπον, ὡς δικαζόμενος οὐκ ὀφείλεις δικαιολογεῖσθαι (I.13).

31 καὶ καθεσθέντων τῶν Ῥωμαίων εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις τόποις καὶ ἡσυχασάντων (I.14).

32 Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Δορυλαέων πόλεως παρελθὼν ἐν τῶι μέσωι (*ibid*.).

Again, as in modern procedures, a person pleading his case in an ecclesiastical council would place himself nearer the judicial authority and would be allowed to speak, or to take the *turn*,[33] occasionally seated but mostly standing up, only on official approval.[34] Furthermore, it is often the case that in a modern court-room — even in the most secular of countries — witnesses are required to take an oath while physically touching the Scriptures.[35]

Going back to our description of the seating arrangement in the church of St. Euphemia we see that a witness speaking to his fellow delegates was held to be speaking under oath, for by moving to the centre the speaker, whether a witness, defendant or a plaintiff, was automatically positioned with his face towards the sanctuary, the Gospels, and the 'president' or 'chairmen', namely Anatolius. This official, one should note, by no means held the official position of a judge: the official 'judges' were the delegates themselves, who, in a combined effort, were expected to reach an agreement on the matters at hand. Yet Anatolius, a powerful 'state' official, exercised full control over the whole process of litigation: no one could speak, or take the 'turn', or motion a petition without Anatolius' consent.

3. Reading Out Loud as an Authoritative Act

Eusebius was well aware of the proper procedure, for he turned to Anatolius with a request to have his petition approved. The formalities, though strict, must have failed[36] to conceal Eusebius' intense excitement:[37]

> By the preservation of the masters of the world, order my petition to be read, in accordance with the wishes of the most pious emperor. I have been wronged by Dioscorus; the faith has been wronged; Bishop Flavian was murdered. He together with me was unjustly deposed. [And turning to Anatolius he exclaimed:] Order my petition to be read.[38]

Eusebius belonged to the anti-Dioscorus camp and therefore, his petition reflected the interests of the Papal party in full. Hence it would be safe to suggest that Eusebius was allocated a seat on Anatolius' left. To be sure, Eusebius did not

---

33 See *Bourdieu's Turns* starting on p. 80 above.

34 See *Speech Acts* starting on p. 81 above.

35 See *Books as Fetishes* on pp. 79 and 109 above.

36 On the reconstruction of tonality and gesticulation as they are reflected in (ancient) texts, see p. 77 above.

37 See discussion of excitement as a solidarity-enhancing factor starting on p. 73 above. Also see *Durkheim on Emotional Excitement* on p. 91 above.

38 Τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑμῖν τῶν δεσποτῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης, κελεύσατε τὰς δεήσεις τὰς ἐμὰς ἀναγνωσθῆναι, καθὼς παρέστη τῶι εὐσεβεστάτωι βασιλεῖ. ἠδίκημαι παρὰ Διοσκόρου. ἠδίκηται ἡ πίστις. ἐφονεύθη Φλαβιανὸς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος. ἅ ἐμοὶ καθῃρέθη ἀδίκως παρ' αὐτοῦ. κελεύσατε τὰς δεήσεις μου ἀναγνωσθῆνα (*ibid.*).

hesitate to link his interests, and thus the interests of the Papal delegates, with those of the Eastern emperor: 'in accordance with the wishes of our most pious emperor'. In effect, one must be reminded, the Papal delegates as well as the Constantinopolitan and Antiochene delegates were seated together.

Legal or Magical Jargon

In our version, Eusebius' appeal begins with the standard formula 'By the preservation of the masters of the world'. And in Greek: Τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑμῖν τῶν δεσποτῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης, κελεύσατε τὰς δεήσεις τὰς ἐμὰς ἀναγνωσθῆναι (I.14) Here, the addressees could be either the bishops present or, more likely, the emperors. Yet a textual variant, reported by Rusticus,[39] is even more intriguing in that, curiously enough, though distinctively legal in nature, it also echoes popular magical formulas of invocation. It reads:

> I adjure you by the holy Trinity, which is the protector of princes and which you worship and in which you were baptized and by whose invocation you are saved, order my petition to be read.[40]

In Greek magical texts, one could find the use of the verb ἐξορκίζω, which has an identical function of making an appeal under oath. It is possible that magical jargon has crept into judicial jargon and vice versa. However, it is equally possible that the use of this formula, with its overtly pagan connotations, may have, perhaps, led to the final suppression of the paragraph in question and to its replacement in the Greek version(s) with a more neutral appeal.

Eusebius' request was granted, yet he did not proceed with the reading of his own appeal. Instead, the task was handed over[41] to Veronicianus 'the hallowed secretary of the divine consistory': ὁ καθωσιωμένος σηκρητάριος τοῦ θείου κονσιστωρίου (I.15). Eusebius himself took a seat in the centre, thus assuming the role of Dioscorus' prosecutor. Eusebius appealed to Marcian as a Christian emperor and as the representative of God 'from whom you have received rule and authority over what is under the sun'. As mentioned in our introduction,[42] Eusebius, like Pope Leo, demanded the annulment of the decisions taken at the Second Council of Ephesus. While referring to Dioscorus by the prescribed honorific title of 'the most devout Bishop of the great city of Alexandria', Eusebius accused Dioscorus of reinstituting the 'heresy' of Eutyches through the use of both violence and bribe.

---

39 Reported in Rusticus' Latin text (ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 41 note).

40 *Per sanctam trinitatem uos adiuro, quae custos est principum, quam colitis et in qua baptizati estis et cuius inuocatione saluamini, iubere preces meas relegi* (*ibid.*).

41 On *'turns'* as criteria for assessing social control, see discussion starting on p. 80 above.

42 See p. 34 above.

In response, Dioscorus requested to have the minutes of the Second Council of Ephesus read to the delegates — a request to which Eusebius concurred. Anatolius' reply is the epitome of the preservation of proper procedures: 'Let everything relating to this affair be read in proper order':[43] Πάντα τὰ ἐν τῆι ὑποθέσει ταύτηι παρακολουθήσαντα κατὰ τάξιν ἀναγινωσκέσθω (I.20) The following episode exemplifies the social control exercised by imperial officials over the high clergy. Dioscorus addresses Anatolius asking 'that matters of faith be examined first': ἐν πρώτοις τὰ τῆς πίστεως γυμνασθῆναι (I.21). Anatolius' reply is abrupt and even rude:

> What is required immediately is for you to answer the accusations. Wait now while the acts are read, as you yourself have requested.[44]

At this point, another 'secretary of the divine consistory', named Constantine, rose to read the official documents 'from a codex' (ἀπὸ κώδικος) he had at hand.[45] Elsewhere, the said Constantine is referred to as 'the consecrated magistrianus and assistant to the divine secretariat': ὁ καθωσιωμένος μαγιστριανὸς καὶ βοηθὸς τῶν θείων σηκρήτων (I.66). Interestingly, in both addresses, the function of the said Constantine, in essence a 'secular' official, is referred to as *divine*, thus blurring the distinction between ecclesiastical and imperial institutions even further.[46]

Theodosius' Stance

The document read by Constantine was an imperial edict issued by Theodosius II and addressed to Dioscorus. In it the emperor announced his wish to convene a Second Council at Ephesus in August of 449, while prescribing the number and identities of the ecclesiastical delegates and while emphatically prohibiting Theodoret of Cyrrhus, the exponent of the Antiochene School and of Nestorianism, from attending the forthcoming council. In the last round of this ecclesiastical ping-pong match, namely in the said Second Council of Ephesus, we may remember that Theodoret suffered the blow of being deposed from his see.

The unrest in both the Alexandrian and Antiochene parties needed to be addressed and Theodosius, wishing to maximize his chances of getting his own theological and political agenda approved, decided to achieve just this goal by excluding Theodoret whom the Alexandrians considered as their chief *bête noire*. The tone of Theodosius' imperial decree and the tension around

---

43 On the characteristics of formal speech, see discussion starting on p. 84 above.

44 Τέως πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν ἀποκρίνασθαί σε προσήκει. ὅθεν περίμεινον τὴν τῶν πεπραγμένων γενέσθαι ἀνάγνωσιν, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸς γενέσθαι ἐξῄτησας (I.22).

45 On the authority of books see discussion starting on p. 79 and on p. 109 above

46 On the anachronistic distinction between secular and religious, see discussion on pp. 36 and 63 above.

Theodoret's presence in the Second Council of Ephesus reveals the mechanisms by which the Byzantine emperor dictated the outcome of ecclesiastical procedures.[47] Theodosius thundered as follows:

> […] we decree that (Theodoret) is not to come to the holy council, unless the entire holy council, after it had assembled, should decide that he should attend and participate in the same holy council; if there should arise any dissension over him, we order the holy council to assemble without him and deal with the agenda we have laid down.[48]

4. Theodoret's Grand Entry

In the Council of Chalcedon too, the figure of Theodoret still remained highly controversial and inflammatory. Anatolius, the all-powerful *magister militum* who presided over the proceedings, was well aware of this fact, for he actually used Theodosius' hostility towards Theodoret as a lever to bring about a change in the latter's position, while contrasting the policy of Marcian with that of his predecessor. Constantine, the secretary, had just finished reading from his book[49] (a piece of reading which, one might observe, had been carefully chosen in advance, for there is no mention in the proceedings of any conversation between Anatolius and Constantine in respect of the choice of reading), when Anatolius turned to the surprised audience of the council, half-announcing and half-ordering the grand entrance of Theodoret:

> Let the most devout Theodoret enter and take part in the council, since the most holy archbishop Leo has restored his see to him, and since the most divine and pious emperor has decreed his attendance at the holy council.[50]

At this point, both parties, which were physically situated opposite each other, began to trade insults and accusations, while giving no heed to the proper procedure, nor to decorum, thus breaking the *co-occurrence* rules.[51]

---

47 On formal, judicial, language as a *boundary marker* see p. 84 above.

48 θεσπίζομεν μὴ πρότερον ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον, ἐὰν μὴ πάσηι τῆι ἁγίαι συνόδωι συνελθούσηι δόξηι καὶ αὐτὸν παραγεύεσθαι καὶ κοινὸν γενέσθαι τῆς αὐτῆς ἁγίας συνόδου. εἰ δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ διχόνοιά τις ἀνακύψοι, χωρὶς αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον συνελθεῖν καὶ τυπῶσαι τὰ κελευσθέντα προστάττομεν (I.24).

49 See *Reading Out Loud as an Authoritative Act* on p. 113 above.

50 Εἰσίτω καὶ ὁ εὐλαβέστατος Θεοδώρητος κοινωνήσων τῆι συνόδωι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀποκατέστησεν αὐτῶι τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ὁ ἁγιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Λέων, καὶ ὁ θειότατος δὲ καὶ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς παρεῖναι αὐτὸν τὴν ἁγίαν συνόδωι ἐθέσττισεν (I.26).

51 On the affects of injurious speech see D. Riley, *Impersonal Passion: Language as Affect* (Durham,-London, 2005), pp. 9–27. On the function of decorum in *co-occurrence rules*, see discussion starting on p. 85 above and on p. 158 below.

The Alexandrian camp, headed by Dioscorus, realised that Anatolius' speech marked a change in imperial policy. Upon Theodoret's entry they began to exclaim:

> Have mercy, the faith is being destroyed. The canons exclude him. Drive him out. Drive out the teacher of Nestorius.[52]

The Oriental bishops answered back in fury: 'We signed blank sheets': Εἰς ἄγραφα ὑπεγράψαμεν (I.28) — in reference to their official consent in the Council of Ephesus to excommunicate Theodoret:

> We suffered blows and we signed. Drive out the Manichees. Drive out the enemies of Flavian. Drive out the enemies of the faith.[53]

The next person to shout was Dioscorus who now invoked the memory of Cyril, Theodoret's chief opponent, to his aid:

> Why is Cyril being cast out, who was anathematized by this man?[54]

The Oriental bishops were persistent in their breach of *decorum*:[55]

> Drive out Dioscorus the murderer. Who does not know of the actions of Dioscorus?[56]

Goffman's Response Cries

All in all, the onlooker witnesses here some sort of communication, i.e. cries or acclamations, which, as Erving Goffman puts it, 'does not amount to dialogue'.[57] Elsewhere in his study,[58] Goffman defined *response cries* as being 'exclamatory interjections which are not full-fledged words' (e.g. *Oops!*). In our case, the delegates utter whole sentences, rather than plain 'roguish utterances' which, together, still do not amount to any form of real conversation.

The climax of this verbal skirmish was the Alexandrians' bold cry in favour of the Empress Pulcheria: 'Long live Augusta!', Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς αὐγούστας,

---

52 Ἐλεήσατε, ἡ πίστις ἀπόλλυται. οἱ κανόνες τοῦτον ἐκβάλλουσιν. τοῦτον ἔξω βάλε. τὸν διδάσκαλον Νεστορίου ἔξω βάλε (I.27).

53 ἐτυπτήθημεν καὶ ὑπεγράψαμεν. τοὺς Μανιχαίους ἔξω βάλε. τοὺς ἐχθροὺς Φλαβιανοῦ ἔξω βάλε. τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τῆς πίστεως ἔξω βάλε (I.28).

54 Κύριλλος διὰ τί ἐκβάλλεται ὁ παρ ἀ τούτου ἀναθεματισθείς; (I.29)

55 On diversion from *co-occurrence rules* by breaking of decorum in formal contexts, see p. 158 below.

56 Διόσκορον τὸν φονέα ἔξω βάλε. Διοσκόρου τὰς πράξεις τίς οὐκ οἶδεν; (I.30)

57 E. Goffman, *Forms of Talk* (Philadelphia, 1981), pp. 78–122, esp. p. 78.

58 *Ibid.*, p. 99.

thus marking emperor and empress as the heads of two opposing parties.[59] That these groups represented the differences not between East and West but between rival parties within the Eastern empire is attested in Anatolius' snub to the Alexandrian opposition, stating that Theodoret who had been 'restored to his see by the most holy Archbishop of the renowned city of Rome, has now appeared in the role of accuser'[60] (i.e. of those who keep demanding his deposition and excommunication).

Imperial attributives are not only official, but also manipulative in that they are aimed at gaining the reader's heart and sympathy. When, in session I, the parties were divided clearly into two separate and opposing parties, the Empress Pulcheria was hailed by her anti-Nestorian followers, in complete concord with the *normative rules* set by fifth-century Byzantine society,[61] as being 'the Orthodox one' (τῆς ὀρθοδόξου). The subsequent imperial attributive, uttered by Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus, is an asymmetric tricolon: 'most divine, pious and Christ-loving, masters of the world'. Initially, one understands this attributive as addressing the Eastern imperial couple, but on second thoughts, it could also be applied to both Eastern and Western emperors, as being the official addressees of the litigation. Anatolius' sympathy with Theodoret is undoubtedly reflected in his consistent address to the latter as 'most devout bishop', ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος. The inclusion of an honorific title in *the address system*[62] did not escape the notice of the Alexandrians and anti-Nestorians who protested:

Do not call him a bishop; he is not a bishop.[63]

And again in rebuff to Theodoret's alleged denial of Christ's divinity:

He is not a bishop. Drive out the enemy of God. Drive out the Jew.[64]

---

59 A similar division was later re-enacted by Justinian and Theodora, with Justinian relentlessly trying to curb Miaphysite sentiments in the eastern provinces while his wife, Theodora, continued to show her sympathy towards the Miaphysite cause: 'Justinian was forced by the logic of the situation to combine constant pressure and occasional selective persecution with concessions to the Miaphysites, provided they could be made without sacrifice of principle. In this delicate task he was helped by Theodora's sincere, if somewhat emotional, attachment to the Monophysite cause. The imperial couple could speak in two voices: the rigidity of Justinian's official policy could be tempered by the backstairs intrigues of his wife' (cf. R. Browning, *Justinian and Theodora* (London, 1971), p. 215–241, esp. 215).

60 τὸν οἰκεῖον τὸ ἀπολαβὼν τόπον παρὰ τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς μεγαλωνύμου πόλεως ʿΡώμης εἰσῆλθεν νῦν κατηγόρου τάξιν ἐπέχων (I.35).

61 See *Bailey's Normative Rules* starting on p. 174 below.

62 See *The Formal Linguistic Arsenal — Honorific Title* starting on p. 86 above.

63 Μὴ λέγετε αὐτὸν ἐπίσκοπον, οὔκ ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος (I.37).

64 οὔκ ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος. τὸν θεομάχον ἔξω βάλε. τὸν Ἰουδαῖον ἔξω βάλε (I.37).

Anatolius, once again addressed as 'the most glorious officials and exalted senate' (οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος), clearly asserts Theodoret's status:

> Theodoret […] has now appeared in the role of accuser.[65]

The next episode exemplifies the function of the human body as a *performative space*:[66] Theodoret was indeed 'seated in the centre' (μετὰ τὸ καθεσθέναι ἐν τῶι μέσωι)—whereupon the Nestorian or Antiochene party exclaimed enthusiastically: 'He is worthy, he is worthy': Ἄξιος ἄξιος (I.36). To be seated in the centre was required of all litigants, whether accused or accusers. Leaving the Antiochene party content, Anatolius managed to irritate its Alexandrian rival quite a bit.

Once again the latter had to assert Theodoret's lack of orthodoxy, while singling him out (as the opposite faction had done to Dioscorus) as a member of the *outgroup* (according to Tajfel, 'a group to which an individual does not identify'[67]) by repeatedly demanding his physical expulsion from the place and from the community (I.39).[68] The *ideological polarization* between *ingroups* and *outgroups* cannot be expressed more clearly than in the following denouncement of Theodoret's orthodoxy:[69]

> Drive out the enemy of God. Drive out the blasphemer against Christ.[70]

The Alexandrians were not satisfied with mere slander of Theodoret, for they concluded their plight with a telling form of imperial hailing:

> Long live Augusta! Long live the emperor! Long live the orthodox emperor […][71]

The acclamation of their immediate patron, the empress, was followed by what seems to be a ceremonial acclamation of the emperor. We know the acclamation is ceremonial because its main function here was to assert their loyalty and devotion to an emperor, who was, as we may remember, initially opposed to the standpoint of the well-wishers.

---

65 Θεοδώρητος εἰσῆλθεν νῦν κατηγόρου τάξιν ἐπέχων (I.35).

66 See *Communication Strategies* starting on p. 153 below.

67 H. Tajfel, 'Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour', in: *Social Science Information* 13 (1974), pp. 65–93.

68 *Ibid.*

69 Cf. Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context,* pp. 192–194.

70 Τὸν ὀρθόδοξον τῆι συνόδωι. τοὺς ἀνασειστὰς ἔξω βάλε.

71 Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς αὐγούστας. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τοῦ βασιλέως. τοῦ ὀρθοδόξου βασιλέως πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη.

Acclamations and Conclamations —
Their Communicative Dynamics

What is an acclamation? Klauser gives a broad definition of acclamation which also includes criticism and rebuke. According to Klauser

> […] acclamations are calls which were often rhythmically formulated and pre-formed like a chorus with which a crowd could express their approval, praise and congratulations, or their disapproval, curse, or complaints.[72]

Rouché also acknowledges a wider definition of the term especially when it applies to earlier periods. However, she does notice a change in the social function of acclamation by the fourth century when at least in church councils acclamations were only used to express assent:

> Acclamation had played a part in the church councils of the fourth century […], but only for the purpose of expressing assent. The Council of Chalcedon in 451 appears to have been the first occasion when acclamations were extensively used by opposing parties in such a gathering.[73]

We see that the attempt of the opposing parties at Chalcedon to go back to the probable original use of acclamations, that is, the expression of both approval and disapproval, met with criticism on the part of the imperial party. To be sure, the *Acts* record many instances of insults, such as 'drive out Dioscorus the murderer'. Interestingly, the Egyptian bishops who answered back claimed that their shouting was 'for the sake of piety'. This implies that shouting in disapproval of the other party at church councils was considered to amount to impiety as the principle of unity was violated.[74]

In addition to Pulcheria and Marcian, the Egyptian bishops also acclaimed the Constantinopolitan senate: 'Long live the senate', Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς συγκλήτου. The exclamations of the anti-Nestorian camp are characterized by a strong loyalist and political orientation.[75] On the other hand, the Oriental camp,

---

72 Th. Klauser, 'Akklamation', *RAC* 1 (Stuttgart, 1950), pp. 216–233, esp. 216; cf. also E. Peterson, *Εἷς θεός: epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Göttingen, 1926), pp. 191–193.

73 Rouché, 'Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire: New Evidence from Aphrodisias', *JRS* 74 (1984), pp. 181–199, esp. pp. 186–187.

74 On the ideals of *consensus*, *concord,* and *harmony* see discussion on pp. 36, 74–75 above, and p. 198 below.

75 Similar loyalist sentiments were upheld by Christians living in the Sassanian empire who, so as to distinguish themselves from their co-religionists living within the realms of the Christian Empires, Eastern and Western, came to adopt anti-Chalcedonian, Nestorian, agendas (see G. Fowden, 'Religious Communities', in: G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, O. Grabar (ed.), *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 82–106, esp. pp. 94ff.

though it was physically closer to Constantinople and to the imperial centre of power, reflected no such sentiments. Both parties concentrated their attacks on individual people: for the Oriental bishops it was 'Dioscorus the murderer', Τὸν φονέα Διόσκορον, whereas for the Egyptian bishops it was Theodoret who, so went the accusation, '[…] is rejected by God', τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀπεστράφη.

In order to explain the dynamics of the dialogue between the parties and Anatolius, the *magister militum*, a full quotation is given here:

> The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'These vulgar outbursts are not becoming to bishops, nor useful to either party. Allow everything to be read'. The Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'Expel that one man and we shall all listen. Our interjections are for the sake of piety. We speak on behalf of the orthodox faith.' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'Allow, rather, the hearing to be conducted according to God, and permit everything to be read in order.'[76]

In this case, Anatolius, much like a college Dean,[77] is abrupt and uncompromising in his insistence on communal decorum and on the preservation of the *rules of the community*. His authority is manifested, time and again, in his control over the turns.[78] However, he is far from being consistent in the application of his authority when his favourite party breaks the rules of the community in a similar manner. For example, on another occasion (I.530–531), the 'Oriental' bishops do not hesitate to call Bishop Dioscorus names ('murderer', 'Pharaoh'), again, without encountering any reproach or criticism on Anatolius' part.

The tone and flow of the episode in question (I.44–46), as well as the silence of the Oriental camp, indicate that the chief addressees of Anatolius' reproach were the Egyptian, rather than the Oriental, bishops, who are obviously breaking the rules of the community by not keeping to the prescribed decorum: 'Expel that one man' (τὸν ἕνα ἐκβάλετε), 'and we shall all listen' (καὶ πάντες ἀκούομεν). In view of Anatolius' evident wish to have Theodoret present at the proceedings, it becomes clear why the Egyptians took pains to stress their loyalty towards the appropriate state institutions, Anatolius included. To sum up this episode, the verbal skirmish between the parties can be visualised as a quadrangle comprising Anatolius, who patently favoured Theodoret's presence, the Egyptians who launched a fierce protest while condemning Theodoret's alleged unorthodoxy, the Orientals who fired back with a new demand to expel

---

76 […]Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Μᾶλλον ἀνάσχεσθε κατὰ θεόν τὴν ἀκρόασιν γενέσθαι καὶ συγχωρήσατε πάντα κατὰ τάξιν ἀναγνωσθῆναι (I.44–46).

77 See *Rules of the Community* starting on p. 82 above.

78 See discussion of the function of *turns* on p. 80 above. For the influence of space on the verbal exertion of authority, see *Authoritative versus Corrosive Discourses* on p. 106 above.

Dioscorus, the leader of the Egyptian camp, and finally Theodoret, the cause of all the trouble, who sat passively, not taking an active part in the argument and totally entrusting his defence to the hands of his supporters.

After a public reading of the relevant documents relating to the Second Council of Ephesus, Dioscorus addressed the council in a seemingly astonished and bewildered tone:[79]

> Why are these people singling me out for attack? Responsibility was given to the three of us [i.e. Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Thalassius, to preside over the said proceedings] equally, and the whole council […] concurred with our judgement.[80]

Dioscorus was clearly manipulating his audience in the sense that his attempt at 'sharing' the responsibility with the two other clerics, did not conform with the explicit order issued by emperor Theodosius concerning the presidency over the Second Council of Ephesus:

> we […] entrust the responsibility and presidency to your religiousness, since we know for certain that Juvenal the most religious Archbishop of Jerusalem, the most religious Archbishop Thalassius, and every fervent lover and champion of orthodoxy will be of one mind with your holiness […][81]

5. The Role of the Imperial Establishment

The presidency of the Second Council of Ephesus was entrusted by Theodosius into the hands of Dioscorus. That these were the circumstances in which the Second Council of Ephesus was convened proves beyond any doubt that in the fifth century, supreme power, also in ecclesiastical affairs, lay in the hands of the emperor:[82] the latter bestowed his authority on chosen clerics who would, in turn, ensure the execution of imperial religious policy. This impression is enhanced by reading the following description of the reaction of the Nestorian camp and the followers of Theodoret who, questioning the legitimacy of the proceedings of the Second Council of Ephesus, exclaimed:

> No one concurred [i.e. with the proceedings and with the deposition of Flavian, the then bishop of Constantinople?], force was used, force with blows. We signed blank paper. We were threatened with deposition. We were threatened with exile. Sol-

---

79 On the reconstruction of tonality, see pp. 77–78 above.

80 διὰ τί εἰς ἐμὲ μόνον ἀποτείνονται οὗτοι; ὅτι ἡ αὐθεντία ἐπίσης ἐδόθη τοῖς τρισὶν καὶ τοῖς κεκριμένοις παρ' ἡμῶν συνήνεσεν, ὡς εἶπον, πᾶσα ἡ σύνοδος (I.53).

81 […] ἐπιστάμενοι ἀκριβῶς ὡς καὶ ὁ θεοσεβέστατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Ἱεροσολύμων Ἰουβενάλιος καὶ ὁ θεοσεβέστατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θαλάσσιος καὶ πᾶς τοιοῦτος θερμὸς τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἐραστὴς καὶ ζηλωτὴς ὁμογνώμονες ἔσονται τῆι σῆι ἁγιωσύνηι […] (I.52).

82 On the relationship between church and state see discussion starting on p. 96 above.

diers with clubs and swords stood by, and we took fright at the clubs and swords. We were intimidated into signing. Where there are swords and clubs, what kind of council is it?[83]

The presence of armed soldiers in a church council exemplifies the absolute power which an Eastern emperor had over ecclesiastical affairs. Imperial control over ecclesiastical affairs was far from being a new phenomenon: it could be traced back to the time of Constantine. Yet whereas Constantine's initiative to convene an ecumenical church council at Nicaea (AD 325) was the highlight of his personal interest in all things theological and religious (consequently, also setting the model for a new set of normative rules),[84] Theodosius' interference was already far more brutal and far less intellectual.[85] Marcian, his successor, apparently refrained from using military force, and was even quite late in making a personal appearance in the sixth session of the Council of Chalcedon, yet the person chosen by him to preside over his 'own' church council was no longer a cleric, but a state official, namely the *magister militum.*

The Egyptian bishops answered back with a very peculiar argument cum protest against what they saw as a breach of decorum and the established set of co-occurrence rules:[86]

> Why are the clerics now shouting? This is a council of bishops not of clerics. Drive out the supernumeraries. May those who signed [i.e. on the decisions of Ephesus II] come to the centre.[87]

---

83 Οὐδεὶς συνῄνεσεν, βία ἐγένετο, βία μετὰ πληγῶν. εἰς ἄγραφον χάρτην ὑπεγράψαμεν. καθαίρεσις ἡμῖν ἠπειλήθη. ἐξορία ἡμῖν ἠπειλήθη. στρατιῶται μετὰ βάκλων καὶ ξιφῶν ἐπέστησαν καὶ τὰ βάκλα καὶ τὰ ξίφη ἐφοβήθημεν. φοβούμενοι ὑπεγράψαμεν. ὅπου ξίφη καὶ βάκλα, καὶ ποία σύνοδος; (I.54).

84 A continuator of the pagan imperial role of *pontifex maximus*, Constantine played an active role in the religious re-shaping of the empire. Most famous is Constantine's supposedly active role in stressing the divinity of the Son in relation to the Father and the subsequent branding of the term *homoousios* (*of the same substance*). Constantine's learned enthusiasm is a recurring *topos* in Eusebius of Caesarea. The document, entitled *Oration to the Assembly of the Saints* is attached to Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*. Though it is commonly perceived as a speech delivered by Constantine himself, its date is still disputed (Cf. H. A. Drake, 'The Impact of Constantine on Christianity', in: N. Lenski (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 111–136, esp. 125–130). For a discussion of *normative rules*, see p. 174 below.

85 The Second Council of Ephesus was branded as *latrocinium* (i.e. 'robbery') by Pope Leo (Cf. *Ep.* 95), though his reason for doing so was not the soldiers present, but the fact that decisions had been taken prior to the arrival of both the papal and the Constantinopolitan delegations in Ephesus.

86 See discussion on pp. 85, 116 above and 158 below.

87 κληρικοὶ νῦν διὰ τί κράζουσιν; ἡ σύνοδος ἐπισκόπων ἐστίν, οὐχὶ κληρικῶν. τοὺς περισσοὺς ἔξω βάλε. οἱ ὑπογράψαντες εἰς μέσον ἔλθωσιν (55)

In addition to Theodoret, the Egyptian camp also demanded the expulsion of non-bishops from the council. Their demand stands in complete contrast to the detailed list of participants given at the beginning of the proceedings — a fact that may allude to the position of low-level clergy as being merely passive and auditory. Such a meticulous nominal list seems to function as a binding commitment on the part of all participants, whether junior or senior, to abide by the final decisions of the council. The complaint of the Egyptians may be explained in that the proceedings of any church council would be physically subscribed only by the higher clergy, namely the bishops present. The Egyptians then ceremonially demanded that 'those who signed come to the centre': οἱ ὑπογράψαντες εἰς μέσον ἔλθωσιν. In other words, all who now claim to have signed under physical threat should put their arguments openly and as litigants. More important, they should perform and demonstrate their new position with their very own bodies.[88]

Atmosphere of Fear at the Second Council of Ephesus

A glimpse of the power-struggle between the different ecclesiastical factions and their political affiliation is provided by Stephen, Bishop of Ephesus, who described the events surrounding the Second Council of Ephesus as follows:

> I received into communion the presbyter Helpidius and the other deacons and Bishop Eusebius — Bishop Eusebius himself knows that I received them. But then Helpidius and Eulogius, with soldiers and Eutyches' monks (i.e. Miaphysites monks?), about three hundred persons, came to me in the episcopal palace, and were about to kill me, saying, 'You received the enemies of the emperor (i.e. Theodosius), you are the enemy of the emperor'.[89]

This citation from the *Acts* of the Council of Ephesus reflects the high degree of social and political commitment which typified monastic behaviour throughout the ages. Yet, unlike Theodosius who, in this case, happened to profit from the pro-imperial sentiments of the enraged monks, Marcian proved to be less fortunate than his predecessor: in the aftermath of Chalcedon, masses of Palestinian, Egyptian, and, to a lesser extent, Syrian monks rioted fiercely in protest

---

88 On the body as a performative space see *Communication Strategies* starting on p. 153 below.

89 Ὡς ἔτι ἐδεξάμην εἰς κοινωνίαν Ἐλπίδον τὸν πρεσβύτερον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους διακόνους καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Εὐσέβιον (οἶδεν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Εὐσέβιος ὅτι ἐδεξάμην αὐτούς), ἐπῆλθόν μοι εἰς τὸ ἐπισκοπεῖον Ἐλπίδιος καὶ Εὐλόγιος καὶ στρατιῶται καὶ οἱ μονάζοντες Εὐτυχέος, ὀνόματα ὡς τριακόσια, καὶ ἔμελλόν με φονεύειν λέγοντες ὅτι τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ βασιλέως ἐδέξω, ἐχθρὸς εἶ τοῦ βασιλέως (I.58).

against imperial ecclesiastical policy, thus posing a real threat to the stability of Marcian's regime.[90]

Other witnesses to the alleged mental and physical abuse employed against bishops in order to force the latter to sign in favour of the deposition of Flavian and the excommunication of Theodoret, also testify to a psychological manipulation applied by Dioscorus and his camp:

> The minutes [of Ephesus II] were read, Flavian of blessed memory was praised, and during this we remained silent, presuming that the proceedings had been in order. But afterwards, to frighten us, they invoked as similar the heresy of Nestorius, shouting at us, 'Cut into two those who shout two natures! Cleave, kill, and drive out those who say two!', so that, out of fear of the Nestorian heresy, we would not be judged orthodox but condemned as heretics […].[91]

6. The Process of Boundary Marking

Comparing a recognized heretic with an ecclesiastical opponent in order to bring about the condemnation of the latter is certainly not typical of fifth-century councils alone.[92] In this case, however, we may remember that at first Flavian was not condemned, but praised — a fact which testifies to the sophistication of Dioscorus' camp who, well aware that such a link between the Nestorian heresy and Flavian had already been made, was now ready to implicate Flavian's followers with the same much-defamed heresy: 'Cut into two' (εἰς δύο ποιήσατε), 'cleave, kill, throw' (διχάσατε ἀνέλετε ἐκβάλετε), are rather harsh words which can be taken as a literal enticement to commit murder.[93]

---

90 For the spread of the riots across the Eastern Empire, see Samuel, *The Council of Chalcedon*, pp. 92–102; D. J. Chitty, *The Desert a City: An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism under the Christian Empire* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 149–153; Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, pp. 149–153; B. Bitton-Ashkelony and A. Kofsky, *The Monastic School of Gaza* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 47–61.

91 καὶ ἀνεγινώσκετο μὲν τά ὑπομνήματα καὶ εὐφημεῖτο ὁ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Φλαβιανός, μεταξὺ δὲ τῶν εὐφημιῶν ἡμεῖς ἐσιωπῶμεν ὡς καλῶς πεπραγρένων τῶν πραχθέντων. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ἵνα ἡμᾶς πτοήσωσιν, ἀνεβόησαν τὴν παραπλησίαν Νεστορίου αἵρεσιν ἐπιφημίσαντες ἡμῖν. εἰς δύο ποιήσατε τοὺς λέγοντας δύο φύσεις. τοὺς τὰς δύο λέγοντας διχάσατε ἀνέλετε ἐκβάλετε, ἵνα τῶι φόβωι τῆς Νεστοριανῆς κακοδοξίας μὴ ὡς ὀρθόδοξοι κριθῶμεν, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς αἱρετικοὶ κατακριθῶμεν (I.62).

92 On intergroup dynamics and Tajfel's socio-psychological study of *ingroup* and *outgroup*, see p. 119 above.

93 Averil Cameron questions the popular image of Byzantine society as a 'persecuting society'. She argues that the most extreme form of corporeal punishment brought against 'heretics' was mutilation, rather than execution, and that mutilation itself was introduced into Byzantine practice only after Justinian. More common forms of punishment remained all manners of public humiliation, and in case of senior clerics, deposition and the public burning of books (see *eadem*, 'Enforcing Orthodoxy in Byzantium', in: K. Cooper and J. Gregory (ed.), *Discipline and Diversity* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 1–24.

Yet quite surprisingly, the followers of Flavian do not express fear for their own fate, but for the fate of those who were baptised by them:

> Each of us was afraid that, if expelled as a heretic, he would ruin those he had baptised; the danger affected not so much him as those who had been baptised after professing their faith in Christ. We should not at this point have remained silent, but they then did something else. The council had been ordered by the master of the world [i.e. the emperor][94] to judge the case of Flavian first. But they held many sessions together; without signing or giving notice of their resolutions, or reading them out to anyone, with some of us not knowing what was happening, they brought us blank sheets — Dioscorus and Juvenal — accompanied by a mob of disorderly people, with a mass of them shouting and making a tumult and disrupting the council. We were one hundred and thirty-five in all; forty-two were ordered to keep silent; the rest were Dioscorus and Juvenal and the disorderly mob; that left only fifteen of us. What could we do? They made sport of our lives. They, the heretics, all spoke with one voice. They terrified us. They said we were heretics, and we were excluded as heretics.[95]

The violence and physical intimidation which are inferred from Theodore's description reflect a reality rooted in the religious and social atmosphere of the day.[96] However, worse still, was the common recourse to psychological manipulation, which focused on people's fear of *social exclusion*, and was a feature common to all councils.[97] Fear of social exclusion was far from intellectual or academic: it is expressed here in almost magical terms in that the vocal branding of someone as a heretic, the mere uttering of one's name in the context of heresy was sufficient to strike fear in his heart:[98] 'They said we were heretics and we were excluded as heretics', αἱρετικοὺς ἡμᾶς εἶπον καὶ ἐξεβλήθημεν ὡς αἱρετικοί. This and similar episodes may point the reader to the sociological significance

---

94　Compare with citation on p. 164 below.

95　καὶ ἕκαστος ἐδεδοίκει μὴ ἐκβληθείς ὡς αἱρετικὸς ἀπολέσοι οὓς ἐβάπτισεν, καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτῶι ὁ κίνδυνος, ἀλλ᾽ ἤ τῶν βαπτισθέντων ἤν τῶν πιστευσάντων τῶι Χριστῶι. καὶ οὐκ ἔδει μὲν ἡμᾶς σιωπῆσαι τότε, ἔπειτα καὶ ἄλλο ἐποίησαν. ἐκελεύσθη παρὰ τοῦ δεσπότου τῆς οἰκουμένης ἡ σύνοδος πρῶτον τὰ περὶ Φλαβιανοῦ κρῖναι. οὗτοι πολλὰς ἐν ταὐτῶι συνόδους ποιήσαντες καὶ οὐχ ὑπογράψαντες οὐδὲ προγράψαντες τὰ δεδογμένα οὐδὲ ἀναγνόντες τινὶ οὐδὲ εἰδότων τινῶν προσήνεγκαν ἡμῖν ἀγράφους χάρτας Διόσκορος καὶ ᾽Ιουβενάλιος, πλῆθος ἔχοντες ἀτάκτων ἀνθρώπων, βοώντων πολλῶν καὶ θορυβούντων καὶ κατασειόντων τὴν σύνοδον. ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα πέντε ἦμεν οἱ πάντες, τεσσαρακονταδύο ἐκελεύσθησαν σιωπῆσαι, οἱ λοιποὶ ἦσαν Διόσκορος καὶ ᾽Ιουβενάλιος καὶ πλῆθος ἀτάκτων, ἦμεν λοιπὸν δεκαπέντε ἄνθρωποι. τί εἴχομεν ποιῆσαι; εἰς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἔπαιξαν… οὗτοι. αἱρετικοὶ ὄντες μίαν φωνὴν ἔλεγον πάντες; κατεπτόησαν ἡμᾶς. αἱρετικοὺς ἡμᾶς … εἶπον καὶ ἐξεβλήθημεν ὡς αἱρετικοί (I.62).

96　Cf. MacMullen, *Voting about God*, pp. 56–66.

97　See *Atmosphere of Fear* on p. 124 above.

98　On the function of vocalization see *Senders and Receivers as Criteria for Measuring Social Control* on p. 87 above (also compare with the vocalization of dogmatic creeds on p. 135 below and cases of vocalized reiteration on p. 169 below).

of church gatherings as a means of securing formal concord through the application of psychological manipulation.[99]

The shifting of imperial patronage — of the emperor, that is, rather than the empress — from the Miaphysite to the Dyophysite party was very conspicuous to everybody involved:[100] the Oriental bishops do not spare any effort in trying to persuade their audience, or rather the imperial entourage, that their consent to the excommunication of Flavian was secured by means of trickery and deceit on one hand, and of crude manipulation of their naïvety on the other. Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, opposed the version given by the Orientals, while pointing out the following technical impossibility:

> Since they are making the accusation that they were given a blank sheet to sign, who, then, composed their declaration?[101]

Dioscorus' friends display an even more original reasoning, insisting on making their opponents undergo a quasi *rite de passage*:

> A Christian fears no one. An orthodox fears no one. Bring fire, and we shall learn. If they (i.e. saints) had feared men, there would never have been martyrs?[102]

Burning someone at the stake in order to test his orthodoxy?[103] One cannot miss the manipulative yet harsh rhetoric employed here against the Oriental camp which is contrasted here with the positive and larger than life *exempla* of the Christian martyrs of the past.[104] Returning to Dioscorus, he concludes his speech with the following direct address to Anatolius: 'I ask Your Magnificence to make them answer': αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν ἀξιῶ προσάξαι τὴν ὑμετέραν μεγαλοπρέπειαν. Officially, Anatolius, the *magister militum*, should take a neutral stance concerning the verbal skirmish between the two parties, yet instead he totally ignores Dioscorus' demand and merely orders a further reading of the minutes of the Second Council of Ephesus: 'Let the proceedings [i.e. of Ephesus II] be read': Τὰ πεπραγμένα ἀναγινωσκέσθω.[105]

---

99 See *The Purpose of Group Gatherings* on p. 70 above, and the comparison of heresy with pollution on p. 195 below.

100 See further discussion starting on p. 50 above.

101 ἐπειδὴ δὲ αἰτιῶνται ὡς χάρτου καθαροῦ δεδομένου αὐτοῖς εἰς ὑπογραφήν, τίς καὶ τὰς διαλαλιὰς αὐτῶν ἐτύπωσεν (I.65).

102 Χριστιανὸς οὐδένα φοβεῖται. πῦρ τεθῆι, καὶ μανθάνομεν. εἰ ἀνθρώπους ἐφοβοῦντο, μάρτυρες οὐκ ἦσαν (I.64).

103 Not to be taken literally, this is, again, another example of uncompromising Byzantine rhetoric, which has less to do with corporeal punishment, as much as it concerns a metaphorical *rite de passage* and the establishment of the 'orthodox' *ingroup* (see *The Process of Boundary Marking* on p. 125 above).

104 For the use of historical (or hagiographical) *exempla* as sources of authority and as *identity markers*, see pp. 60 and 91 above, and p. 202 below.

105 For Anatolius' control over the 'turns', see pp. 80–81 above.

The reading of the minutes of Ephesus II no doubt rekindled old animosities and redefined the power-struggle, not only between state and church, but also, and mainly so, between the different sees of the East and between the East and Rome. Constantine, the secretary, made a point of repeating the names· of those present at Ephesus: Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria; Julius, representative of Pope Leo; Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem; Domnus, Bishop of Antioch; Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople. The vocal protest of the Oriental bishops over the seating arrangement in a council which had taken place some two years earlier is more than telling, for it indicates that the seating arrangement at any council strictly reflected the status of the different sees. The Oriental bishops said:

> '[…] Why was Flavian not seated in his proper place? Why was the bishop of Con-
> stantinople put in fifth place?' Paschasinus the most devout bishop said: 'Look, in
> accordance with the will of God we give first place to Lord Anatolius. But they put
> the Blessed Flavian fifth.'[106]

This passage is extraordinary in that it provides evidence of the fact that the seating arrangement was not only practical, intended to observe good order, but also highly symbolic, intended to mark and reflect social control.[107] We may learn that the order indicated the actual distance of the delegates from a specific epicentre. We also learn that this epi-centre was Anatolius, the *lord*, or *magister militum* and that Flavian's followers were particularly incensed at the remoteness of Flavian from Anatolius. Furthermore, Paschasinus poignantly recognized the presence of divine Providence in what would appear to us to be a mere technicality:

> In accordance with the will of God we give first place to Lord Anatolius.[108]

Paschasinus' seemingly banal remark embraces Byzantine political theory in a nutshell, for it admits the presence of divine Providence in the actions of the 'secular' authorities, while acknowledging the superiority of the Godly minded imperial bureaucracy over the ecclesiastical establishment.[109]

The rest of the verbal skirmish between the parties took on an almost comical character:

> Diogenes the most devout Bishop of the Church of Cyzicus said: 'Because you
> know the canons (it is that Flavian was seated in the fifth place).' The most de-
> vout Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'We request, that you drive
> out the supernumeraries. The emperor summoned the bishops. This is a council

---

106 Φλαβιανὸς ἐν τῶι ἰδίωι τόπωι διὰ τί οὐκ ἐκαθέσθη; τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπισκόπου διὰ τί μέμπτον ἔταξαν; Πασκασῖνος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν· Ἴδε ἡμεῖς θεοῦ θέλοντος τὸν κύριον ᾿Ανατόλιον πρῶτον ἔχομεν. οὗτοι πέμπτον ἔταξαν τὸν μακάριον Φλαβιανόν (I.71–72).

107 See *Seating Games* starting on p. 107 above and further examples on p. 143 below.

108 Ἴδε ἡμεῖς θεοῦ θέλοντος τὸν κύριν ᾿Ανατόλιον πρῶτον ἔχομεν (I.72).

109 See discussion starting on pp. 86, 96 above.

of bishops. Why are the supernumeraries shouting?' Theodore, Bishop of Claudi-
opolis in Isauria, said: 'It is the notaries of Dioscorus who are shouting'. Dioscorus
the most devout Bishop of Alexandria said: 'I have only two notaries. How can
the two of them cause a disturbance?' The most glorious officials and the exalted
senate said: 'Let the sequel be read'.[110]

To be sure, the Egyptian bishops keep on trying to have the remarks of the
Orientals ignored by labelling the latter as 'supernumeraries', thus getting them
socially excluded.[111] In this particular case the speaker was Diogenes, Bishop of
Cyzicus. Therefore, it is rather odd on the part of the Egyptians to demand the
overruling of his remarks on the grounds of Diogenes' ecclesiastical status rather
than, for example, on procedural grounds (that is, on the grounds of the disrup-
tion of the formal reading of the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus). One ex-
planation of this oddity could be that the Orientals insisted on only the bishops
of the major sees having the right of speech,[112] thus excluding provincial bishops.
Anatolius, however, ignored the protests on both sides and dryly ordered the con-
tinuation of the formal reading: 'Let the sequel be read': Τὰ ἑξῆς ἀναγινωσκέσθω.

7. Further Reactions to Ephesus I —
Reading and Protesting

The next part of the minutes of the Council of Ephesus addressed a letter of Leo
(no. 33) in which he asserted the supremacy of the Roman see and condemned
Eutyches, the ultra-Miaphysite Egyptian monk.[113] The ground for the renewed
outburst of anger on the part of the Oriental camp was that 'the letter was not
read to us' (i.e. in Ephesus): Οὐκ ἀνεγνώσθη ἡμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή (I.88).[114] In a fur-
ther attempt at *face saving*,[115] Aetius of Constantinople adds:

---

110 Διογένης ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησίας Κυζίκου εἶπεν· Ἐπειδὴ ὑμεῖς τοὺς
κανόνας οἴδατε. Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν.
Δεόμεθα, τοὺς περισσοὺς ἔξω βάλε. ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπισκόπους ἐκάλεσεν. ἡ σύνοδος ἐπισκόπων
ἐστίν. περισσοὶ διὰ τί κράζουσιν; Θεόδωρος ἐπίσκοπος Κλαυδιουπόλεως Ἰσαυρίας εἶπεν· Οἱ
νοτάριοι Διοσκόρου κράζουσιν. Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν·
Δύο νοτάριους ἔξω πονῶ. οἱ δύο θόρυβον πῶς ποιοῦσιν; Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ
ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπεν· Τὰ ἑξῆς ἀναγινωσκέσθω (I.73–77).

111 See *The Process of Boundary Marking* starting on p. 125 above.

112 See *Bourdieu's Turns* on p. 80 above, and further examples on p. 121 above.

113 Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. 43–44 (Greek); *ACO* 2.4, pp. 15–16 (Latin).

114 For the practical and sociological significance of the public reading of documents, see
Reading Out Loud as an Authoritative Act on p. 113 above.

115 Using the excuse of not being aware of the relevant letter is, in fact, a form of *disclaimer*
in that the speaker testifies to what he is *not*, namely that he is not a violator of any rule,
practice, or code (compare with more direct attempts at *face saving,* such as 'I am not a racist,
sexist' etc., discussed by Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context,* p. 183.

The letter was neither received nor read. He [i.e. Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria] swore seven times in the presence of all to have it read, but it was not read and he perjured himself.[116]

Swearing under oath pertains to the legal world, whereas swearing repetitively and for a prescribed number of times — here we find the ominous number seven — is, in itself, a distinctive ceremonial, if not magical, feature.[117] Anatolius' ruling in the matter is interesting, not so much for the subject in hand as it is for shedding further light on the nature of the relationships between church and government in fifth-century Byzantium:

Let the most devout bishops who were then given by the imperial head responsibility for the proceedings say why the letter of the most sacred Archbishop Leo was not read [...][118]

Once more we witness the subordination of the clergy to the *imperial head* — a metaphor which alludes to the function of state and church as bodily organs. The tone of Anatolius' subsequent cross-examination of Dioscorus, and (as is the case in other similar communications) the lack of *modality*,[119] leaves no doubt as to the absolute control of the former over the latter: 'Give a clear answer': σαφῶς εἰπέ (as to why the letter of Leo has not been read),[120] and:

answer yourself why the reading did not take place; they (Bishops Juvenal and Thalassius) will be asked in their turn.[121]

Juvenal's reply to the said question also reflects the precedence given to the imperial authority:

John the presbyter and primicerius of the notaries suddenly announced that he had in his hands a pious letter from the most beloved of God and pious emperors, and I replied that the imperial letter should be read.[122]

---

116 Οὔτε ὑπεδέχθη ἡ ἐπιστολὴ οὔτε ἀνεγνώσθη. καὶ ἑπτάκις ὤμοσεν ἐπὶ πάντων ποιεῖν ταύτην ἀναγνωσθῆναι καὶ οὐκ ἀνεγνώσθη καὶ ἐπιώρκησεν ὅ τι ὤμοσεν (I.90).

117 See *Legal or Magical Jargon*, starting on p. 114 above.

118 Οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι οἷς ἡ αὐθεντία τότε τῶν πραττομένων παρὰ τῆς βασιλικῆς ἐδέδοτο κορυφῆς, λεγέτωσαν διὰ τί ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Λέοντος οὐκ ἀνεγνώσθη (I.92).

119 Cf. Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context*, pp. 181–182.

120 In the context of tonality, Van Dijk discusses the example of the 'barking' military sergeant (*Discourse and Context*, p. 159). To stress the functionality of this particular style of communication (as opposed to certain feelings which people might associate with it), I should mention here the instruction of a skilled dog trainer, to the effect that when training a dog 'one might *act* angrily without actually *being* angry'.

121 Ἐν πρώτηι τάξει ἀπόκριναι αὐτὸς δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν ἡ ἀνάγνωσις οὐκ ἐγένετο. ἀκολούθως γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐρωτηθήσονται (I.98).

122 Εὐθέως ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πριμικήριος τῶν νοταρίων Ἰωάννης ἔχειν μετὰ χεῖρας εὐσεβῆ γράμματα τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων καὶ εὐσεβεστάτων βασιλέων καὶ ἀπεκρινάμην ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὰ βασιλικὰ γράμματα (I.102).

The reader should supply the word 'first' at the end of Juvenal's sentence. Here, a letter of 'the most Beloved of God and pious emperors' is given priority over the papal letter. The titles of the imperial official, *presbyter* and *primicerius of the notaries* reflect the blurring of the distinctions between state and church.

However, by presenting the imperial letter before the papal letter could be read, the official's conduct testifies that, in this case, he was more of a *notaris* than a presbyter. Thalassius was the other bishop who was implicated in the affair. His apologetic answer illustrates the rigid formalities associated with the execution of a church council:[123]

> I only know that I did not prevent it [i.e. the reading of the papal letter], and that I did not have the authority to order the reading on my own.[124]

In the Second Council of Ephesus the man in charge of the proceedings was Bishop Dioscorus who was appointed to the task by Emperor Theodosius himself.

The subsequent reading from the minutes of the Second Council of Ephesus provoked a row of an unclear nature, for in response to Dioscorus' stipulation that anyone who questions the Nicene Creed is to be automatically anathematized, the Oriental camp rose in the following protest: 'We did not say this. Who said this?': Ταῦτα οὐκ εἴπομεν. ταῦτα τίς εἶπεν;

Given the fact that no objection to the Nicene Creed was to be expected from the Orientals, there remains the question of the precise reason for their rejection of the minutes. One possibility is that the rhetorical question put by the Orientals was designed to indicate their total absence from that particular session.

Description of Shorthand Writing

What follows next is a fascinating description of shorthand writing,[125] as well as of the, at times violent, behaviour of the bishops involved:

> Theodore the most devout bishop of Claudiopolis, said: 'Let him (Dioscorus) bring his notaries, for he expelled everyone else's notaries and got his own to do the writing. Let the notaries come and say if this was written or read in our presence, and if anyone acknowledged and signed it?' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'In whose hands are the minutes written?' Dioscorus, the most devout bishop of Alexandria, said: 'Each one wrote through his own notaries. Mine

---

123 See *Church Gatherings as Formal Speech Events* on p. 82 above.

124 Ἓν οἶδα ἐγὼ ὅτι οὔτε ἐκώλυσα οὔτε δὲ τοσαύτην αὐθεντίαν εἶχον, ὥστε ἐμὲ μόνον τυπῶσαι γενέσθαι τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν (I.106).

125 Also see *The Process of Conciliary Record Keeping* starting on p. 47 above.

recorded my statements, those of the most religious Bishop Juvenal recorded his, those of the most religious Bishop Thalassius recorded his, while the other most devout bishops had many notaries who kept a record. So the text is not the work of my notaries; each has his own.'[126]

Can the multitude of notaries be the reason for the rather complex textual history of church councils, Ephesus included? The bishops approving of Dioscorus' testimony were those who were initially appointed by the emperor to serve with him as convenors of the councils:

Juvenal, the most devout Bishop of Jerusalem said: 'I had one notary of my own who kept a record alongside the other notaries.' Thalassius, the most devout Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia said: 'And I had one who kept a record.'[127]

Dioscorus, who was well aware of the position of the said two bishops exhibited a false naïvety by stating:

Look, the notary of Bishop Juvenal kept a record, as did the notary of Bishop Thalassius and that of the Bishop of Corinth. Was it only my notaries?[128]

Further on, Stephen, Bishop of Ephesus, recalls the alleged brutality of the Alexandrian camp at Ephesus, thus shedding light not only on the outburst of emotions, but also on the basic facts relating to public writing and inscribing:

My own notaries, Julian who is now the most devout Bishop of Lebedos and Deacon Crispinus, were keeping a record, but the notaries of the most devout Bishop Dioscorus came and erased their tablets,[129] and almost bruised their fingers in the attempt to snatch their pens. I didn't get copies of the minutes, and I

---

126 Θεόδωρος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Κλαυδιουπόλεως εἶπεν· Ἀγάγηι τοὺς νοταρίους αὐτοῦ. ἐκβαλὼν γὰρ τοὺς πάντων νοταρίους τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ ἐποίησεν γράφειν. ἔλθωσιν οἱ νοτάριοι καὶ εἴπωσιν εἰ ἐγράφη ταῦτα ἢ εἰ παρόντων ἡμῶν ἀνεγνώσθη ἢ τις ἐπέγνω καὶ ὑπέγραψεν. Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Τὰ ὑπομνήματα τίνος χειρὶ γέγραπται; Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων εἶπεν· Ἕκαστος διὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ νοταρίων ἔγραφεν, οἱ ἐμοὶ τὰ ἐμά, οἱ τοῦ θεοσεβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Ἰουβεναλίου τὰ αὐτοῦ, οἱ τοῦ θεοσεβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Θαλασσίου τὰ αὐτοῦ. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλων εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων πολλοὶ νοτάριοι ἐκλαμβάνοντες. οὕτως οὐκ ἔστιν τῶν ἐμῶν νοταρίων τὸ γράμμα. ἕκαστος ἔχει τὸ ἴδιον (I.122–124).
127 Ἰουβενάλιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἱεροσολύμων εἶπεν· Ἦν νοτάριός μου εἷς ἐκλαμβάνων μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων νοταρίων. Θαλάσσιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας εἶπεν· Καὶ ἐμὸς ………. εἷς ἦν ἐκλαμβάνων (I.125–126).
128 Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ καὶ ὁ νοτάριος τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ἰουβεναλίου ἐξέλαβεν καὶ ὁ νοτάριος τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Θαλασσίου καὶ ὁ τῆς Κορίνθου ἐξέλαβεν· μὴ οἱ ἐμοὶ μόνοι; (I.127)
129 Stephen alludes here to the use of wax tablets, rather than of papyri. Given the fact that the procedures were needed to be recorded in shorthand, in a manner which could allow quick writing and erasing, opting for the wax tablets was an obvious choice.

don't know what happened next, but on that very day the investigation took place, and the bishops who had not signed it did so under my guarantee on the following day.'[130]

The first part of Stephen's description illustrates the physical violence in which the Second Council of Ephesus was conducted.[131] The second part, on the other hand, and in particularly Stephen's statement that 'bishops who had not signed it did so under my guarantee on the following day', οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ μὴ ὑπογράψαντες ἐμοῦ ἐγγυμσαμένου τῆι ἑξῆς ὑπέγραψαν, teaches us a great deal about the effectiveness of the application of relentless psychological pressure in public, ritualistic, and ceremonial gatherings. Every ecclesiastical council was concerned with the definition of orthodoxy, as much as it was with the distribution of power amongst the major sees, and between them and the imperial machinery.

8. He Who Defines is the One with Power

The acts of defining and redefining are themselves acts of exercising social control, for if one brands oneself successfully as 'orthodox', one may also appropriate to oneself the right to exclude others, as one pleases. Yet every such power struggle had to be carried out with extreme caution by all parties, lest they would be implicated with the charge of attacking their respective opponents. In this matter, a battle over words also implied a very careful and meticulous choice of words, representing ongoing social processes of *exclusion*, *inclusion* and the formation of religious *communal identities*,[132] in formulating one's own definition of orthodoxy and one's own designated sources of authority.[133] For example, at Ephesus Dioscorus proclaimed that 'In order to convince everyone, to confirm the faith and refute novelty, I am examining the fathers, those at Nicaea and at (the First Council of) Ephesus'.[134]

---

130 Ἐξελάμβαωον οἱ νοτάριοί μου, Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ νῦν εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Λεβέδου καὶ Κρισπῖνος διάκονος καὶ ἦλθον οἱ νοτάριοι τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Διοσκόρου καὶ ἀπήλειψαν αὐτῶν τὰς δέλτους καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτῶν παρά τι ἔκλασαν θέλοντες λαβεῖν καὶ τὰ καλαμάρια αὐτῶν. καὶ οὔτε ἀντίγραφα ἔλαβον τῶν ὑπομνημάτων οὔτε οἶδα ἐκ τότε τί ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῆι τῆι ἡμέραι ἐν ἧι ἡ ἐξέτασις ἐγένετο, ὑπεγράψαμεν εἰς χάρτην καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ μὴ ὑπεγράψαντες ἐμοῦ ἐγγυησαμένου τῆι ἑξῆς ὑπέγραψαν (I.130).
131 See *Atmosphere of Fear* starting on p. 124 above.
132 Also see *Reiteration of Ecclesiastical Sources of Authority* starting on p. 169 below.
133 See *Dramatic Climaxes—The Vocalization of the Dogma* starting on p. 135 below, and *Acknowledging Sources of Authority*, starting on p. 152 below, and *Marcian's Sources of Authority* on p. 192 below.
134 Ἐγὼ πρὸς πληροφορίαν ἁπάντων καὶ βεβαίωσιν τῆς πίστεως καὶ πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν τῶν ἀναφυέντων τὰ τῶν πατέρων ἐρευνῶ, καὶ τῶν ἐν Νικαίαι καὶ τῶν ἐν Εφέσωι (I.136).

At Chalcedon, Dioscorus comes back to the said declaration of purpose, maintaining that he was examining rather than innovating the Scriptures (ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς). Here, Dioscorus has indeed addressed the contemporary and deeply rooted fear of novelty and breaking with tradition. In ancient Roman society, as is the case with every modern traditional society, *novitas* entailed lack of authority and the disruption of social order.[135] And authority is what Dioscorus was looking for when backing his theological soul-searching with an appropriate scriptural quotation, taken from Matthew 7: 'Examine the Scriptures': ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς. Dioscorus, we may remember, describes the process of defining orthodox doctrine as threefold: *convincing everybody*, *confirming the faith*, and *refuting novelty*. This he would achieve by 'examining the fathers, those at Nicaea and at Ephesus': τὰ τῶν πατέρων ἐρευνῶ, καὶ τῶν ἐν Νικαίαι καὶ τῶν ἐν Εφέσωι.

The Quest for Consensus

Dioscorus' call met with a consensual exclamation, delivered unanimously and ceremonially by all participants who, at this point, functioned like a Greek chorus,[136] expressing consensual agreement:[137] 'This saves the world. This strengthens the faith': Τοῦτο τὴν οἰκουμένην σώιζει. τοῦτο τὴν πίστιν στηρίζει. In Dioscorus' ideal world, persuasion comes before rebuke as much as the doctrines of the fathers seem to come before the Scriptures. The perception of former councils as sources of authority lay at the heart of every church council after Nicaea. Reflecting the principles of Roman legislation, where custom overrules precedence, church councils were conducted under the primary condition of the delegates having adopted the precepts of former councils. Even the Second Council of Ephesus which, by the time of the Council of Chalcedon, had been utterly rejected by Rome and the Oriental (i.e. Antioch and surrounding) sees, was not officially discarded at Chalcedon, for we see that the first session, which makes up nearly one third of the minutes, was dedicated to the procedural viability of the Second Council of Ephesus.

As the reading of the minutes of Ephesus continued, the Oriental camp erupted with yet another protest: 'No one said this', Οὐδεὶς εἶπεν ταῦτα, they exclaimed, referring to the acclamations with which Dioscorus' professed orthodoxy and sources of authority were praised in Ephesus:[138]

---

135 See further references to *novelty* on p. 169 below.

136 For communal chanting in acclamations and conclamations see discussion starting on p. 161 above.

137 For the function of consensus in social gatherings, see pp. 36 and 74–75 above. Also see discussion of the ideal of harmony on p. 198 below.

138 For similar attitudes regarding sources of authority, see pp. 100–111, 127 above.

These are the sayings of the Holy Spirit. To the guardians of the canons. The fathers live through you. To the guardian of the faith.[139]

As mentioned above, these and similar consensual cheers are formulaic and repetitive. They function as ceremonial attributives whose known text enables the participants to utter them simultaneously and unanimously. In this case, the Oriental bishops did not question the wording of the attributives in question, but denied that they could have ever uttered them in the first place on the grounds of their alleged absence from the event: 'Let them also say', says Dioscorus in contempt, 'we were not there': εἴπωσιν καὶ τοῦτο ὅτι οὐδὲ παρῆμεν.

At this stage, the argument between the sides revolves around the confirmation of basic facts regarding an event which took place just two years earlier. Anatolius, the *magister militum*, is reluctant to clarify the basic facts in question, for Constantine, the secretary, succinctly resumes his reading which included the citation of Eutyches' letter to the Council of Ephesus.

9. Dramatic Climaxes — Vocalization of the Dogma

In contrast with the co-occurrence rules,[140] outbursts, exclamations, and interruptions of the proceedings were common behaviour on the part of both parties. The linguistic nature of these outbursts, however, remains distinctive and intriguing.[141] At this stage of the debate, Eutyches, the ultra-Miaphysite Alexandrian monk is cited as having embraced the Nicene Creed in declaring that Christ

> […] came down, was made flesh, became man, suffered, and rose on the third day, and ascended into heaven, and is coming to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit […][142]

The charge against Eutyches was that the alteration made to the Nicene Creed in the Council of Constantinople of 381, which was aimed at combating the heresy of Apollinarius and which read 'made flesh by the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin' (καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου) was deliberately omitted by him.

---

139 Ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος εἶπεν· Αὗται αἱ φωναὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου. τῶι φύλακι τῶν κανόνων. διὰ σοῦ ζῶσιν οἱ πατέρες. τῶι φύλακι τῆς πίστεως (I.148).

140 For definition, see p. 85 above. For consequences following their breach, see pp. 116, 123 above, and pp. 158–159 below.

141 See discussion on p. 89 above.

142 κατελθόντα σαρκωθέντα ἐνανθρωπήσαντα παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῆι τρίτηι ἡμέραι, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα (I.157).

Eutyches' Egyptian friends rose in defence of his orthodoxy and commit-ment to the Nicene Creed as follows:

> 'No one admits any addition or subtraction. Confirm the work of Nicaea; the orthodox emperor has commanded this.' The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'That is what Eutyches said.' The most devout Egyptian bishops and those with them: 'No one admits any addition. Confirm the work of the fathers. Confirm the work of Nicaea. Confirm the work of the Holy Spirit. The orthodox Emperor has commanded this.'[143]

A tricolon uttered aloud and unanimously may have had quite an auditory effect.

Furthermore, the formulaic style suggests once more that the participants of both parties were very familiar with what they were expected to express aloud as a group, and that they did so with the sole purpose of making their collective presence felt and accounted for. The last part of the exclamation cited above removes any possible doubt as to its direct addressee: 'The orthodox emperor has commanded this': ὁ ὀρθόδοξος βασιλεὺς τοῦτο ἐκέλευσεν. By referring to the *orthodox emperor*, the Egyptian bishops acknowledged the Byzantine emperor as their superior.[144] Moreover, by referring to the orthodoxy of the emperor, the bishops further highlighted religious piety as an important feature in their set of normative rules.[145] In their attempt at claiming imperial patronage, the Orientals also presented themselves here as being the emperor's obedient servants and exemplary citizens who, as opposed to the Egyptians, abided by the emperor's wish to preserve the Nicene Creed.

To the modern reader, church councils are mostly associated with strife and division, yet the declared purpose of these gatherings — one must not forget — was to achieve unity and concord.[146] We have seen, how Eutyches' declaration of faith discussed above, sparked a typical row between the groups. However, towards the end of the public reading the tone and atmosphere seemed to change quite dramatically.[147] After the examination of Eutyches' declaration, all sides addressed their own religious standing. Here is Dioscorus:

---

143 Οὐδεὶς δέχεται προσθήκην, οὐδεὶς μείωσιν. τὰ τῶν ἐν Νικαίαι κρατείτω ὁ ὀρθόδοξος βασιλεὺς τοῦτο ἐκέλευσεν. Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Ταῦτα Εὐτυχὴς εἶπεν. Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι εἶπον· Προσθήκην οὐδεὶς δέχεται. κρατείτω τὰ τῶν πατέρων. τὰ τῶν ἐν Νικαίαι κρατείτω. τὰ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου κρατείτω. ὁ ὀρθόδοξος βασιλεὺς τοῦτο ἐκέλευσεν (I.161–163).

144 See discussion of *Church and State* starting on p. 160 above.

145 See *Bailey's Normative Rules* and *Christianity as a Normative Rule* starting on p. 174 below.

146 See *The Purpose of Group Gatherings* starting on p. 70 above.

147 On tonality, see p. 77 above.

[…] If Eutyches holds opinions contrary to the doctrines of the church, he deserves not only punishment but hell fire. For my concern is for the catholic and apostolic faith and not for any human being. My mind is fixed on the Godhead, and I do not look to any person nor care about anything except my soul and the true pure faith'.[148]

And Basil, Bishop of Seleucia:

[…] I asserted in my statement (expressing agreement with Ephesus and with the condemnation of Nestorius), as I still do now, that I worship our one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, acknowledged in two natures after taking flesh and becoming man.[149]

These individual confessions of faith are tantamount *to performative utterances*, whose saying ('*I worship*') amounts to performing an act.[150] These were followed by a relatively long succession of public exclamations, arranged in a complex order. The complexity may raise doubts as to their spontaneity and *impromptu* delivery.[151] The Egyptian bishops make a start, followed by the Oriental bishops:

The most devout Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'Let no one separate the invisible. No one says that the one Son is two.' The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'Anathema to those who divide! Anathema to those who separate!' Basil the most devout bishop of Seleucia in Isauria said: 'Anathema to those who divide, anathema to those who separate the two natures after the union! Anathema also to those who do not recognize the distinctive properties of the natures!' The most devout Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'As he was begotten, so he suffered. (Report) our words to the emperor. One Lord, one faith! No one says that the one Lord is two. This was what Nestorius held. That is what Nestorius proclaimed.' The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'Anathema to Nestorius and Eutyches!' The most devout Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'Do not divide the Lord of glory. Do not divide the invisible.'[152]

---

148 εἰ δὲ Εὐτυχὴς παρὰ τὰ δόγματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας φρονεῖ, οὐ μόνον τιμωρίας ἄξιός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πυρός. ἐγὼ γὰρ τῆς πίστεως τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς φροντίδα τίθεμαι, οὐκ ἀνθρώπου τινός. Περὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον τὸν νοῦν τεταμένον ἔχω καὶ εἰς πρόσωπον οὐκ ἀφορῶ οὔτε μὴν φροντίζω τινὸς ἢ τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς πίστεως (I.168).

149 εἶχεν δὲ ἡ διαλαλιά μου, ὡς καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἔχει, ὅτι προσκυνῶ τὸν ἕνα κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν θεὸν λόγον μετὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν καὶ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐν δύο φύσεσιν γνωριζόμενον (I.169).

150 See *The Acts as Records of Performative Utterances* starting on p. 64 above.

151 Compare with exclamations in the Emperor Marcian's presence on pp. 183, 187 below.

152 Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Τὸν ἀμέριστον μηδεὶς χωριζέτω. τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν οὐδεὶς λέγει δύο. Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Ἀνάθεμα τῶι περίζοντι. ἀνάθεμα τῶι διαιροῦντι.

These remarkably long public exclamations seem to be a rare reflection of unity between both parties in their respective assertion of Christ's single, undivided, nature and in their overwhelming condemnation of both Nestorius and Eutyches. Yet, to whom, in fact, are these exclamations addressed? Are the rival bishops speaking to each other in reconciliation, or are they talking over the other's head, aiming their words at a third party, in defence of their own orthodoxy?[153] The difference between the two options is quite considerable, for the first permits dialogue, whereas the second entails the subordination of the parties to a higher authority which functions as the object of apologetic persuasion. That these declarations of faith were covert manifestations of rivalry rather than of theological concord[154] becomes clear from Dioscorus' appeal: '[…] Report our words to the emperor!' With each party wanting to avert any suspicion of heresy, it was for the emperor, rather than for a notable bishop, to witness and approve of the orthodoxy of the participants.

A glimpse of the enormous psychological pressure to which delegates were exposed in a church council is provided in the description of Basil, Bishop of Seleucia, of the events which took place at Ephesus.[155] Here we also witness the genuine difficulty in discussing what had been essentially philosophical terminology under circumstances of turmoil, pressure, and threat:

> […] When asked by the most beloved of God Bishop Eusebius if he [i.e. Eutyches] said two natures in Christ, he said that he recognized Christ to be from two natures before the union but one nature after the union. As reading the minutes has reminded me, I then said: 'If you do not say two natures undivided and unmixed after the union, you imply mixture and confusion.' When this statement was read, there was such an uproar from them that we were all shaken in our souls, especially those of us who were being judged and had been ordered to await the sentence of the council. In the confusion of the moment I said: 'I don't remember if I said it in precisely those words, but I know that I said, 'If you say 'one nature' after the union without qualification, you imply confusion and mixture; if, however, you add to the phrase 'made flesh and made man', and understand taking flesh and becoming man just as the most blessed Cyril did, then you say the same as we

---

Βασίλειος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Σελευκείας Ἰσαυρίας εἶπεν· Ἀνάθεμα τῶι περίζοντι, ἀνάθεμα τῶι διαιροῦντι τὰς δύο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν. ἀνάθεμα δὲ καὶ τῶι μὴ γνωρίζοντι τὸ ἰδιάζον τῶν φύσεων. Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Ὡς ἐγεννήθη, οὕτως ἔπαθεν. τὰς φωνὰς τῶι Βασιλεῖ. εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις. τὸν ἕνα κύριον δύο οὐδεὶς λέγει. ταῦτα Νεστόριος ἐφρόνει. ταῦτα Νεστόριος ἐβόα. Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Ἀνάθεμα Νεστορίωι καὶ Εὐτυχεῖ. Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης μὴ περίζετε. τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης μὴ περίζετε. τὸν ἀμέριστον μὴ περίζετε (I.169–175).

153 See *Coser on the Functions of an Open Debate* starting on p. 75 above.
154 See the discussion of social bonding and social dissent on p. 72 above.
155 See *Atmosphere of Fear at the Second Council of Ephesus* starting on p. 124 above.

do.' For it is clear that his Godhead from the Father is one thing, and the manhood from his mother, another.' And those who condemned me at first later approved of my having said this.[156]

Reading this passage, witnessing yet another verbal skirmish, one may ask, what kind of a religion ancient Christianity was, where words were (and still are) used as a key to social exclusion or inclusion? What is the sociological function of philosophical debates over jargon and terminology in mass gatherings of hundreds? Every group, we see, had its own defined criteria by which its individual members were constantly judged and reassessed. Could the constant struggles over abstract definitions be part of a ritualistic ceremonial aimed at cementing the bond within Christian communities[157] — a process which inevitably also entailed the exclusion of the 'others'? By the force of their ceremonial setting, Christological debates had social, as well as, practical functions, and so did ecumenical church councils.

To be sure, following the ancient distinction between *erga* and *logoi*, or words and deeds, intellectual Christianity, or rather, Christians, had clearly opted for the *logoi* — a fact which may count for the prominence of theology in Christian thought. By contrast, Jews of all streams and denominations throughout the ages have concentrated their collective efforts on definitions of what can or cannot be done. Deliberations on the nature of God are so negligible to the extent that one may doubt whether Jewish theology ever existed. In the process of assessing the tension between words and deeds in the religious context, it could be tempting to single out the monastic and ascetic Christian movements as reflecting a counter-reaction to the urban, over-philosophizing bishops, such as those who gathered in Chalcedon.

On the other hand, in reality we see that things are not quite so clear cut: monks in rural and desert sites in Egypt and Palestine were more than con-

---

156 ἐπωτώμενος γὰρ παρὰ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Εὐσεβίου εἰ λέγει δύο φύσεις ἐν τῶι Χριστῶι, εἶπεν ἐκ δύο μὲν φύσεων εἰδέναι τὸν Χριστὸν πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν. ἐγὼ δὲ τότε, ὡς νῦν ἐντυχὼν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν ἀνεμνήσθην, εἶπον· ἐὰν μὴ μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν ἀσυγχύτους εἴπηις δύο φύσεις, σύγχυσιν λέγεις καὶ σύγκασιν. ἀναγνωσθείσης τῆς φωνῆς τοσοῦτος ἐγένετο κρότος παρ' αὐτῶν, ὥστε πάντων ἡμῶν τιναχθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μάλιστα ἡμῶν τῶν κρινομένων καὶ κελευσθέντων ἀναμένειν τὴν ψῆφον τῆς συνόδου. ἀχλύος πληρωθεὶς εἶπον ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐ μέμνημαι αὐταῖς λέξεσιν ταῦτα εἰρηκώς, οἶδα μέντοι εἰρηκὼς ὅτι ἐὰν μίαν φύσιν εἴπηις ἀπολελυμένως μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σύγχυσιν λέγεις καὶ σύγκασιν. ἐὰν μέντοιγε προσυῆις σεσαρκωμένην καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσασαν καὶ νοήσηις παραπλησίως τῶι πακαριωτάτωι Κυρίλλωι τὴν σάρκωσιν καὶ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν, τὰ αὐτὰ λέγεις ἡμῖν. δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι ἄλλο μέν τί ἐστιν ἡ θεότης αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός ἄλλο δὲ ἡ ἀνθρωπότης ἡ ἐκ τῆς μητρός. καὶ οἱ κατεγνωκότες πρότερον ὕστερον ἀπεδέξαντό με ταῦτα εἰπηκότα (I.176).

157 For the ritualistic features, see *Dramatic Climaxes — The Vocalization of the Dogma* starting on p. 135 above. For vocalization as a *performative act*, see pp. 87–88 above.

scious of the outcome of Chalcedon, and their taking up residence in the cit-
ies, was the major vehicle for unrest and disruption of civil order in the cities
of Alexandria and Jerusalem.[158] Intellectual or not, it is obvious that the philo-
sophical debate at Chalcedon proved to be too difficult an experience for poor
Bishop Basil of Seleucia who, referring to the definition of Christ, exclaimed in
distress: 'I don't remember if I said this in precisely those words […]': ἐγὼ οὐ
μέμνημαι αὐταῖς λέξεσιν ταῦτα εἰρηκώς (I.176).

In response, Anatolius, the *magister militum*, addressed Basil in a tone not
entirely devoid of partiality in favour of the Oriental camp:

> If your teaching was so orthodox, why did you sign the deposition of Flavian of
> sacred memory?[159]

Dioscorus, questioning Basil's sincerity and wishing to refute his allegation of
having to sign under pressure, muses on people's behaviour when placed under
pressure:

> Have you, out of respect for human beings, transgressed what is correct and
> rejected the faith? Have you not heard the words, 'Do not be put to shame to your
> downfall (Mt. 12.37)?[160]

Basil's subsequent reply is a valuable testimonial to contemporary views regard-
ing the distinction between civic and religious authorities:[161]

> If I had been up before secular officials [i.e. in Ephesus], I would have borne wit-
> ness; after all, I displayed boldness of speech at Constantinople. But if one is
> judged by one's father [i.e. a bishop], one cannot defend oneself. 'Death to a child
> who defends himself against his father' (Lev. 20.9)![162]

Both Dioscorus and Basil turn here to the biblical text and use it as a rhetorical
means of persuasion,[163] with Dioscorus casting doubt on Basil's independence
of mind, and with Basil adopting a somewhat apologetic stance. Thus, quite
paradoxically, Basil suggests that a council headed by an imperial official guar-

---

158 On the relationship between monasticism and urbanism with a special emphasis on
Constantinople, see Dagron, 'Aux origines de la civilization Byzantine', in: *idem*, *La romanité
chrétienne*, Chapter I.

159 Καὶ οὕτως ὀρθοδόξως διδάξας διὰ τί τῆι καθαιρέσει Φλαβιανοῦ τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης
ὑπέγραφας; (I.177).

160 αἰδούμενος ἀνθρώπους παρέβης τὸ εὔλογον καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠθέτησας; οὐκ ἤκουσασ
καὶ μὴ ἐντραπῇις εἰς πτῶσίν σου;

161 See *The Role of the Imperial Establishment* on p. 122 above.

162 Εἰ πρὸς ἄρχοντας εἶχον, ἐμαρτύρουν. καὶ γὰρ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπεδειξάμην
παρρησίαν. παρὰ πατρὸς δὲ ὁ κρινόμενος δικαίοις οὐ κέχρηται. παῖς γὰρ πατρὶ δίκαια λέγων
τεθνάτω (I.178).

163 For the rhetorical use of Scriptures, see Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, esp. pp. 3–8.

antees the delegates' freedom of speech and ability to stand in for their views. Basil's argument constitutes a paradox, for in his scheme, a lesser cleric would instantly become more powerful, as long as he was not bound by any moral obligation to his adversary. To have imperial officials chairing a church council was the optimal situation according to Basil. In reality, imperial involvement in ecclesiastical procedures meant an infringement of the status of the church. Yet, in a circular process, imperial interest in ecclesiastical affairs resulted in a greater empowerment of the church.[164] As Christianity was placed right at the top of the imperial agenda, it became an important part of its *normative rules*.[165] The Christian members of Byzantine society began to think, feel, and as Averil Cameron says, 'speak' Christianity.

What follows next is a group confession, reminiscent in tone and ritual of individual confessions held by Catholic priests, or even more so, to public confessions of sin on the Jewish Day of Atonement:[166]

> The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'We have all sinned, we all beg forgiveness.' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'Yet you declared earlier that you were forced by violence and compulsion to sign the deposition of Flavian of sacred memory on a blank sheet.' The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'We have all sinned, we all beg forgiveness.' Thalassius, Eustathius and Eusebius the most devout bishops said: 'We have all sinned, we all beg forgiveness.'[167]

Such confessional exclamations were made more effective through their auditory impact, their repetitiveness and above all, through the patronage of Anatolius who, from the perspective of the Orientals, functioned here as a spiritual mentor rather than a judicial authority. To be sure, no sympathizer of Alexandria dared to challenge this Oriental expression of repentance, and the reading from the minutes of Ephesus continued uninterrupted.[168]

---

164 In this context, H. A. Drake urges the reader to be aware of 'the concept of agendas', and the imperial, or more specifically, Constantine's, ability to control it by turning theological dispute into a key component of the renewed vitality of popular interest in government' (H. A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore, 2000), pp. 309–352, esp. p. 317).

165 See *Bailey's Normative Rules* starting on p. 174 below.

166 Also see *Functional versus Ceremonial Purposes of Group Gatherings* starting on p. 71 above, and *Radcliffe-Brown's Solidarity-enhancing Functions of Gatherings* on p. 72 above.

167 Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Πάντες ἡμάρτομεν, μάπντες συγγνώμην αἰτοῦμεν. Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Καὶ μὴν ὑμεῖς πρότερον ἐδιδάξατε ὡς κατὰ βίαν καὶ ἀνάγκην ἀγράφωι χάρτηι ὑπογράψαμαι κατηναγκάσθητε εἰς τὴν καθαίρεσιν τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης Φλαβιανοῦ. Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Πάντες ἡμάρτομεν, μάπντες συγγνώμην αἰτοῦμεν (I.181–183).

168 On the social function of the public reading of documents, see pp. 113 and 129 above.

10. Dioscorus vs. Theodoret

One complaint by the Oriental camp was that they were made to sign Flavian's deposition by means of force. Another complaint was that the adversaries of Eutyches, namely the Orientals and in particular Eusebius of Dorylaeum, were hindered by Dioscorus from performing their role as official accusers of the said monk. In reply, Dioscorus puts the blame, or rather responsibility, squarely on Emperor Theodosius II, thus acknowledging the imperial patronage formerly enjoyed by the Alexandrian camp:

> Dioscorus the most devout bishop of Alexandria said: 'I ask that the testimony of Helpidius be read. I would not have had the power to prevent it [i.e. Eusebius' appearance at Ephesus], had not Helpidius brought an instruction in which he certified that the emperor had ordered him (Eusebius) not to appear.'[169]

Helpidius, the Eastern *comes sacri consistorii*,[170] is presented by Dioscorus, the president of the proceedings of Ephesus, as having been his superior. True, the whole episode is marked by blatant attempts on the part of the Alexandrian camp to brush off any responsibility for the mishandling of the procedure:

> Juvenal the most devout bishop of Jerusalem said: 'It was the admirable count Helpidius who did not allow him to appear.' Thalassius the most devout bishop of Cappadocian Caesarea said: 'I was not responsible.'[171]

The Second Council of Ephesus was presided over by Dioscorus, yet Dioscorus and his colleagues did not hesitate to relegate the overall responsibility for any decisions taken, even at the price of openly acknowledging the superiority of the imperial court,[172] albeit favourable to the Alexandrian camp, as was evidently the case. The tension between Anatolius and Dioscorus continued to escalate. First, Anatolius undermined Dioscorus' religiousness and integrity: 'When the faith is being decided, this is no excuse': Πίστεως κρινομένης αὕτη οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπολογία (I.192). This remark was bounced back by a snub on Dioscorus' part in which the bishop tried to shift the focus of the discussion from the shortcomings of the procedure of Ephesus to that of Chalcedon.[173]

---

169 Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Ἀξιῶ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν κατάθεσιν Ἐλπιδίου. οὐκ εἶχον γὰρ κωλῦσαι, εἰ μὴ κομμονιτώριον ἤνεγκεν Ἐλπίδιος διαβεβαιούμενος ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν μὴ εἰσελθεῖν (I.188).

170 Cf. 'Helpidius 5', *PLRE*, vol. 2, 536.

171 Ἰουβενάλιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἱεροσολύμων εἶπεν· Ὁ περίβλεπτος κόμης Ἐλπίδιος οὐκ ἐπέτρεψεν εἰσελθεῖν αὐτόν. Θαλάσσιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ οὐκ ἤμην αὐθέντης (I. 190–191).

172 See *Imperial Patronage* on p. 35 above.

173 See *The Mechanics of the Ecclesiastical Gathering* on p. 43 above.

Here, Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus continues to play an important role:

> Dioscorus the most devout bishop of Alexandria said: 'Since you now accuse me of having broken the canons by obeying Helpidius, answer me this: how is observance of the canons compatible with the admittance of Theodoret?' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'Bishop Theodoret has been admitted as an accuser, as you heard from his own mouth.' Dioscorus the most devout bishop of Alexandria said: 'Why is he seated among the bishops? The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'Bishop Eusebius and Bishop Theodoret are seated as accusers, just as you are seated among the accused. Let the rest be read.'[174]

One can only imagine Anatolius' growing ire in the face of Dioscorus' attempts to disqualify him as a fair and impartial arbitrator.[175] Theodoret's presence at the Council of Chalcedon, we may remember, did not go down well with the Alexandrian camp. At this stage of the debate, Dioscorus finds another opportunity to raise the subject, not only of Theodoret's presence, but also of his status. Dioscorus protests that Theodoret 'is seated among the bishops': Καὶ τί ἐν τάξει ἐπισκόπου καθέζεται; (I.195). We know that Theodoret had originally been seated in the centre, as befitting a litigant, and that, according to Anatolius, this seating arrangement had not changed since, despite Dioscorus' implication that Theodoret had moved to another seat.[176] To be sure, whereas Theodoret's seating arrangement remains disputable, there should be no doubt in the reader's mind as to Anatolius' angry and authoritative tone:[177]

> Bishop Eusebius and Bishop Theodoret are seated as accusers, just as you are seated among the accused. Let the rest be read.[178]

Here, Anatolius not only clarifies Theodoret's status but also — and more importantly — that of Dioscorus. Anatolius is patently impatient with Dioscorus and, while employing crude techniques of marginalization, does his best to

---

174 Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Ἐπειδὴ νῦν αἰτιᾶσθέ με ὡς παραβεβηκότα τοὺς κανόνας καὶ ἀκούσαντα Ἐλπιδίου, νῦν ποῖοι σῴζονται κανόνες, ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν Θεοδώρητος; Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Θεοδώρητος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος κατηγορήσων εἰσελήλυθεν, ὡς τῆς αὐτοῦ φωνῆς ἀκηκόατε.

Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Καὶ τί ἐν τάξει ἐπισκόπου καθέζεται; Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Εὐσέβιος καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Θεοδώρητος ἐν τάξει κατηγόρων καθέζονται, ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τάξει κατηγορουμένων καθέζεσθε. ὅθεν τὰ λοιπὰ ἀναγινωσκέσθω. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ καθωσιωμένος σηκρητάριος τοῦ θείου κουσιστωρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχεδαρίου ἀνέγνω (I.193–196).

175 On tonality, see pp. 77–78 above.

176 See *Seating Games — Rhetoric and its Practice* on p. 107 above.

177 For tonality, see pp. 77–78 above.

178 Καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Εὐσέβιος καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Θεοδώρητος ἐν τάξει κατηγόρων καθέζονται, ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τάξει κατηγορουμένων καθέζεσθε. ὅθεν τὰ λοιπὰ ἀναγινωσκέσθω (I.296).

'put the Alexandrian bishop in his place'. By reminding Dioscorus so bluntly of his inferior position as a defendant and of Theodoret's superior position as an accuser, Anatolius' attempt to marginalize Dioscorus is complete. Further on, we see that Anatolius continues to exert his authority successfully, and as the proceedings advance, the number of interruptions decreases quite dramatically, with the result that Anatolius' questions are treated as rhetorical:

> During the reading the most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'You see that when the most devout Bishop Eusebius accused Eutyches at Constantinople he demanded that Eutyches be present for examination. Why then was this example not followed at Ephesus, and the most devout Bishop Eusebius not admitted there?' When all remained silent, the most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'Proceed through the rest.'[179]

11. Dynamics of Disputation and Concord

We have so far witnessed mainly the dynamics of disputation, but what about moments of agreement and concord? Following a lengthy citation from the proceedings of Constantinople over the nature of Christ, many among the bishops who signed Flavian's deposition, perhaps sensing the change in imperial policy, came to acknowledge their 'wrongdoing'. Theodoret sets out the principles of orthodoxy as follows:

> Anathema to whoever says two Sons; for we worship one Son, our Lord Jesus Christ the only-begotten.[180]

Theodoret's speech, in fact, a public proclamation of his faith,[181] is met with a general approval on all sides. The bishops present actually compete with each other in their eagerness to prove their orthodoxy, and their positive exclamations are distinctly ceremonial and ritualistic in their repetitiveness and structuring as tricolon utterances:

> All the most devout (Illyrian) bishops exclaimed: 'We believe as Cyril did. So we believed, and so we believe. Anathema to whoever believes otherwise.' The most

---

179 Καὶ ἐν τῶι ἀναγινώσεσθαι οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Ἡνίκα Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Εὐτυχοῦς κατηγόρει, ὁρᾶτε ὅτιπερ αὐτὸς ἠξίωσεν παρόντα Εὐτυχῆ εὐθυνθῆναι. πῶς τοίνυν τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπόδειγμα καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσωι οὐκ ἐφυλάχθη οὔτε εἰσεδέχθη Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος; Καὶ σιωπώντων ἁπάντων οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Διέξιθι τὰ λοιπὰ (I.236).

180 Ἀνάθεμα τῶι λέγοντι δύο υἱούς. ἕνα γὰρ υἱὸν προσκυνοῦμεν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν μονογενῆ (I.248).

181 See *Dramatic Climaxes — The Vocalization of the Dogma* on p. 135 above.

devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: Flavian believed this; Flavian defended this; for this Flavian was deposed. Eusebius condemned Nestorius. Dioscorus has corrupted the faith.'[182]

The barrage of exclamations continued along the same ceremonial pattern, which consists of the communal expression of consent, followed by an enlisting of authoritative figures:[183]

> The most devout Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'God condemned Nestorius.' The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'Leo holds this. Leo believes this. Anatolius holds this.' The most devout Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'We all believe this. We all hold this. Give no place to Satan. Give no room to Satan.' The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'The emperor and the senate and everyone holds this.' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate and the entire holy synod of the most devout bishops exclaimed: 'The emperor holds this. The Augusta holds this. We all hold this.' The most devout Egyptian bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'The whole world holds this. The faith of the fathers holds good.'[184]

The entire synod then came to accept Theodoret's formula. What is more: everybody present expressed his agreement vocally. It was the very act of exclaiming, and not only the content, that constituted the ceremonial gesture. By contrast, a functional gathering, or an *arena council*, would be inclined to reach its decisions, for example, by a majority vote. However, in this case, the uttering of consent is in itself a sort of a totalizing action, typical of *elite councils*, aimed at consolidating a general consensus which, in turn, replaces the method of majority vote.[185] More patently, the participants also point to sources of authority, beginning with Pope Leo and Patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople

---

182 Πάντες οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν· Ἡμεῖς Κύριλλος πιστεύομεν. οὕτως ἐπιστεύσαμεν, οὕτως πιστεύομεν. ἀνάθεμα τῶι μὴ οὕτως πιστεύοντι. Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν· Φλαβιανὸς οὕτως ἐπίστευεν. Φλαβιανὸς ταῦτα ἐξεδίκει. διὰ ταῦτα Φλαβιανὸς καθηιρέθη. Εὐσέβιος Νεστόριον καθεῖλεν. τὴν πίστιν Διόσκορος παρέτρωσεν (I.249–250).

183 See *Bailey on the Functions of Consensus* on p. 74 above.

184 Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Ὁ θεὸς Νεστόριον καθεῖλεν. Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν· Λέων οὕτως φρονεῖ. Λέων οὕτως πιστεύει. Ἀνατόλιος οὕτως φρονεῖ. Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Πάντες οὕτως <πιστεύομεν. πάντες οὕτως> φρονοῦμεν. ὁ σατανᾶς τόπον μὴ σχῆι. ὁ σατανᾶς χώραν μὴ σχῆι. Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν· Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἡ σύγκλητος καὶ πάντες οὕτως φρονοῦσιν. Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐβόησαν· Ὁ βασιλεὺς οὕτως φρονεῖ. ἡ αὐγούστα οὕτως φρονεῖ. πάντες οὕτως φρονοῦμεν. Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν· Οὕτω φρονεῖ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος. τὰ τῶν πατέρων καλῶς ἔχει (I.251–256).

185 For discussion on the different functions of consensus see p. 74 above.

and ending with the imperial couple. The delegates, one could observe, do not let reality stand in the way of their manifestations of concord, for the imperial couple were poignantly divided over dogma. The delegates, however, may have perceived this division as initially tactical and political, rather than theological.

Yet dogma and politics are quite different issues, for this harmonious state of dogmatic unity came to an end with yet another exclamation on the part of the Orientals, who demanded the deposition of Dioscorus as a punitive measure: 'Drive out the murderer of Flavian. Drive out the patricide': Τὸν φονέα Φλαβιανοῦ ἔξω βάλε. τὸν πατραλοίαν ἔξω βάλε.[186] The Oriental rhetoric was strong indeed: according to the biblical code, murder is the worst crime and the murder of parents is considered an even graver offence.[187] The Egyptians' tactic in handling this serious and repetitive accusation on the part of the Alexandrians was yet another reaffirmation of the Christological formula in question, accompanied with a renewed acclamation of the imperial house the major part of which was, yet again, composed precisely of three rhythmical units,[188] re-enforced by confessional statements:

> We all believe this. Many years to the senate! Long live the emperors! Long live the orthodox! We all believe this. May you bring peace! We all affirm correctly.[189]

Ideals of Peace and Concord

How could we explain the inclusion of such acclamations in a confirmation of a theological formula? How could one explain the exclusion of church officials from a public affirmation of faith? The answer lies in the phrase 'May you bring peace!': δι' ὑμῶν εἰρήνη γένηται, referring to the role of the emperor, not only as promulgator but also as an enforcer of the law, both civic and ecclesiastical.[190] The procurement of peace with arms, achieving a *pax Romana* was one import-

---

186 On the notorious harshness of Byzantine rhetoric compared with their actual punitive standards, see note to p. 125 above.

187 The Bible even demands capital punishment for sons or daughters who have dishonoured (cursed) their parents, let alone on actual patricides (Cf. Leviticus 20.9, Exodus 21.17, Deutronomy 27.16, Proverbs 20.20, Ezekiel 22.7).

188 For examples of rhythmical chanting in tricolons, see pp. 118, 136 above, and 171 below.

189 πάντες οὕτω πιστεύομεν. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς συγκλήτου. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῶν βασιλέων. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῶν ὀρθοδόξων. πάντες οὕτως πιστεύομεν. δι' ὑμῶν εἰρήνη γένηται. Πάντες ὀρθῶς δοξάζομεν (I.258).

190 Dagron refers in this context to the contemporaneous perception of the Byzantine emperor as the 'living law': 'l'empereur n'est pas soumis aux lois, puisqu'il est lui-même "loi vivante" [...] mais un souverain légitime doit choisir de se conformer aux lois' (*idem*, *Empereur et prêtre*, pp. 39–40).

ant obligation of the emperor.[191] The enforcement of theological harmony, *pax Christiana*, was, in fact, an extension of the first. Both obligations reflected the presence of divine Providence in the man elevated to the ranks of emperor.[192]

Alas, as is often the case when reality does not quite coincide with an abstract ideal, rigorous attempts within institutional Christianity to achieve dogmatic unity, or 'peace', often ended up with quite the opposite results.[193] Thus, the active elaboration of the ideals of peace and harmony in formalistic and ceremonial contexts, but also in theoretical treatises, became a springboard for the formation and elaboration of manifold Christian identities. Anatolius, the *magister militum*, still keeping a firm hold on the flow of the debate, ignored the Egyptians' enthusiastic profession of orthodoxy and insisted on the clarification of past events:

> Why did you receive Eutyches into communion, who contradicted these doctrines, while deposing Flavian of holy memory and the most devout Bishop Eusebius, who upheld them?[194]

Dioscorus, in turn, avoiding confrontation with Anatolius, pointed to the written records of previous councils as legitimate and established sources of ecclesiastical authority: 'The minutes will reveal the truth': Τὰ ὑπομνήματα αὐτὰ διδάξει τὴν ἀλήθειαν (I.260).

12. Cyril of Alexandria

The next episode revolves around the letters of Cyril of Alexandria and the Alexandrians' attempt, headed by Dioscorus, at proving how their teaching was commensurate with that of Cyril. At this stage of the proceedings, the reading of the minutes of the Second Council of Ephesus included Eustathius' summary

---

191 For the Stoic origins of the terms, and the role of Pope Leo I in their transformation from *pax Romana* to *pax Christiana* in Late Antiquity, see A. Momigliano, 'Koine eirene, pax Romana, pax Christiana', in: *idem, Nono contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (ed. R. Di Donato; Rome, 1992), pp. 409–423.

192 Imperial titulature and the phenomenon of Christian emperors in Late Antiquity, acting as religious symbols, commanding *divinely delegated mission and authority*, are discussed in: Garnsey and Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World*, pp. 25–33.

193 In this context, the commotion and activity which preceded church councils should also be regarded as part of the ceremony: as already mentioned, bishops clogging the roads, using imperial transport and relying on the imperial postal services were a very physical manifestation of imperial patronage, as well as a subject of mockery by more critical observers (cf. Ammianus' obituary to Constantius, *Res Gestae* 21.16.18).

194 Καὶ ποίῳ λόγῳ Εὐτυχῆ μὲν τὸν ἐναντία τούτοις λέγοντα ἐδέξασθε εἰς κοινωνίαν, φλαβιανὸν δὲ τὸν τῆς ἁγίας μνήμης καὶ Εὐσέβιον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον τούτοις κεχρημένους καθείλετε; (I.259).

of Cyrillian christology: 'One should not conceive of two natures but of one in-carnate nature of the Word.' The Oriental party at Chalcedon seized the opportunity to portray Dioscorus, not as a Cyrillian, but as a straightforward heretic: 'Eutyches says this. Dioscorus says this.' Upon Dioscorus' outward rejection of the allegation, Anatolius ordered the matter to be investigated:

> Let the holy council say whether the declaration of Eustathius the most devout bishop is in harmony with the canonical letters of Cyril of sacred memory which were published at the council and have just now been read.[195]

The Standing of the Cyrillian Corpus

The recorder of the minutes indicated clearly that what happened next was quite outside proper protocol:

> Before the holy council answered, Eustathius the most devout bishop of Berytus came forward to the centre (after the public reading of his speech delivered at Ephesus II), threw down a book and said: 'If I have spoken wrongly, here is the book of Cyril. Let it be anathematized and let me be anathematized.'[196]

We must stop for a moment to discuss the performative qualities of the occasion.[197] What renders the book in question something resembling a fetish rather than a mere practical accessory is precisely the fact that it had not been opened.[198] It did not have a functional purpose but rather, it was being *thrown down* by Eustathius ostentatiously and purposefully, so as to produce the right sound, emphasizing resolution and perhaps, irritation. Moreover, as further proof of the ceremonial, rather than the pragmatic, nature of the gesture, the book itself was never once actually consulted:

> Eustathius the most devout bishop of Berytus said: 'The letter of Cyril of sacred memory goes as follows.' — And he recited by heart the letter containing among other statements the following: 'One should therefore not conceive of two natures but of one incarnate nature of the Word.'[199]

---

195 Λεγέτω ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος εἰ ταῖς κανονικαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης Κυρίλλου ταῖς καὶ ἐν τῆι συνόδωι δημοσιευθείσαις καὶ νῦν ἀναγνωθείσαιςσυμφωνεῖ ἢ διαλαλιὰ Εὐσταθίου τοῦ εὐλαβέστατου ἐπίσκοπου (I.264).

196 Καὶ πρὶν ἀποκριθῆναι τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Βηρυτοῦ παρελθὼν εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ ῥίψας βιβλίον εἶπεν· Εἰ κακῶς εἶπον, ἴδε τὸ βιβλίον Κυρίλλου. ἀναθεματισθῆι καὶ ἀναθεματισθῶ (I.265).

197 For the use of books as fetishes, see pp. 79 and 109 above.

198 See discussion in *Socio-Anthropological Perspectives* on pp. 62ff.

199 Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Βηρυτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης Κυρίλλου οὕτως ἔχει. καὶ ἀπεστήθισε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν μεταξὺ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔχουσαν οὕτως. οὐ δεῖ τοιγαροῦν νοεῖν δύο φύσιν τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην (I.267).

David Parkin is being, I think, unnecessarily apologetic when he makes the following remark:

> Without labouring an obvious point, rhetoric is a type of ritual: it says something about the speaker, the spoken-to, and the situation, which goes beyond what is contained in the surface message.[200]

To be sure, ceremony, or ritual, is a type of performance, and performing is exactly what Eustathius did here: he stepped into the centre of the assembly and furiously threw a book down before the delegates, either onto the floor, or onto a table nearby, demanding of them that they have the matter settled once and for all. What further evidence would someone possibly need in order to visualise Christianity as the 'religion of the book', where everything is determined and settled by the written word, from the Scriptures to the writings of the Fathers?[201]

The world of Eustathius and his co-religionists, with their extreme awareness of legal precedents on one hand and their search for intellectual or philosophical authority on the other hand, was that of the written book.[202] In their search for authority, whether political or dogmatic, the senior clergy present did not seek to resolve the essentially abstract christological dispute by adopting the Platonic strategies of getting down to the elements until the 'truth' is stripped bare.[203] Quite the contrary, the scholasticism of Eustathius' colleagues dictated a disputation over authoritative texts, rather than over abstract terms.

Eustathius wisely identifies Cyril's writings as one of these authoritative texts, poignantly demanding that the delegates consult the Cyrillian corpus directly, rather than relying on testimonies as to what Cyril had said. To be sure, the Egyptian delegates were pleased with Eustathius' move, having instantly embraced the presentation of Cyril's letters as such authoritative texts:

> Bishop Eustathius has spoken well. The orthodox one has spoken well. To the revered and devout one! The memory of Cyril is everlasting.[204]

---

200 Parkin, 'The Rhetoric of Responsibility', in Bloch (ed.), *Political Language*, p. 114.

201 A detailed discussion of the authoritative position given to both Scriptures and tradition (the church fathers and custom) during the deliberations at Nicaea and Ephesus I is found in R. E. Person, *The Mode of Theological Decision Making at the Early Ecumenical Councils* (PhD diss., Basel, 1978), esp. pp. 166–214.

202 On Christianity as a textual religion, see Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, pp. 115–116.

203 Platonic literary and philosophical models were widely exercised in Christian disputation literature, in particularly in disputation dialogues (see Cameron, 'Disputation', p. 100).

204 Εὐστάθιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καλῶς εἶπεν. ὁ ὀρθόδοξος καλῶς εἶπεν. τῶι εὐδοκίμωι τῶι εὐλαβεῖ. Κυρίλλου αἰωνία μνήμη (I.266).

Now that Eustathius had proven his formula to be identical to that of Cyril, the issue in hand was to establish Flavian's position in relation to Cyril's. If, it was thought, Cyril were to be taken as a pillar of orthodoxy and if Flavian's formula reflected Cyril's, then the deposition of Flavian had been unjust and unlawful. The Oriental camp could not have objected to this course of action, and indeed, the discussion around Cyril's letters continued uninterrupted.

The dramatic use Eustathius made of Cyril's book is further accentuated in the following episode, in which, following the dramatic presentation of the book in question, Eustathius, rather than opening it, went on to recite Cyril's creed by heart:[205]

> Eustathius the most devout bishop of Berytus said: 'The letter of Cyril of sacred memory goes as follows.' — And he recited by heart the letter containing among other statements the following: 'One should therefore not conceive of two natures but of one incarnate nature of the Word.'[206]

and later on:

> [...] I want to speak on behalf of the blessed Flavian: the blessed Flavian took precisely these words and sent them to the most pious emperor (i.e. Theodosius II). Have his autograph letter read, so that the whole council may say that it was accepted deservedly.[207]

Again, the emperor was seen as the supreme legislator, whose authority covered all aspects of life, including the application and enforcement of Christian dogma. Roman legal codes were structured around previous imperial legislation, and Eustathius' reference to Theodosius reflected this tradition precisely.

At this point Anatolius intervened and asked Eustathius bluntly: 'Why then did you depose Flavian of devout memory?': Διὰ τί τοίνυν Φλαβιανὸν τὸν τῆς εὐλαβοῦς μνήμης καθεῖλες; (I.268) To this question Eustathius merely gave a meek reply, his entrance ticket to the *ingroup*: 'I erred': Ἐσφάλην (I.269). Following the reading from the minutes of Constantinople, Anatolius proceeded with the process of exonerating Flavian by making a direct address to the delegates and presenting them with an almost rhetorical question:

---

205 This is reminiscent of a common theatrical rhetorical device, whereby the rhetorician lets everybody notice his folded scroll, whereas he, in fact, makes an oral speech.

206 Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Βηρυτοῦ εἶπεν. Ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης Κυρίλλου οὕτως ἔχει. καὶ ἀπεστήθισε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν μεταξὺ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔχουσαν οὕτως. οὐ δεῖ τοιγαροῦν νοεῖν δύο φύσιν τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην (I.267).

207 καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μακαρίου δὲ Φλαβιανοῦ εἰπεῖν θέλω. αὐτὰ ξηρὰ ἔλαβεν ὁ μακάριος Φλαβιανὸς καὶ ἐπέδωκεν τῶι εὐσεβεστάτωι βασιλεῖ. καὶ κελεύσατε ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὸ ἰδιόχειρον αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πᾶσα ἡ σύνοδος εἴπῃ ὅτι δικαίως ἐδέχθη (I.267).

What say the most devout bishops of the present holy council? In so expounding the faith did Flavian of sacred memory preserve the orthodox and catholic religion, or did he make some mistake in its regard?[208]

Anatolius' choice of words here is careful and calculating: any dogmatic 'abnormality' on Flavian's part is purposely softened by presenting it, using the tactics of deferral,[209] as a mere mistake, rather than straightforward heresy.

13. The Papal Delegates

The Papal delegates, though they were not directly approached, volunteered to answer Anatolius' question:

'Flavian of blessed memory gave a pure and comprehensive exposition of the faith. His faith and exposition accords with the letter of that most blessed and apostolic man, the Bishop of Rome.' After this statement had been translated into Greek by Constantine, the hallowed secretary of the divine consistory, Anatolius, the most devout Archbishop of Constantinople said: 'The blessed Flavian gave a fine and orthodox exposition of the faith of our holy fathers.' Lucentius the most devout bishop, representing the apostolic see, said: 'Since the faith of Flavian of blessed memory is in harmony with the apostolic see and the patristic traditions, it is just that the most holy council should transfer to the heretics the condemnation which they decreed against him.'[210]

Interestingly, despite the fact that Latin was still the official language in both parts of the Roman Empire,[211] the replies of both Papal delegates had to be translated into Greek, for the majority of the delegates had no knowledge of Latin

---

208 Τί λέγουσιν οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τῆς παρούσης ἁγίας συνόδου; οὕτως ἐκθέμηνος τὴν πίστιν ὁ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης θλαβιανὸς ἔσωσεν τὴν ὀρθόδοξον καὶ καθολικὴν θρησκείαν ἤ τι περὶ αὐτὴν ἐσφάλη; (I.272).

209 For further examples, see pp. 101 above, and 154 below.

210 Ἀγνῶς καὶ ὁλοκλήρως τὴν πίστιν ἐξέθετο ὁ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Φλαβιανός, ἥτις πίστις καὶ ἔκθεσις συμφωνεῖ τῇ ἐπιστολῆι τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης. Ἀνατόλιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως εἶπεν· Ὁ μακάριος Φλαβιανὸς καλῶς καὶ ὀρθοδόξως τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν πίστιν ἐξέθετο. Ἧστινος φωνῆς Ἑλληνιστὶ ἑρμηνευθείσης διὰ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ καθωσιωμένου σηκρηταρίου τοῦ θείου κονσιστωρίου. Λουκίνσιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος ἐπέχων τὸν τόπον τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέλδρας ἔφη· Ἐπειδὴ τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Φλαβιανοῦ ἡ πίστις συμφωνεῖ μετὰ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν πατρικῶν παραδόσεων, δίκαιον τὴν ἁγιωτάτην σύνοδον τὴν καταδίκην τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἐπενεχυεῖσαν εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀντιστρέψαι (I.273–275).

211 In session VI, Emperor Marcian notably addressed the assembly in Latin and had to wait for his speech to be simultaneously translated into Greek for the benefit of the bishops present.

(and this is precisely why the Emperor Marcian's choice to perform a *language switch*[212] and to address the council in Latin and then deliver the same speech in Greek should be taken as highly rhetorical).[213] It seems that everybody, beginning with Anatolius and ending with the Papal delegates, was striving to restore Flavian's name, while emphasizing the conformity of the latter, not, for example, by citing the text of the New Testament, but from the teachings of the Fathers. Yet again we witness the scholasticism of fifth-century church officials and their constant quest for sources of authority. Thus, far from performing an empirical examination of the abstract issue at hand, the delegates are content with affirming the conformity of Flavian's teaching with that of greater figures of authority.

Acknowledging Sources of Authority

It is in this context that Pope Leo was recognized and officially acknowledged as an authoritative figure whose opinions should set the theological standards to the lesser bishops:

> Maximus the most devout Bishop of the Antioch in Syria said: 'Archbishop Flavian of sacred memory gave an exposition of the faith that was orthodox and in harmony with the most beloved of God and the sacred archbishop Leo, and we all accept it eagerly.'[214]

By adopting Pope Leo as the criterion for assessing orthodoxy, Maximus seems to have effectively placed the see of Rome above his own. By contrast, Thalassius, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, prefered to lean on Cyril as his source of authority: 'Flavian of blessed memory spoke in accord with Cyril of blessed memory': Ὁ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Φλαβιανὸς συνωιδὰ διελάλησεν τῶι τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Κυρίλλωι (I.276). And further on:

> Eusebius the most devout Bishop of Ancyra in Galatia said: 'We approve and accept the statement on religion of the most sacred Flavian.' Eustathius the most devout Bishop of Berytus said: 'The then archbishop of the imperial city, Flavian, most God-beloved in memory, followed the teachings of our most blessed and holy father Cyril, then bishop of Alexandria.' The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'The martyr Flavian gave a fine exposition of the faith. Archbishop Flavian gave a fine exposition of the faith.'[215]

---

212 For a definition and discussion of the term, see pp. 181–182 below.

213 See discussion on pp. 188–189 below.

214 Μάξιμος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀντιοχείας Συρίας εἶπεν· Ὀρθοδόξως ὁ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Φλαβιανὸς καὶ συμφώνως τῶι θεοφιλεστάτωι καὶ ὁσιωτάτωι ἀρχιεπισκόπωι Λέοντι τὴν πίστιν ἐξέθετο καὶ πάντες αὐτὴν προθύμως δεχόμεθα (I.276).

215 Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀγκύρας Γαλατίας εἶπεν· Συντιθέμεθα καὶ ἀποδεχόμεθα τὴν τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου Φλαβιανοῦ ἐπὶ τῆι θρησκείαι διαλαλιάν. Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Βηρυτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἠκολούθησεν ὁ θεοφιλέστατος τὴν μνήμην

The Oriental camp was unanimous in its approval of Flavian's orthodoxy, yet this process of affirmation and confirmation is highly ritualistic and ceremonial in that, much like making a vow, it is vocal and was carried out individually, by each delegate in turn.

At this point, the Egyptian camp made their discontent evident for all to see. Dioscorus, undeterred by Anatolius' sympathy with Flavian, insisted on the following procedure:

> Let the rest of his [i.e. Flavian's] words be read, and then I will answer. He will be found in what follows to contradict himself and speak of two natures after the union.[216]

The debate which followed was nothing short of a record of the disintegration of the Egyptian camp. Hear how Juvenal, still an official member of the Alexandrian camp, addressed Dioscorus' demand:

> The most holy bishop Flavian spoke in harmony with the statements of Cyril blessed in memory, but we ask for the reading of what follows, in order to make his thought more clear.[217]

And the Palestinian reaction, expressed, again, in both verbal and bodily means:[218]

> We say the same as the most sacred Archbishop Juvenal.' Standing up, the most devout Juvenal with these [i.e. Palestinian] bishops crossed over to the other side.[219]

14. Communication Strategies

Bishop Juvenal, sure enough, demanded a further reading from the documents in question, yet he, as well as a few of his colleagues, did not actually wait for the execution of his demand. In an act which corresponds with contem-

---

ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς βασιλευούσης γεγονὼς Φλαβιανὸς τοῖς διδάγμασι τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἁγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἐπισκόπου τῆς ᾿Αλεξανδρέων γενομένου Κυρίλλου. Οἱ ᾿Ανατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν· ῾Ο μάρτυς θλαβιανὸς τὴν πίστιν καλῶς ἐξέθετο (I.278–280).

216 ᾿Αναγνωσθήτω τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοῦ ῥήματα, καὶ οὕτως ἀποκρίνομαι. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἑξῆς εὑρίσκεται διαμαχόμενος ἑαυτῶι καὶ λέγων μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν δύο φύσεις (I.281).

217 Σύμφωνα τοῖς εἰρημένοις τῶι μακαρίωι τὴν μνήμην Κυρίλλωι καὶ ὁ ἁγιώτατος ἐπίσκοπος Φλαβιανὸς εἶπεν, παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὰ ἑξῆς, ἵνα σαφέστερα ἡ διάνοια γένηται (I.282).

218 See *The Body as a Communicative Tool* on pp. 79 and 109 above and note to p. 154 below.

219 Τὰ αὐτὰ λέγομεν τῶι ὁσιωτάτωι ἀρχιεπισκόπωι ᾿Ιουβεναλίωι. Καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος ᾿Ιουβενάλιος ἅμα αὐτοῖς μετῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ἄλλο μέρος (I.283).

porary definitions of the human body as a *communicative tool*[220] and a *performative space*,[221] he physically and most dramatically joined the Oriental camp by crossing over to the other side of the room. The Orientals, needless to say, were overjoyed, and concluded his re-admittance to the group with a formal greeting:

> The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them exclaimed: 'God has led you well, orthodox one. You are welcome.'[222]

In the following episode (I.286–298), Anatolius is most certainly deliberately absent: the exchange of words is rapid, staccato-like, each *turn*, comprising 1–2 sentences at the most, is either a short personal statement of faith, or a short group conclamation after which delegates, individually or within a group, moved to join the hitherto rival group. The episode of Juvenal's defection from the Alexandrian camp is followed by the defection of Peter, bishop of Corinth. He also did not abide by his own demand to have the minutes of Constantinople read further, but crossed over to the Oriental camp with no further delay.

Employing rhetoric of deferral,[223] Peter's argument is essentially apologetic. Bent on distancing himself from Flavian's condemnation, Peter declares: 'I was not present then at the Council of Ephesus': Ἐγὼ μὲν τὸ τηνικαῦτα οὐ παρήμην τῆι συνόδωι τῆι κατὰ Ἔφεσον (I.286). The apology is then followed by an attempt to show an intellectual and impartial stance: 'The reading of the rest will instruct me more fully': τὰ δὲ ὑπόλοιπα ἀναγινωσκόμενα τελεώτερόν με διδάξει (I.286). The action, nonetheless, is immediate, decisive, and intended to establish contact with the emerging *ingroup*: 'Standing up, he too crossed over to the other side': Καὶ ἀναστὰς καὶ αὐτὸς μετῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ἄλλο μέρος (I.287). And the enthusiastic cries of the Orientals: 'Peter thinks like Peter. Orthodox one, you are welcome': Ὁ Πέτρος τὰ Πέτρου φρονεῖ. ὀρθόδοξε, καλῶς ἦλθες (I.288).

A similar pattern of behaviour can be detected in respect of the Greek clergy:

---

220 See *The Body as a Communicative Tool* on p. 79 above.

221 See M. Hallensleben in his introduction to *Performative Body Spaces*, ed. *idem* (Amsterdam-New York, 2010), pp. 9–27, esp. p. 13 and p. 16, where Walter Benjamin's following definition is cited: 'There is an immediate relationship between the body and its space, between the body's deployment in space and its occupation of space. Before producing effects in the material realm (tools and objects), before producing itself by generating other bodies, each living body is space and has its space. This is a truly remarkable relationship: the body with the energies at its disposal, the living body, creates or or produces its own space' (W. Benjamin, *Collected Writings: Articles, Essays, Lectures*, ed. R. Tiedemann and H. Schweppenhäuser (Frankfurt a. M., 1977), p. 170).

222 Καὶ ἀνεβόησαν οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι· Ὁ θεὸς καλῶς ἤνεγκέν σε, ὀρθόδοξε. καλῶς ἦλθες (I.285).

223 Also see pp. 101, 151 above.

Irenaeus the most devout Bishop of Naupactus in Hellas said: 'I too was not present at the recent holy Council at Ephesus, and after the reading to us just now of the teaching of Flavian of sacred memory I hesitate to criticize him, and ask that the rest be read.' The other most devout bishops of Hellas said: 'We teach the same about what has been read.' And they all crossed over to the other side.[224]

In this episode we see that like children submitting themselves to the ceremony of the game, the delegates, too, 'took sides', and displayed their loyalty, not only metaphorically, but also physically, albeit in a controlled, well-behaved manner.[225]

Decision-making on the Spot: the 'Turncoats'

At this point, the stage was open for the 'turncoats', or those who wished to retract their condemnation of Flavian and join the Oriental camp. In sociological terms, the 'turncoats' represent the weak links within a group, or cleavages.[226] Far from being content with the customary exclamations in the style of a Greek chorus, one by one the 'turncoats' stepped into the centre and — as befitted a court procedure — declared their error, in person and aloud. Subsequently, Quintillus, Sozon, and Nicholas of Macedonia, Athanasius of Tripolis (in Egypt), Auxonius of Sebennytus, Nestorius, Bishop of Phlabonis, Macarius, Bishop of Casaba, Constantine, Bishop of Demetrias and others — all declared Flavian's orthodoxy and crossed over to the Oriental camp. Despite this blow to the Alexandrian camp, Dioscorus persisted in maintaining Flavian's unorthodoxy. True to the scholastic traditions of the time, he based his arguments on an array of authoritative figures, namely the patristic fathers:

> Clearly Flavian was deposed for this reason, which was that he spoke of two natures after the union. But I have quotations from the holy fathers Athanasius, Gregory and Cyril saying in numerous passages that one should not speak of two natures after the union but of one incarnate nature of the Word. I am being

---

224 Εἰρηναῖος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ναυπάκτου Ἑλλάδος εἶπεν· Κἀγὼ οὐ παρήμην μὲν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τῇ κατὰ Ἔφεσον ὑπόγυον γενομένῃ, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀρτίως ὑπαναγνωσθέντων ἡμῖν τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης Φλαβιανοῦ διηγημάτων ὀκνῶ ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ ὑπόλοιπα ἀξιοῦμεν ἀναγνωσθῆναι. Οἱ ὑπόλοιποι εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι Ἑλλάδος εἶπον· Τὰ αὐτὰ περὶ τῶν ἀναγνωσθέντων καὶ ἡμεῖς διδάσκομεν. καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸ ἄλλο μετῆλθον μέρος (I.289–290).

225 Games amongst children (and, for that matter, also amongst dogs and other social animals) have a marked civilizing function, even when children engage themselves in aggressive games, i.e. when their game is conducted on the street rather than at the playground, and is thus not controlled by adults (see B. Bettelheim, *A Good Enough Parent* (London, 1987), esp. pp. 260–262).

226 See discussion on p. 98 above.

cast out together with the fathers. I stand by the doctrines of the fathers, and do not transgress in any respect. And I have these quotations not indiscriminately or in a haphazard form but from books. As all have asked, I too request that the rest be read.[227]

Dioscorus held firmly to the authority of the Fathers, while creating a direct link between the latter and himself: 'I am being cast out together with the fathers': ἐγὼ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἐκβάλλομαι. In a nutshell, the struggle between the parties was about the interpretation of the patristic texts: at its core stood the appropriation of the patristic heritage which Christians came to appreciate, alongside the biblical corpus itself, as an increasingly important source of authority.[228] In this context, one can only visualise poor and defeated Dioscorus flashing out his authoritative evidence which he himself tellingly describes as '[…] quotations (arranged) not indiscriminately or in a haphazard form but in books': καὶ τούτων τὰς χρήσεις οὐχ ἁπλῶς οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν βιβλίοις ἔχω.

Dioscorus's use of the Patristic corpus is further indication of the possible fetishist status and function of books in the context of an ecumenical gathering.[229] The latter, sensing his imminent condemnation, and with his back against a metaphorical wall, makes an interesting, and most probably excited and high-pitched statement,[230] testifying to his sources of authority, which, he deems to be consensual sources of authority.

In terms of the dynamics of the debate, it would be interesting to note that only when quite a few of the bishops had already decided to take the imperial, or rather, the emperor's side, did Anatolius order the clerks to proceed with a continuous reading of the minutes of Constantinople and Ephesus II. The allegations, that Ephesus II was a faulty and unlawful council related largely to Dioscorus' role as the mastermind of psychological manipulations and outright intimidation of individual delegates.[231] The reading of the said minutes yielded a protest on the part of one Aetherichus bishop of Smyrna who alleged that he had been put under pressure on account of Eutyches' condemnation and the subsequent condemnation of Flavian. The culprit, he claimed, was none other than Dioscorus:

---

227 Φανερῶς διὰ τοῦτο καθηιρήται Φλαβιανός, ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν δύο φύσεις εἶπεν. ἐγὼ δὲ χρήσεις ἔχω τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων Ἀθανασίου Γρηγορίου Κυρίλλου ἐν πολλοῖς τόποις ὅτι οὐ δεῖ λέγειν μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν δύο φύσεις, ἀλλὰ μίαν σεσαρκωμένην τοῦ λόγου φύσιν. ἐγὼ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἐκβάλλομαι. ἐγὼ συνίσταμαι τοῖς τῶν πατέρων δόγμασιν. οὐ παραβαίνω ἕν τινι. καὶ τούτων τὰς χρήσεις οὐχ ἁπλῶς οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν βιβλίοις ἔχω. καθὼς δὲ πάντες ἤιτησαν, κἀγὼ ἠξίωσα τὰ ὑπόλοιπα ἀναγνωσθῆναι (299).

228 For sources of authority as a recurring theme, see pp. 111, 133–134, 152 above, and 162 below. Also see *Reiteration of Sources of Authority* on p. 169 below.

229 See discussions on pp. 77 and 109 above.

230 For tonality, see pp. 77–78 above.

231 See *Atmosphere of Fear* on p. 124 above.

During the reading Aetherichus the most devout bishop of Smyrna stood up and said: 'Originally I simply agreed and signed. I went off (to Ephesus). Dioscorus the most devout bishop suddenly collared me and said "Why did you sign Eutyches' condemnation?" I replied, "I signed along with all our fathers. If there is anything else, tell me." He said, "Why did you sign?" He said: "I signed what they brought to me: 'Anathema to whoever does not believe with the 318 and as did those at Ephesus; let him be anathema.' What they wrote after that I don't know." I said this in front of everyone.' Dioscorus the most devout Bishop of Alexandria said: 'Let him produce two witnesses.' Aetherichus the most devout bishop of Smyrna said: 'I share the belief of Cyril.' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'In whose presence did Dioscorus the most devout bishop made these remarks to you?' Aetherichus the most devout Bishop of Smyrna said: 'In front of everyone.' Thalassius the most devout Bishop of Caesarea said: 'What was written down, you spoke without compulsion; why do you now want to cancel it?' Dioscorus the most devout Bishop of Alexandria said: 'Is he not going to be punished for his calumny? If I were condemned, would I not be punished?'[232]

The Council as a Judicial Venue

The formal nature of an ancient church gathering has been discussed above.[233] Our impression of a church council being more a court procedure[234] rather than an academic debate is further strengthened here: the litigant does not speak freely, but has to stand, as part of the ceremony or for reasons of acoustics. Furthermore, the discussion here is about the signature of a specific individual, for everybody had to add his name to a written deposition in person (hence the

---

232 Καὶ ἐν τῶι ἀναγινώσκεσθαι Αἰθέριχος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Σμύρνης ἀναστὰς εἶπεν· Τὰ πρῶτα συνεθέμην καὶ ὑπέγραφα μόνον. ἀπῆλθον. εὐθέως ἐκολλήθη μοι Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος καὶ λέγει· διὰ τί ὑπέγραφας κατὰ Εὐτυχοῦς; λέγω· ἐγὼ ὑπέγραφα ὡς πάντες οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. εἰ δὲ ἐστίν τί ποτε ἄλλο, εἴπατέ μοι. λέγει· τί ὑπέγραφας; λέγω· ὡς προσήνεγκάν μοι, ὑπέγραφα. ἀνάθεμα, εἴ τις οὐ πιστεύει τοῖς τριακοσίοις δεκαοκτὼ καὶ ὡς <οἵ> ἐν Ἐφέσωι. οὗτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ὕστερον τί ἔγραφαν, οὐκ οἶδα. ἐπὶ πάντων εἶπα. Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Ἐνέγκηι δύο μάρτυρας. Αἰθέριχος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Σμύρνης εἶπεν· Ὡς Κύριλλος φρονῶ. Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Τίνος παρόντος ταῦτά μοι εἶπεν Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος; Αἰθέριχος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Σμύρνης εἶπεν· Ἐπὶ πάντων. Θαλάσσιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας εἶπεν· Ταῦτα ἃ γέγραπται, εἶπες ἐκτὸς ἀνάγκης. τί θέλεις ἄρτι καταστρέφειν; Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Σθκοφαντήσας οὐδὲν πάσχει; εἰ ἤμην καταγνωσθείς, οὐκ ἔπασχον; Βερονικιανὸς ὁ καθοσιωμένος σηκρητάριος τοῦ θείου κονσιστωρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχεδαρίου ἀνέγνω (I.323–329).

233 See *Seating Games — Rhetoric and its Practice* starting on p. 107 above, and *Legal or Magical Jargon* on p. 114 above.

234 For communication models borrowed from legal contexts, see *Larson's Communication Test* on p. 197 below.

attendance of proxies). Finally, witnesses were called and the end result, as Dioscorus implied, was either acknowledgement and praise or punishment and public disgrace. As the debate went on, the atmosphere worsened and the delegates began to remove their masks of genteel politeness. Dioscorus, and not his camp, became prone to vicious personal attacks, with Anatolius, the official arbitrator, silently approving of the course of events:

> During the reading Dioscorus, the most devout Bishop of Alexandria said: 'I accept "from two (natures)"; I do not accept "two". I am compelled to speak boldly: my soul is at stake.' Eusebius, the most devout Bishop of Dorylaeum said: 'You have already been my death.' Dioscorus, the most devout Bishop of Alexandria said: 'I shall defend myself before God both here and there.' Eusebius, the most devout Bishop of Dorylaeum said: 'And before the laws, do you mean? Why did I come here? Entirely to demand justice from you. Surely you didn't come here just to greet us?' Paschasinus, the most devout Bishop said: 'Was Bishop Flavian, when this man was conducting the hearing, allowed to say as much as he is now doing?'[235]

Diversions from Co-occurrence Rules

In the heat of the argument we see that Paschasinus stripped Dioscorus of his ceremonial attributive: instead of 'the most devout Bishop of Alexandria', Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας, Dioscorus was rudely referred to as 'that man', τούτου, and 'he', οὗτος. Anatolius did not protest against this last breach of protocol and diversion from co-occurrence rules.[236] Rather, he approved of Paschasinus' allegations by drawing a sharp distinction between the former council, or Dioscorus', and *his* council, that is the Council of Chalcedon: 'But now', he reassured Paschasinus, 'the council is proceeding according to justice': Ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἡ σύνοδος μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἐπιτελεῖται. This statement, to be sure, was immediately reinforced by the Papal party:

> Lucentius, the most devout Bishop, representing the apostolic see, said: 'The council is just. Let both parties enjoy the right to speak.'[237]

---

235 Καὶ ἐν τῶι ἀναγινώσκεσθαι Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Τὸ ἐκ δύο οὐ δέχομαι. ἀναγκάζομαι καὶ ἀναισχυντεῖν. περὶ ψυχῆς μοί ἐστιν ὁ λόγος. Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Δορυλαίου εἶπεν· Αὐτός με ἤδη ἐφόνευσας. Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Ἀπολογοῦμαι τῶι θεῶι καὶ ὧδε καὶ ἐκεῖ. Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Δορυλαίου εἶπεν· Καὶ τοῖς νόμοις, ὡς λέγεις οὖν; διὰ τί προσῆλθον; πάντως ἵνα δίκας σε ἀπαιτήσω. μὴ γὰρ προσαγορεύσων εἰσῆλθες ὧδε; (I.332–336).

236 For a definition, see p. 85 above.

237 Λουκίνσιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος ἐπέχων τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον εἶπεν· Δικαία ἐστὶν ἡ σύνοδος. δοθήτω τούτωι κἀκείνωι δικαία ἀπόφασις (I.338).

Dioscorus nonetheless remained undeterred. Disregarding the rules of proper interaction and taking the *turn*, or the right to speak, thus exhibiting social dominance,[238] he interrupted the subsequent reading from the minutes of Constantinople with a personal confession of faith:

> During the reading Dioscorus, the most devout Bishop of Alexandria said: 'Mark, this is what I object to: there are not two natures after the union.'[239]

Yet Veronicianus, one of the two secretaries, continued with his reading:

> Veronicianus, the hallowed secretary of the divine consistory read from the same document.[240]

Veronicianus did not mark anything himself, but, rather than addressing the audience,[241] concentrated only on the reading of the documents. The shorthand documentation of the proceedings,[242] including the above remark of Dioscorus, must have been executed by the other secretary present, Constantine. That such 'personal' confessions of faith were not taken as part of the official procedure is evidenced by the fact that the secretary kept on reading continuously, regardless of the person involved:

> During the reading Eustathius, the most devout Bishop of Berytus said: 'He did not assume a man but became man; flesh is what he assumed.' Veronicianus the hallowed secretary of the divine consistory read from the same document [i.e. Constantinople]: [...].[243]

The minutes in question recorded Eutyches' confession of faith, which, as we may remember, had been fully embraced by Dioscorus and his camp. Thus, when the minutes of Ephesus II stated a unanimous agreement with Eutychus' doctrine, the Oriental camp in Chalcedon rose in protest:

> No one said this. Anathema to whoever said it. The murderer said this. The Egyptians said this. This is from Pharaoh. Anathema to those who said this! This is

---

238 Similarly to Anatolius whose discourse exhibits *interruption patterns* throughout the proceedings. Also see Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context,* p. 205.

239 Καὶ ἐν τῶι ἀναγινώσκεσθαι Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ τούτου ἐπιλαμβάνομαι. μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἕνωσιν δύο φύσεις οὐκ εἰσίν.

240 Βερονικιανὸς ὁ καθοσιωμένος σηκρητάριος <τοῦ θείου κονσιστωρίου> ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχεδαρίου ἀνέγνω (I.341).

241 Due to their formality, interpersonal communication during the sessions was overall limited and restricted. See *The Mechanics of Interpersonal Communication* on p. 37 above.

242 See *The Process of Conciliary Record Keeping* on p. 47 above. Also see pp. 131 and 159 above.

243 Καὶ ἐν τῶι ἀναγινώσκεσθαι ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Βηρυτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἀνέλαβεν, ἀλλ' ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο. Σάρκα δὲ ἀνέλαβεν. Βερονικιανὸς ὁ καθοσιωμένος σηκρητάριος τοῦ θείου κονσιστωρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχεδαρίου ἀνέγνω (I.347).

from Dioscorus. This is from the murderer. What further inquiry is needed? (Report) our acclamations to the emperor. Long live the emperor! Long live the Augusta! Long live the senate![244]

The harshness of the Orientals' rhetoric is unmistakable: *Pharaoh* and *murderer* are hardly examples of diplomatic language.[245] Furthermore, the Orientals demanded that their alienation from Eutychian doctrine be reported to the emperor. They concluded their acclamations with a salutation of the imperial house—a fact which confirms yet again the association between political loyalty and the adoption of dogmatic views which were favourable to the imperial house. The reading of a vast corpus of text concluded with Anatolius' official closure of the first day of deliberations. Interestingly and quite significantly, the reading of such a vast corpus of documents was not followed by a further discussion, nor was the stage given to any of the parties to comment on the issues at hand, these being the definition of Christ and the deposition of Flavian. In his concluding speech, however, Anatolius agreed that further discussion was needed in order to clarify the Christological issues.

Regarding Flavian and the treatment of his episcopal adversaries, here Anatolius took the liberty to decide the matter himself:[246]

On the question of the orthodox and catholic faith we decree that a more exact examination must take place more completely when the council meets tomorrow. But since the injustice of the deposition of Flavian of devout memory and of the most devout bishop Eusebius has been proved by the scrutiny of the proceedings that have been read and the spoken testimony of some of the leaders at the then council, who have confessed that they erred and that they had no reason to depose them since they had not erred in the faith, it appears right to us according to the will of God, if it pleases our most divine and pious master, that Dioscorus, the most devout Bishop of Alexandria, Juvenal, the most devout Bishop of Jerusalem, Thalassius, the most devout Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Eusebius, the most devout Bishop of Ancyra, Eustathius, the most devout Bishop of Berytus, and Basil, the most devout Bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, who had the authority at the council and directed it, should receive the same penalty from the sacred council and be excluded from the episcopal dignity in accordance with the canons. All these developments are to be reported to the divine head.[247]

---

244 Ταῦτα οὐδεὶς εἶπεν. ἀνάθεμα τῶι εἰπόντι. ὁ φονεὺς ταῦτα εἶπεν. ταῦτα οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι εἶπον. ταῦτα τοῦ Φαραῶ εἰσιν. ἀνάθεμα τοῖς εἰποῦσιν. ταῦτα Διοσκόρου εἰσίν. ταῦτα τοῦ φονέως εἰσιν. μετὰ ταῦτα τί ζητοῦμεν; τὰς φωνὰς τῶι βασιλεῖ. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τοῦ βασιλέως. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς αὐγούστας. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς συγκλήτου (I.530).

245 For rhetorical harshness, see note to p. 125 above.

247 Περὶ μὲν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καὶ καθολικῆς τελεώτερον συνόδου γινομένης τῆι ὑστεραίαι ἀκριβεστέραν ἐξέτασιν δεῖν γενέσθαι συνορῶμεν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ Φλαβιανὸς ὁ τῆς εὐλαβοῦς μνήμης καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ τῆς τῶν πεπραγμένων καὶ

The decision to depose Dioscorus and his colleagues — still described as *devout*, despite the disgraceful context of Anatolius' speech — required the approval, not of the *holy* synod there present, but of God and of the *divine and pious master*, namely the emperor, the *divine head* who was to be kept informed as to these developments in the ecclesiastical order. That such rhetoric effectively places the emperor at the top of the ecclesiastical order is unmistakable. It depicts the emperor not as an external onlooker — powerful as that may be — but as an inherent part of the religious system. Whether this was perceived by Marcian's contemporaries as a reflection of the 'natural order', or otherwise, its disruption remains fundamental to our understanding of the relationship between church and state in the fifth century.

The Societal Functions of Conclamations

What, then, were the reactions of the delegates? The Oriental bishops — and only they — burst into a public approval of Anatolius' sentence, chanting unanimously in praise of the institutions of the empire and its imperial house:

> Long live the senate! Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us! Long live the emperors! The impious are always rooted; Christ has deposed Dioscorus. Christ has deposed the murderer. This is a just sentence. This is a just council. {This is a holy council.} The senate is just, {the council is just}. God has avenged the martyrs.[248]

Christ had deposed the sinful bishops by means of the senate and the emperor(s). The latter, not the church as a whole or the episcopal bishops, were Christ's instruments. And these instruments, with Anatolius as their representative, took the liberty of advising the bishops what steps they should take next:

διαγνωσθέντων ἐρεύνης καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς φωνῆς τινῶν τῶν ἐξάρχων γενομένων τῆς τότε συνόδου ὁμολογησάντων ἐσφάλθαι καὶ πάτην αὐτοὺς καθῃρηκέναι οὐδὲν περὶ τὴν πίστιν σφαλέντας δείκνυνται ἀδίκως καθῃρηκέναι, καταφαίνεται ἡμῖν κατὰ τὸ τῶι θεῶι ἀρέσκον δίκαιον εἶναι, εἴ παρασταίη τῶι θειοτάτωι καὶ εὐσεβεστάτωι ἡμῶν δεσπότηι, τῶι αὐτῶι ἐπιτιμίωι Διόσκορον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἰουβεναλίον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Θαλάσσιον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας καὶ Εὐσέβιον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Ἀγκύρας καὶ Εὐστάθιον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Βηρυτοῦ καὶ Βασίλειον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Σελευκείας Ἰσαυρίας τοὺς ἐξουσίαν εἰληθότας καὶ ἐξάρχοντας τῆς τότε συνόδου ὑποπεσεῖν παρὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τοῦ ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος ἀλλοτρίους γενησομένους, πάτρων τῶν παρακολουθησάντων τῆι θείαι κορυφῆι γνωριζομένων (I.1068).

248 Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς συγκλήτου. ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῶν βασιλέων. ὁ ἀσεβὴς ἀεὶ φεύγει. Διόσκορον ὁ Χριστὸς καθεῖλεν. τὸν φονέα ὁ Χριστὸς καθεῖλεν. αὕτη δικαία ψῆφος. αὕτη δικαία συνόδος ** δικαία σύγκλητος ** τοὺς μάρτυρας ὁ θεὸς ἐξεδίκησεν (I.1071; additions supplemented from the Latin version).

Let each of the most devout bishops of the present holy council set out in writing what he believes, without any anxiety and with the fear of God before his eyes, recognizing that the beliefs of our most divine and pious master accord with the creed of the 318 holy fathers at Nicaea and the creed of the 150 after that (i.e. Constantinople), with the canonical letters and expositions of the holy fathers Gregory, Basil, Hilary, Athanasius and Ambrose, and with the two canonical letters of Cyril which were approved and published in the First Council of Ephesus, and does not depart from their faith in any way. In addition it is a familiar fact that the most devout Leo, Archbishop of senior Rome sent a letter to Flavian of devout memory concerning the dispute that Eutyches impiously stirred up in opposition to the catholic religion.[249]

In their personal confessions of faith the bishops, maintained Anatolius, should bear in mind the belief of Emperor Marcian who, in turn, formed his opinion according to the following sources of authority: Nicaea (AD 325), Constantinople (AD 381), the writings of Gregory, Basil, Hilary, Athanasius, Ambrose, the letters of Cyril (to Nestorius), and the letter of Leo to Flavian. This is an interesting list indeed, for it outlines in a hierarchical order (decreasing, perhaps, from Nicaea to Leo) the pillars of Christian orthodoxy. Interestingly, of the church fathers, only two of the Cappadocian fathers (Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil) are included in the list. These two, together with Athanasius and Cyril make up the Greek list. Furthermore, leaving aside Augustine, for example, the only Latin Fathers included are Hilary and Ambrose. With such a restricted list, the inclusion of Leo, albeit at the end, is indicative of the high esteem with which the Roman see was held.

---

249 Ἕκαστος τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων τῆς παρούσης ἁγίας συνόδου ὅπως πιστεύει, ἐγγράφων ἄνευ τινὸς δέους, τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν τιθέμενος φόβον, ἐκθέσθαι σπουδασάτω, γινώσκων ὡς ὁ θειότατος καὶ εὐσεβέστατος ἡμῶν δεσπότης κατὰ τὴν ἔκθεσιν τῶν ἐν Νικαίαι ἁγίων πατέρων τιη καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἔκθεσιν τῶν ρν τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ τὰς κανονικὰς ἐπιστολὰς καὶ ἐκθέσεις τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων Γρηγορίου Βασιλείου Ἰλαρίου Ἀθανασίου Ἀμβροσίου καὶ τὰς Κυρίλλου δύο κανονικὰς ἐπιστολὰς τὰς ἐν τῆι κατ᾽ Ἔφεσον πρώτηι συνόδωι βεβαιωθείσας καὶ δημοσιευθείσαις πιστεύει, καὶ οὐδένα τρόπον τῆς αὐτῶν πίστεως ἀναχωρῶν. καὶ γὰρ ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης Λέων πρὸς τὴν παρὰ Εὐτυχοῦς ἀπίστως καὶ ὑπεναντίον τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνακύψασαν ἀμφιβολίαν φαίνεται πρὸς τὸν τῆς εὐλαβοῦς μνήμης Φλαβιανὸν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐκπέμψας (I.1072).

B. Discourse Analysis of Session II
(On the Orthodox Faith)

The delegates were given some time to recover from the significantly long open-ing session[250] and perhaps, as requested by Anatolius in his concluding state-ment, also to reflect upon Christian dogma. Just as in the opening session, the second session also opened with a meticulous list of the delegates present. These lists are effectively identical, and therefore, had no real practical function. Given the strong plausibility that both the names of the delegates and their honor-ific attributives were re-read aloud, one cannot overestimate their ceremonial significance.[251]

1. The Imperial Official as Leader

On the second day of the deliberations, the delegates convened and sat, each in his designated place 'in front of the rails of the holy sanctuary': καὶ καθεσθέντων πάντων πρὸ τῶν καγκέλλων τοῦ ἁγίου θυσιαστηίου. Anatolius began his speech with a recapitulation of what had been decided in the previ-ous session:

> At the previous session an investigation was made into the deposition of Flavian of devout memory and of the most devout Bishop Eusebius. It was evident to all that the inquiry proceeded in accordance with justice and due process, and it was then proved that they had been deposed in a manner both cruel and improper. The steps we thought necessary to be taken on this were then made known to you by the resolution. The question that is now to be investigated, judged and studied is how to confirm the true faith; it is particularly because of the faith that the coun-cil has assembled […][252]

---

250 Aetius, archdeacon of Constantinople: '[…] there followed a reading of the text of cer-tain minutes […] till late in the evening': καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν φανερὸν κατέστη ὅπως [καὶ] δικαίως καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τὰ τῆς ἐξετάσεως προέβη.

251 See *Attendance and Signatory Lists —Ceremonial and Societal Functions* on p. 179 below.

252 Τῆι προτεραίαν συνόδωι περὶ τῆς κατὰ Φλαβιανὸν τὸν τῆς εὐλαβους μνήμης καὶ Εὐσέβιον τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον καθαιρέσεως ἡ ζήτησις ἐγένετο καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν φανερὸν κατέστη ὅπως [καὶ] δικαίως καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τὰ τῆς ἐξετάσεως προέβη ἀπεδείχθησαν τότε ὠμῶς καὶ μὴ προσηκόντως καθαιρθέντες. ἅπερ τοίνυν ἡμῖν ἐφάνη ἐπὶ τούτωι τῶι κεφαλαίωι δεῖν γενέσθαι, τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἡμῖν δῆλα ἐκ τῆς διαλαλιᾶς ἐγένετο. νῦν δὲ τὸ ζητούμενον καὶ κρινόμενον καὶ σπουδαζόμενόν ἐστιν ὥστε τὴν ἀληθῆ πίστιν συγκροτηθῆναι, δι᾽ ἣν μάλιστα καὶ ἡ σύνοδος γέγονεν (II.2).

Again, in conformity with his central role and elevated social status, Anatolius'
language was authoritative and full of control: 'it was evident to all', he says, thus
ignoring the opposition of the Egyptian camp. Again, the body of the senate, of
which Anatolius was the representative, is granted the following group honor-
ific title 'the most glorious officials and exalted senate', as it was represented by
Anatolius. And Anatolius continued:

> You know that each one of you will give an account to God on behalf both of his
> own soul and of all of us, who long both to be taught the truths of religion correctly
> and to see every dispute resolved through the concord and agreement, harmoni-
> ous exposition and teaching, of all the sacred fathers. Therefore apply yourselves
> without fear, favour or enmity to produce a pure exposition of the faith, so that
> even those who appear not to share the views of all may be restored to harmony by
> acknowledging the truth. We wish you to know that the most divine and pious
> master of the world and we ourselves preserve the orthodox faith handed down by
> the 318, by the 150, and by other holy and glorious fathers, and believe in accor-
> dance with it.[253]

2. Harmony as a Token of Divine Providence

Here and in the previous session Anatolius declared the goal of the synod to be
'to confirm the true faith': ὥστε τὴν ἀληθῆ πίστιν συγκροτηθῆναι. This is what
was at stake on the practical level. Anatolius went on to expound the spiritual
implications of this πρᾶξις for every Christian individual who wished, in order
of importance, to be taught the true principles of Christian dogma *and* to have
every dispute resolved on the basis of the teaching of the Fathers. As mentioned
above, the Fathers—and not only the biblical Scriptures—were taken as the
guidelines of orthodoxy, which in turn reflects, in fact, one single abstract ideal,
that of harmony, concord and agreement.

According to Anatolius, this ideal, already achieved by the Fathers, was to
be sought after and emulated by all devout Christians. The imperial rhetoric of
Anatolius stressed harmony, not only the reflection of a personal state of mind,

---

253 εἰδότες οὖν ὡς καὶ τῶι θεῶι λόγον δώσετε ὑπέρ τε τῆς οἰκείας ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ψυχῆς καὶ
ὑπέρ ὑμῶν ἁπάντων, οἵτινες καὶ διδαχθῆναι τὰ τῆς θρησκείας ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ὀρθῶς καὶ πᾶσαν
ἀμφισβήτησιν ἀναιρεθῆναι ἐκ τῆς πάντων τῶν ὁσίων πατέρων ὁμονοίας καὶ συναινέσεως
καὶ συμφώνου ἐκθέσεως καὶ διδασκαλίας, σπουδάσατε ἄνευ φόβου ἢ χάριτος ἢ ἀπεχθείας
τὴν πίστιν καθαρῶς ἐκθέσθαι, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς δοκοῦντας, μὴ ταῦτὰ πᾶσιν πεφρονηκέναι τῆι
τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπιγνώσει ἐπαναχθῆναι εἰς τὴν ὁμόνοιαν. εἰδέναι γὰρ ἡμᾶς βουλόμεθα ὡς ὁ
θειότατος καὶ εὐσεβέστατος δεσπότης τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑμεῖς ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν τὴν παρὰ τῶν
τιη καὶ παρὰ τῶν ρν, ἔτι μὴν καὶ παρὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐπιδόξον πατέρων παραδοθεῖσαν
φυλάττομεν καὶ κατὰ ταύτην πιστεύομεν.

as was the case with the teachings of the Stoic philosophical system,[254] but, as it would appear, a means of spiritual redemption in the next world:

> you will give an account to God on behalf of both his own soul and of all of us.[255]

The Christian emperor too had a role to play in achieving this ideal state of concord:

> We wish you to know that the most divine emperor and we ourselves preserve the orthodox faith.[256]

Thus the Byzantine emperor and the senate, represented here by Anatolius, appear to be none other than the chief guardians of orthodoxy. In his short speech Anatolius outlined the essence of the relationship between church and state as being the establishment of orthodoxy on one hand, and its enforcement on the other. We see that Byzantine ideologies, both political and religious, were indebted heavily to the teachings of the Stoics, with their stress on the individual achieving a harmonious state of mind on one hand, and their promotion of the ideal of the Roman emperor as the chief restorer of peace on the other.

The new and original element in Byzantine political theory was found in the marriage between the personal and the collective, for the Byzantine emperor was not only committed to enabling his subjects to live in a peaceful environment, but was also dedicated to achieving and maintaining a collective harmony between Christians first, and hopefully, for all mankind, when all peoples recognize Christ.

Implying a certain spiritual process (*apply yourselves*) which the delegates should undergo,[257] Anatolius' order was clear: '[…] apply yourselves […] to produce a pure exposition of the faith'.[258] The opposition to this prescript was overwhelming:

> The most devout bishops exclaimed: 'No one makes a new exposition, nor do we attempt or presume to do so. For it was the Fathers who taught; what they expanded is preserved in writing, and we cannot go beyond it.'[259]

---

254 For a study of the Christian perception of order and harmony as tokens of divine Providence in particular, and of the reception of the Stoa by early Christian thinkers in general, see M. Spanneut, *Le Stoïcism des pères de l'église* (Paris, 1957), pp. 372–379.

255 εἰδότες οὖν ὡς καὶ τῶι θεῶι λόγον δώσετε ὑπέρ τε τῆς οἰκείας ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ψυχῆς καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἁπάντων.

256 εἰδέναι γὰρ ἡμᾶς βουλόμεθα ὡς ὁ θειότατος καὶ εὐσεβέστατος δεσπότης τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑμεῖς ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν […] φυλάττομεν καὶ κατὰ ταύτην πιστεύομεν.

257 Compare with Marcian's appeal to the delegates to apply their *sense of religion or piety*, discussed on p. 199 below.

258 σπουδάσατε ἄνευ φόβου ἢ χάριτος ἢ ἀπεχθείας τὴν πίστιν καθαρῶς ἐκθέσθαι.

259 Οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐπεβόησαν· Ἔκθεσιν ἄλλην οὐδεὶς ποιεῖ οὐδὲ ἐγχειροῦμεν οὐδὲ τολμῶμεν ἐκθέσθαι. ἐδίδαξαν γὰρ οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐγγράφως σώιζεται τὰ παρ' ἐκείνων ἐκτεθέντα καὶ παρ' ἐκεῖνα λέγειν οὐ δυνάμεθα (II.3).

Dogma as a No-go Zone

The very Fathers in whose name Anatolius made his request to the synod in the first place were the reason for its rejection by the members of the Chalcedonian synod: they would not expound the Patristic teaching, for it was already 'preserved in writing', ἐγγράφων σώιζεται, and was *seemingly perfect*.[260] This surprising argument coincides with Marcian's official policy of not opening up the floor to discussion about issues of dogma.[261] Leaving aside sublime notions of the emperor's care for the spiritual needs of his Christian subjects, keeping them, as it were, away from the damages of dialectical sophistry (*ars dialectica*) and closer to the pure truth of the faith (*simplicitas fidei*),[262] such a policy, marked by a clear preference for a *declarative* and *affirmative*, rather than *deliberative,* discourse,[263] must have been largely dictated by the emperor's even more urgent need to demonstrate his ability at achieving a dogmatic unity, frail and superficial though it might prove to be.

Cecropius, bishop of Sebastopolis, added an additional source of authority in support of the bishops' outcry:

> There arose the affair of Eutyches. A decree was issued on the subject by the most holy archbishop of Rome [i.e. the Tome of Leo]; we assent to it and we have all signed his letter.[264]

The bishops' approval of Cecropius' statement is overwhelming and unanimous:

> This is what we all say. What has already been expounded is sufficient. It is not permissible to produce another exposition.[265]

This is a consistent reply. The new element it includes, if any, is reflected not in what had been said but in what had not been said: the bishops did not object to Cecropius' observation in respect of Pope Leo's *Tome* and by not doing so, they actually reiterated the supremacy of the Papal see. Similarly, Anatolius' reply is an idealized description of the process of deliberation.[266] Furthermore,

---

260 This collective stance of the bishops might imply that by the fifth century, the Patristic corpus — a great part of which was a mere 100 years old or less — had achieved an authoritative status which sanctioned its further reviewing and questioning.

261 See discussion of the bishops' open rebellion against Anatolius on p. 168 below.

262 For this tension, already detected in connection with the Council of Nicaea, see Lim, *Public Disputation*, pp. 182–216.

263 See examples on p. 171 below.

264 Ἀνεφύη τὰ κατὰ Εὐτυχῆ. ἐπὶ τούτοις τύπος ἐδόθη παρὰ τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμηι ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου καὶ στοιχοῦμεν αὐτῶι καὶ ὑπεγράψαμεν πάντες τῆι ἐπιστολῆι (II.4).

265 Ταῦτα πάντες λέγομεν. ἀρκεῖ τὰ ἐκτεθέντα. ἄλλην ἔκθεσιν οὐκ ἐξὸν ἐνέσθαι (II.5).

266 See *Coser on the Functions of Open Debate* on p. 75 above.

adopting the tactic of rhetorical *vagueness*,[267] the passage is equally interesting in respect of what was not said, i.e. no mentioning of specific topics of disagreement:

> If it seems good to your devoutness, let the most sacred patriarchs of each diocese select, each one, one or two [bishops] from their own diocese, come together, deliberate in common about the faith, and then make their decisions known to all, so that, if all are in accord, every dispute may be resolved, which is what we wish, and if some prove to be of a contrary opinion, which we do not expect, this may reveal their opinions as well.[268]

3. Anatolius' Rhetorical Tactics

Anatolius' tactic is that of displaying a complete disregard for the sweeping demand of the delegates not to get involved in matters of dogma. Anatolius opened his reply with the following address to the synod: 'if it seems good to your devoutness': Εἰ δοκεῖ τῆι μετέραι εὐλαβείαι — an opening which, though polite on the surface, remains, nonetheless rude and forceful in its essence,[269] for when he spoke these words, Anatolius was well aware of the bishops' sentiments.

But what was actually the process which Anatolius proposed to put in action? In a deliberate act designed to bestow authority, the delegates were first asked to choose their representatives to the said committee, thus giving the delegates the illusion of independence. Second, they were to deliberate and thirdly, they were to make their decisions known. The wording of the last part is particularly interesting:

> [...] and then make their decisions known to all, so that, if all are in accord, every dispute may be resolved, which is what we wish, and if some prove to be of a contrary opinion, which we do not expect, this may reveal their opinions as well.[270]

According to Anatolius, the optimal result of the deliberations should be the attainment of dogmatic concord, the very prooftext of the workings of Divine Providence,[271] which would be subsequently announced publicly.

---

267 A tactic which was also employed by the Emperor Marcian (see p. 193 below). Markers such as *precision* versus *vaguess* are further discussed in Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context,* p. 183.

268 Εἰ δοκεῖ τῆι μετέραι εὐλαβείαι, οἱ ὁσιώτατοι πατριάρχαι διοικήσεων ἑκάστης ἐπιλεξάμενοι ἕνα ἢ δεύτερον τῆς οἰκείας ἔκαστος εἰς τὸ μέσον παρελθόντες καὶ κοινῆι περὶ τῆς πίστεως βουλευσάμενοι τὰ συνδοκοῦντα φανερὰ πᾶσι καταστήσωσιν, ὥστε εἰ μὲν σύνθοιντο πάντες, λυθῆναι πᾶσαν ἀμφισβήτησιν, ὅπερ εὐχόμεθα. εἰ δὲ τινες, ὅπερ οὐχ ἡγούμεθα, ἐναντία φρονήσαιεν, ὥστε καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων φανερὰς καταστῆναι γνώμας (II.6).

269 For linguistic politeness as a boundary marker, see p. 85 above.

270 *Ibid.*

271 See *Harmony as a Token of Divine Providence* starting on p. 164 above.

Far from allowing an open discussion, Anatolius seems to approve of a cere-
monial announcement of a desirable outcome (i.e. a declaration of faith in line
with the *Tome* of Leo), alongside a public condemnation of individuals who
might diverge from it and would be courageous or careless enough to reveal
their true selves. Since Anatolius seems to have been more interested in the ritu-
alistic approval of a firmly rooted ideological agenda, the treatment of dissident-
ing individuals could never have included an open discussion with them. At the
most, *this may reveal their opinions*.[272] To judge by Anatolius' scheme, the pro-
posed gathering of the bishops was designed more as a denouncement of here-
tics than as a confirmation of faith.[273] Often employing denigrating imagery,[274]
the guardian of orthodoxy often engaged himself in theological debates, not as a
means of getting to the bottom of things — for the truth is already known — but
as a means of uncovering the true self of undercover heretics, the enemies of the
ecclesiastical and social orders.[275]

4. Rebellion against Anatolius

The bishops, clearly agitated and enraged, actually challenged Anatolius'
authority by giving him an open affront:

> We will not produce a written exposition. There is a canon which declares that
> what has already been expounded is sufficient. The canon forbids the making of
> another exposition. Let the [will] of the fathers prevail.[276]

The position of a selected number of church Fathers as supreme authorities was
yet again confirmed. Florentius, bishop of Sardis, elaborated further on the
identity of the authoritative Fathers:

> Since improvising about the faith is impossible for those taught to follow the holy
> council of Nicaea and the one that was rightly and piously convened at Ephesus,
> in accordance with the faith of the holy Fathers Cyril and Celestine and the letter
> of the most holy Leo, we beg your greatness to grant us a postponement so that we

---

272 ὥστε καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων φανερὰς καταστῆναι γνώμας.

273 For *ingroup* and *outgroup* affiliations see, p. 119 above. Also see *The Process of Bound-
ary Marking* starting on p. 125 above.

274 Compare this for example, with the serpentine imagery in Epiphanius' *Panarion* (dis-
cussion in: A. Pourkier, *L'Hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine* (Paris, 1992), pp. 78–82,
323–335, 480–481, 488–489.

275 Confirming the image of heretics as disruptors of social order, both Irenaeus and
Epiphanius describe their co-religionist separatists as messengers of Satan, causing disruption,
scandal and crime, wherever they go (for a discussion, see *eadem*, *L'Hérésiologie*, pp. 268–269).

276 Ἔγγραφον ἔκθεσιν οὐ ποιούμεθα. κανὼν ἔστιν ὁ διαγορεύων ἀρκεῖν τὰ ἐκτεθέντα.
ὁ κανὼν βούλεται ἄλλην ἔκθεσιν μὴ γενέσθαι. τὰ τῶν πατέρων κρατείτω (II.7).

may attain the truth of the matter with an appropriate plan — although indeed as regards ourselves, who have signed the letter of the most sacred Leo, we stand in no need of correction.[277]

Reiteration of Ecclesiastical Sources of Authority

Nicaea, Ephesus, the church Fathers, Cyril, Celestinus, and Pope Leo — these, according to Florentius are the pillars of Christian orthodoxy. With the exception of Celestinus, Florentius' list is rather predictable. Cyril, notably the grandest figure in the catalogue was merely *sacred*, whereas Leo, perhaps due to Florentius' own political agenda, and his wish to endear himself to Leo was referred to as 'most sacred', τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Λέοντος. Furthermore, true to the scholasticism of the age and its respective disdain for novelty, Florentius was appalled by the prospects of having to *improvise about the faith*.[278] Any clarification, and addition, and original insight,[279] was to Florentius and his colleagues tantamount to heresy.

To be sure, in his appeal Florentius approached Anatolius rather as a supplicant, than as a respectable and distinguished bishop: 'we beg your greatness to grant us a postponement': ἱκετεύομεν ὑμέτερον μέγεθος δοθῆναι ἡμῖν προσθεσμίαν. Neither Florentius nor Anatolius had any doubt as to who was in charge: Anatolius had the power to hand out tasks, as well as to exempt people from them. Florentius' closing remark was a mixture of apologetics and calculating self-exclusion from the mob of the 'erring' bishops, that is those *in need of correction* This latter point leaves us with no doubt as to the bishops' grasp of what was expected of them 'in attaining to the truth of the matter', ὥστε μετὰ σκέμματος πρέποντος προσελθεῖν τῆι ἀληθείαι τοῦ πράγματος, which was, rather than composing a confession of faith from scratch, to single out bishops who did not comply with Leo's *Tome*. In short, one can say that Anatolius' proposal was tantamount to a witch hunt. Florentius, on his part, took the opportunity to identify with the side of the 'good guys'.

The great authorities of the church seemed to be constantly metaphorically present in the public discussion. Their names were recited and announced repeatedly by different individuals who, time and again, turned to the first two ecumenical councils and to a selected number of the Fathers of the church for con-

---

277 Ἐπειδὴ οὔκ ἐστι δυνατόν σχεδιάσαι περὶ πίστεως δεδιδαγμένους ἕπεσθαι τῆι Νικαέων ἁγίαι συνόδωι καὶ τῆι Ἐφέσωι συγκροτηθείσηι καὶ εὐσεβῶς κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων Κυρίλλου καὶ κελεστίνου καὶ ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Λέοντος, ἱκετεύομεν ὑμέτερον μέγεθος δοθῆναι ἡμῖν προσθεσμίαν ὥστε μετὰ σκέμματος πρέποντος προσελθεῖν τῆι ἀληθείαι τοῦ πράγματος, εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα εἰς ἡμέτερον πρόσωπον τῶν ὑπογραψάντων τῆι ἐπιστολῆι τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου Λέοντος οὐ δεόμεθα διορθώσεως (II.8).

278 Ἐπειδὴ οὔκ ἐστι δυνατόν σχεδιάσαι περὶ πίστεως.

279 On attitudes to novelty, see p. 133 above.

firmation of their own faith. To be sure, by ceremonially reiterating their sources of authority, the delegates to the Council of Chalcedon delineated for the community and for themselves the identity of the patrons of orthodoxy. In other words, the oral declamation of the names[280] of, amongst others, Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, and Cyril constituted in itself the ceremonial or ritual part in the search for a *communal identity* based on a religious definition of orthodoxy and heresy.

Thus, we see that each and every one of the subsequent speakers addressing the council saw fit to repeat the said catalogue with the evident purpose of establishing his own orthodoxy:

> Cecropius, the most devout Bishop of Sebastopolis said: 'The faith was well defined by the 318 holy fathers and confirmed by the holy fathers Athanasius, Cyril, Celestine, Hilary, Basil, Gregory, and now again by the most holy Leo. We request that the creed of the 318 holy fathers and the letter of the most sacred Leo be read.' The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said: 'Let the exposition of the 318 holy fathers who assembled at Nicaea be read.'[281]

A reading of the Nicene creed followed, after which one would have expected the delegates to expound the contents of the dogma in question. But this was not the case. Instead, all present made a point out of not discussing it but rather, accepting it *en bloc*.[282] The delegates' expression of commitment to the Nicene creed was ceremonial in that it was uttered simultaneously and unanimously by everybody present,[283] regardless of either political or theological divides, and in that it was formal in terms of its tone, and formulaic in terms of its content:

> The most devout bishops exclaimed: 'This is the faith of the orthodox. This we all believe. In this we were baptised, in this we baptise. The blessed Cyril taught accordingly. This is the true faith. This is the holy faith. This is the eternal faith. Into this we were baptised, into this we baptise. We all believe accordingly. Pope Leo believes accordingly. Cyril believed accordingly. Pope Leo expounded accordingly.'[284]

---

280 See note to p. 60 above.

281 Κεκρόπιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Σεβαστοπόλεως εἶπεν· Ἡ πίστις καλῶς διήρηται παρὰ τῶν τιη ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ ἐβεβαιώθη παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων Ἀθανασίου Κυρίλλου κελεστίνου Ἱλαρίου Βασιλείου Γρηγορίου καὶ νῦν πάλιν διὰ τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Λέοντος, καὶ ἀξιοῦμεν καὶ τὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν τιη καὶ τὰ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου Λέοντος ἀναγνωσθῆναι. Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Ἀναγινωσκέσθωσαν τὰ ἐκτεθέντα παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων τιη πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων (II.9–10).

282 See *Dogma as a No-go Zone* starting on p. 166 above.

283 Also see *The Vocalization of the Dogma* starting on p. 135 above.

284 Οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν· Αὕτη ἡ πίστις τῶν ὀρθοδόξων. ταύτῃ πάντες πιστεύομεν. ἐν ταύτῃ ἐβαπτίσθημεν. ἐν ταύτῃ βαπτίζομεν. ὁ μακάριος Κύριλλος οὕτως ἐδίδαξεν. αὕτη ἀληθινὴ πίστις. αὕτη ἁγία πίστις. αὕτη αἰωνία πίστις. εἰς ταύτην ἐβαπτίσθημεν. εἰς ταύτην βαπτίζομεν. πάντες οὕτως πιστεύομεν. ὁ πάπας Λέων οὕτως πιστεύει. Κύριλλος οὕτως ἐπίστευσεν. ὁ πάπας Λέων οὕτως ἡρμήνευσεν (II.12).

How is the formulaic style reflected? The message is not deliberative, but affirmative and declarative: 'This is the faith of the orthodox. This we all believe': Αὕτη ἡ πίστις τῶν ὀρθοδόξων. ταύτηι πάντες πιστεύομεν. In this the delegates expressed their conviction that the Nicene creed was whole, complete, and in *no need* of further clarifications and deliberations.[285] As the delegates established the Nicene creed as the guideline for 'orthodoxy', they proceeded to associate themselves with the creed in question, while stressing its *continuity* and *authoritative status*: 'In this we were baptised, in this we baptise': ἐν ταύτηι ἐβαπτίσθημεν, ἐν ταύτηι βαπτίζομεν.

The acclamation of an authoritative figure, Cyril, is then followed by a tricolon on the subject of faith: 'This is the holy faith; this is the eternal faith; this is the true faith!' A reiteration of continuity was made with a repetitive formula: 'Into this we were baptised, into this we baptise.' The passage concluded with a rhythmical tricolon on the theme of belief and its respective guardians:[286] 'We all believe accordingly. Pope Leo believes accordingly. Cyril believed accordingly': πάντες οὕτως πιστεύομεν. ὁ πάπας Λέων οὕτως πιστεύει. Κύριλλος οὕτως ἐπίστευσεν. As a token of Pope Leo's overwhelming prestige, the public declaration concluded with an appeal to his exegetical prestige: 'Pope Leo expounded accordingly': ὁ πάπας Λέων οὕτως ἡρμήνευσεν. To be sure, the fact that hundreds of bishops came to chant in chorus a prescribed text is evidence of its formulaic nature — or else, how could one possibly explain the rare collaboration between the Orientals and the Alexandrians?

Anatolius, the highest ranking imperial official present, was committed to one objective, that being the manifestation of theological unity, as opposed to achieving it in reality. Anatolius was not interested in dwelling on theological issues, not even at the most superficial level possible. Instead, he seized this rare public expression of concord and ordered a reading of another canonical and uncontroversial text:

> The most glorious officials and the exalted senate said (to his clerk): 'Read out as well the exposition of the 150 holy fathers.'[287]

And again, upon the public reading of the Constantinopolitan creed, all the bishops present, regardless of their episcopal attachment, answered in chorus:

> This is the faith of all. This is the faith of the orthodox. We all believe accordingly.[288]

---

285 See *Dogma as a No-go Zone* on pp. 166 and 171 above.
286 On rhythmical chanting, see pp. 120, 146, and 188 above.
287 Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Ἀναγινωσκέσθωσαν καὶ τὰ ἐκτεθέντα παρὰ τῶν ρν ἁγίων πατέρων (II.13).
288 Αὕτη πάντων πίστις. αὕτη πίστις τῶν ὀρθοδόξων. οὕτω πάντες πιστεύομεν (II.15).

C. Summary of Discussions

The opening session of the council can be taken as a blueprint for the sociology of ecclesiastical gatherings: the fixed and repetitive honorific titles, the strict etiquette of behaviour, the prescribed procedure. In place of a gathering bursting with intellectual prowess and devotional spontaneity, we witness the unfolding of a careful and well-orchestrated theatrical show, whereby even acclamations and exclamations, some of them tellingly long, are the product of social conventions. The council is staged as a juridical procedure, with the delegates holding the role of judges and the imperial *magister militum* as the all-powerful chairman of the proceedings. The political and social interplay between the clergy and the imperial court is exposed in its total lack of balance in favour of the latter: the emperor summoned the council, prescribed the delegates and appointed one of his own officials, Anatolius, to see to it that the outcome would fit the imperial bill.

Can we actually speak in terms of the East versus the West or the Church versus the imperial bureaucracy? Not quite, for we see that the divisions and alliances do not match any modern preconceptions regarding the notion of secularism. We may also note, for example, that Marcian, the Antiochene and the Constantinopolitan clergy, headed by Theodoret, and Pope Leo formed one group, whereas the empress and the Alexandrian and Palestinian clergy, headed by Dioscorus formed another. In a study of only a fraction of the proceedings we get a taste of the depths of emotions and brutality that the pursuit of ecclesiastical power involved. So much so that many of the arguments heard can be reduced to one simple dictate or wish: *we want or we do not want to see this or that man in our midst.* Imposing ecclesiastical unity was one of Marcian's gigantic tasks as an imperial novice. That Pulcheria, the empress and sister of the late Theodosius, represented the opposite pole of ecclesiastical politics leaves us no choice but to speculate either on Marcian's unexpected independence of mind or on the extreme liberality of the Theodosian court where emperor and empress were allowed to develop their individual religious tastes.[289]

The proceedings of the two sessions discussed here reveal the rapid and forceful rooting not only of canonical texts, such as the Nicene creed, but also of canonical figures of authority. It remains a selective list indeed in the sense that out of the huge spectrum of Patristic Fathers, only a handful found their way into the pantheon of those who came to define orthodoxy, as we all know it. In the Greek-speaking world, we see that within a mere century or less, the teach-

---

289 In the case of Justinian and Theodora separate religious agendas may have pointed to a deliberate political scheme, which was intended to minimize the damage in the face of an ecclesiastical rift.

ing or biblical exegesis of the Cappadocians Athanasius and Cyril, achieved a nearly sacrosanct status, comparable to that of a handful of Latin writers, to include Ambrose, Celestine, Hilary, and the contemporary Pope Leo, whose names were acclaimed by the delegates.[290]

---

290 Interestingly enough, Augustine is tellingly missing from the list.

IV. The New Constantine:
Marcian at Chalcedon

A. Discourse Analysis of Session VI

1. Bailey's Normative Rules

When analysing the nature of political discourse, Bailey coined the term *normative rules*[1] to describe the set of norms which politicians in any given society are expected, by force of social norms, to include in their public communication.[2] As implied by their name, this set of rules addresses moral pre-conceptions which are concerned with the sanctioned, or approved, social behaviour of people, both as individuals and as a group. In fact, when addressing these norms in his speeches, the politician actually re-iterates them, stressing time and again — at least as far as modern Western discourse can be generally typified — common *topoi* such as fairness, care for the weak and needy, prudence in public expenditure, the importance of education, the attempts to achieve social and political stability, and the relentless quest for peace.[3]

Christianity as a Normative Rule

The spectrum of normative rules across different periods of time in history and across countless models of human societies is, of course, enormous and deserves a study of its own. What can be said positively, however, is that each society, without any exception, builds its public discourse around a coded set of normative rules which we, scholars of human societies, are expected to decode. Byzantine society of the mid-fifth century displays such a code, too. One major theme

---

1 First mentioned in his *Stratagems and Spoils: A Social Anthropology of Politics* (4th impr.; Oxford, 1990), p. 68. The concept is further developed in his *Treasons, Stratagems, and Spoils: How Leaders Make Practical Use of Beliefs and Values* (Boulder, 2001), pp. 120–127.

2 Such political speeches are typically dotted with *normative claims*: rather than statements of facts, these claims are in fact *ought statements*, describing what reality should be.

3 Primarily internal peace among Christians (see Averil Cameron, 'Constantine and the "peace of the church"', in: M. Mitchell and F. Young (ed.), *CHC*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 2006, pp. 538–551). Even today, discourse regarding peace is strongly prevalent in the governmental and presidential circles in Israel and the US respectively, precisely because of the fact that both nations are, in fact, embroiled in constant military and political clashes.

encrypted in the coded narrative of the delegates to Chalcedon was — however self-evident this observation may be — the Christian faith and its own unique set of abstract ideals, visualised images and, of course, unique linguistic terminology, without which, 'Constantine or no Constantine, Christianity would never have become a world religion'.[4] Mapping their own world, Christians spoke 'Christian' and it is also for this social reason, rather than for the sole purpose of reflecting various degrees of religiousness that Christians, the emperor and his 'secular' officials included, sprinkled their language, Greek, Syriac, Latin, or any other language, with a surprising abundance of religious imagery.

2. Marcian as a *Custos Fidei*

Marcian did not need to consult Max Weber's *Economy and Society* in order to be able to appreciate, even intuitively, the power of ideology.[5] A newly 'elected' emperor, Marcian could not possibly allow himself to neglect any of the parameters which constitute a total and comprehensive exercise of power: military, economic, political, and ideological.[6] Reflecting his role as continuer and promoter of the Christian faith, Marcian's speech is remarkable evidence of how a Late Antique Christian emperor spoke and practised the 'Christian' language. Responding to explicit acclamations in which he was hailed *custos fidei*,[7] and an agent or restorer of peace, the emperor seems to embrace the corresponding roles in every line of his address to the council, speaking first, of the need to crush heretic opposition to the Orthodox Church and the need to foil the plans of those who were ruining the church 'from within' and secondly, of his commitment to achieving inner harmony and *quietas*, or *pax* (εἰρήνη), within the Christian commonwealth. Understood in their political contexts, these two essentially Stoic terms were reflected, first and foremost, in the unity of the Roman empire in general, and of the Christian church in particular. Destroyer and healer — these were the two seemingly contradicting functions of the Byzantine emperor, as he assumed the role of *defensor fidei*.[8]

---

4 Cf. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, p. 14.

5 M. Weber, *Economy and Society: an Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, trans. G. Roth and C. Wittich, vol. 2 (New York, 1968).

6 A quartet of parameters discussed in Mann's *The Sources of Social Power*, pp. 22–28.

7 See, for example, the acclamations attested in the *versio antiqua*: *custodem fidei deus custodiat; pie et orthodoxe adversarium haereticorum deus custodiat*: 'may God protect the guardian of (our) faith; may God piously, and in keeping with the Orthodox faith, protect the adversary of the heretics' (Session VI.11, ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 176).

8 For the function of the Byzantine emperor as *defensor fidei*, see Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre*, p. 302.

Marcian was a public, political figure in an age, where the political and the religious often merged together. Every public appearance of the emperor, whether before soldiers in the army barracks, or before a collection of ecclesiastical delegates, carried the reinforced image of the emperor (and the empress) as *defensor fidei*.

Here follows a typical acclamation which stresses this important role of both the emperor, and his pious spouse:

> Through you orthodoxy has been confirmed, because of you there is no heresy. Heavenly king, protect the one on earth; the faith is secure through you. Heavenly king, protect the Augusta; the faith is secure through you. It is the one God who has done this. Heavenly king, protect the Augusta. You [two] are worthy of peace. It is you [Pulcheria] who drove out the heretics.[9]

This was the Byzantine emperor's primary source of authority and his *raison d'être* which determined both the content and form of his public communication. Subsequently, in direct continuation of the Roman principle of the emperor being *primus inter pares*, the Byzantine emperor stood both within the circle of the faithful, sharing the principles of Christendom with his co-religionists, but also outside it, guarding it from harmful intruders and admitting the newcomers.

There remains the question of against whom the Christian emperor should stand guard? Barbarians, to be sure, posed a threat not only to the physical well-being of the empire, but also to its Christian 'orthodox' nature.[10] Worse still, and a source of much concern to Christian writers throughout the ages were the 'enemies from within', those who at some stage challenged Christian orthodoxy, but eventually failed to gain the upper hand. We now know a great deal about the complex systems of the dissemination and appropriation of ideas in societies at large, and can hardly assume the exclusive contribution of one individual, however powerful, to these processes.

However, it is evident that Christian emperors saw themselves, and were seen by their subjects, as *defensores fidei*[11] — a function which dominated Christian

---

9 διὰ σοῦ ἡ ὀρθοδοξία ἐβεβαιώθη, διὰ σὲ οὐκ ἔνι αἵρεσις. οὐράνιε βασιλεῦ, τὸν ἐπίγειον φύλαξον· διὰ σοῦ βεβαία ἡ πίστις. οὐράνιε βασιλεῦ, τὴν αὐγούσταν φύλαξον· διὰ σοῦ βεβαία ἡ πίστις. εἰς θεὸς ὁ τοῦτο ποιήσας. οὐράνιε βασιλεῦ, τὴν αὐγούσταν φύλαξον. ἄξιοι τῆς εἰρήνης. τοὺς αἱρετικοὺς σὺ ἐδίωξας (VI.13).

10 For the concept of barbarians as agents of heresy, see W. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (Oxford, 1990), p. 148. In reality, a number of important 'barbarian' groups, such as the Goths, used religion, more specifically, Arianism, as an identity marker (see P. J. Gray, 'Barbarians and Ethnicity', in: Bowersock, Brown, Grabar (ed.), *Late Antiquity*, pp. 107–129, esp. pp. 121ff. Also compare with similar remarks made by former US President, George Bush Jr., regarding terrorist activity on American soil and the threats to 'the American way of life'.

11 See *Marcian as a Custos Fidei* starting on p. 175 above.

imperial propaganda from Antiquity to the Crusaders and beyond.[12] Nothing in Marcian's address to the council revealed any other imperial concern than that of the *defensor fidei*. The barbarians who at the time of the council were closing in on the borders of the empire were certainly on Marcian's mind. Yet Marcian does not address the barbarians, nor does he mention any other affair of state. He makes the internal enemies of the Christian church the centre-piece of his rhetoric, enemies who should be treated by him, Marcian, in the same way as Constantine had treated his own enemies.

    Finally, there remains the all-important theoretical question: did Marcian succeed or did he fail?[13] If our criterium for success remains Marcian's ability to implement the ideal of concord, then indeed he failed: Marcian failed in that the Council of Chalcedon actually opened the floor for centuries of dissension and disagreement. Having said that, how fair is it to judge a public figure on the basis of such unattainable criteria? Who *is* able to realise ideals? Any ideals? To be sure, the events at Chalcedon induced both applause and fierce critique. However, the latter only proves that Marcian and his entourage were the catalyst of an important and meaningful process in the annals of the Christian church. Whether this should be considered as a failure, remains very much an issue open to debate.

The Functions of Acclamations

A speech is always a product of both the rhetorician and his audience, each side tuning in to the wishes and concerns of the other. In this respect, Marcian's speech is no exception. The audience, too, has an active, albeit ceremonial and regulated part, in the form of public acclamations.[14] Such an acclamation, which conforms in every detail with Marcian's self-image and public agenda, is the hailing of the latter as *the new Constantine*.[15] By doing so, the delegates did not invent anything new. Following a well-established tradition of using Constantine as a Christian *exemplum*,[16] the delegates of the Council of Chalcedon

---

12 This sentiment of religious fervour, expressed in Crusader ideology in terms of *zelus fidei*, was subsequently transformed into the idealization of physical pain, or *sacrilegii dolor*, as discussed by B. Z. Kedar, 'Croisade et Jihad vus par l'enemi', in: *idem, Franks, Muslims, and Oriental Christians in the Latin Levant* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 345–355, esp. p. 350.

13 In private communications, Averil Cameron insists that in the context of Chalcedon, Marcian failed completely since he never actually succeeded in realizing his proclaimed ideal of ecclesiastical unity and peace. As explained above, I obviously disagree with her on this point.

14 See *The Audience as Senders or Receivers* on p. 88 above.

15 A volume of collected articles dedicated to the theme is by P. Magdalino (ed.), *New Constantines. The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1993).

16 Most instrumental in affixing the notion of God's achievement in Constantine was Eusebius of Caesarea who, in the first book of his *Life of Constantine* asserts the following: 'By him (i.e. Constantine) he (i.e. God) cleansed humanity of the Godless multitude, and set him up as a teacher of true devotion to himself for all nations, testifying with a loud voice for all to

followed both a literary, as well as a ceremonial tradition. The title of *the new Constantine*, or νέος Κωνσταντῖνος was, no doubt, one of the most common acclamatory formulas used in addressing Christian emperors in public and ritual occasions.[17] Acclamations were an important element in all types of public gatherings in the ancient world.[18] Regardless of their specific immediate context, acclamations played a fundamental social role in asserting and re-asserting the social bonds between those present.

In other words, to Marcian, the exclamation *the Orthodox one* is much more than a confirmation of the emperor's faith. It was 'a validation of the authority of leaders',[19] a ritualistic utterance whose main function was to prescribe loyalty to the imperial house and its establishments, the church included.[20] On these occasions, the expression of concord and unanimity — not only in one mind μία ψυχη, but also in one voice μία φωνή[21] — became the centre-piece of the ceremonial. On such occasions, rival parties often reverted to the exchange of abusive insults.[22] Unison, being an expression of earthly and divine order, had to be displayed in gesture, mime, and sound.

The auditory aspect in public gatherings in the Roman and Byzantine eras cannot be underestimated. The modern reader has only to step out of his or her relative passivity in order to get a sense of ancient gatherings in which texts were recited aloud, rather than consulted in silence. In this context, it becomes much easier and obvious to imagine the ancient *notarius* more as a vociferous court bailiff, than a timid secretary. To be sure, when examined in detail, yet taken as a coherent whole, numerous parts of the running text seem to be distinctly auditory and less archival or procedural in nature. For recording the presence of the emperor, it would be only reasonable to assume that of all sessions, the sixth session would display the strongest ceremonial and hence, most auditory, nature.

---

hear, that they should know the God who is, and turn from the error of those who do not exist at all' (trans. by A. Cameron and S. G. Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), p. 69).

17 See discussion in Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre*, pp. 141–168, esp. 142.

18 For an excellent historical survey and description of the evidence, see the study by Rouché, 'Acclamations', pp. 181–199, and esp. pp. 188–189 on church councils.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 188.

20 Roman emperors, Pagan and Christian alike, all had a clear grasp of the propagandist potential of mass gatherings and crowd manipulation (for discussion, see A. Cameron, *Circus Factions*, revised ed. (Oxford, 1999), pp. 157–192, esp. p. 174). This fact may well be the background to many a clash between domineering emperors and overly independent bishops. Bishops like John Chrysostom, who overtly preached against the presence of Christians at the theatres and the circus places, found themselves quite rapidly on a collision course with the emperor and his household (Cf. Amirav, *Rhetoric and Tradition*, pp. 15–22). Recapitulating on MacMullen's *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Cambridge, MA, 1966), discouraging mass gatherings might have been an additional factor which contributed to the branding of some bishops as such enemies.

21 Cf. Rouché, 'Acclamations', pp. 187–188.

22 On the exchange of abuse between rival parties in Chalcedon, see Rouché, *ibid.*, p. 186.

3. Attendance and Signatory Lists —
Ceremonial and Societal Functions

As in the previous and following sessions, the sixth session opens with a detailed listing of the delegates present. Discrepancies and apparent inaccuracies have led scholars to brand the attendance lists as plausible forgeries. Yet before speculating on the physical presence of individual delegates, and before assuming any malevolence on the part of the 'forger', it might be necessary first, to recapitulate on the motivation underlining such 'forgeries', or rather, manipulative 'misrepresentations', and secondly, to reconsider the issue in the specific context of the ceremonial and hence, social function, of these lists.

Doubts regarding the reliability of both attendance and signatory lists (i.e. lists of those bishops and their representatives who signed their approval of the Definition of Faith) had risen on account of discrepancies between the different lists, as well as on account of the high number of delegates listed which led to suspicions regarding their having been manipulated.[23] Regarding the latter point, wishing to stage Chalcedon as an ecumenical, all-important, and *legitimate* council, the patrons of the council, namely the imperial couple, had a clear interest in pointing out the overwhelming participation on the part of all factions of the church on one hand, and the wide extent of their respective realms on the other. To be sure, the lists meticulously documented the names of bishops and clerics, senior and junior alike, who came from all corners of the Roman empire: from urban centres, such as Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem to peripheral cities, such as Iabruda, Danaba, Arlana, and Corala.[24]

The theoretical ideal behind the documentation of these names is clear. However, how did this and such other lists function in the wider ceremonial context of the gatherings? Again, the key to fully grasping the ritual and ceremonial aspects of ecclesiastical and imperial public gatherings lies in assuming and, if possible, acknowledging their auditory nature. Further proof of the oral nature of the gatherings may be found in the subsequent list, consisting of the signatures of the fathers on the approved Definition of Faith. With each signatory opening with an indication of the cleric's name and function and ending with a sentence such as 'I have defined and signed', ὁρίσας ὑπέγραφα,

---

23 See discussion in Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 3, pp. 193–203. An attempt at explaining such discrepancies on technical grounds (i.e. the reliance of copyists, in the case of Ephesus I, on the original invitation list issued by the imperial officers) is provided by A. Crabbe (see *eadem*, 'The Invitation List to the Council of Ephesus and Metropolitan Hierarchy in the Fifth Century', *Theological Studies* N. S. 32 (1981), pp. 369–400.

24 On the diversity of sees represented and the corresponding mobility of the delegates, see Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*, pp. 98–99.

these personal, or personalised, confirmations of faith seem to function as acclamatory formulas.

Here the following two scenarios are equally possible: the delegate would stand up, while ceremonially declaring his name and re-iterating the decision of the council. Alternatively, the address to each delegate by his name, carried out by the *notarius*, would serve as an invitation to the delegate to stand up and subsequently give his approval to the Definition of the Faith.[25] One may imagine a crammed hall, packed with delegates, all engaged— each in his turn and in an orderly manner — in responding to the call of the *notarius*.

If applied to the entire session, a similar acclamatory nature can be attributed to the attendance list as well: a long and meticulous list of names whose ceremonial function can be fully grasped only if we assume that they were also read aloud, carried out, again, by the imperial *notarius*. Such a public presentation of the delegates, one should think, prescribed a reasonable degree of transparency. As already suggested earlier, manipulation of the records was by no means easy to apply. For example, adding or deleting the names of prominent figures (it would be quite hard, for example, to declare the presence of an absentee emperor), having a clear discrepancy between the length of the list of delegates, comprised of both senior, high profile figures and of junior clerics from all corners of the Christian world,[26] and the number of delegates present (too many names when faced with a half empty hall would give a rather odd and non-ecumenical, non-festive impression).

Our assumption regarding the relative accuracy of the lists is further reinforced by the stress on the part of the scribe to produce a meticulous recording of all ecclesiastical representatives and their absentee patrons — a custom designed primarily to avoid nominal forgeries and manipulations of the decisions of the council, but also and not least important, to preserve a high public and ceremonial profile.

As with all other lists, the list which adorns the sixth session is undoubtedly hierarchical.[27] However, what makes the list in question unique is the fact that the bloc of ecclesiastical delegates precedes the listing of imperial officials.

---

25 This observation is also shared by Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 217, n. 21.

26 Christians of all social and educational strata expressed active and keen interest in theological doctrine. Rioting monks and, as Gregory of Nyssa testifies in his *Oratio de deitate filii et spiritus sancti* (*PG* 47.557) to the situation following the Second Council of Constantinople when everyone and everybody felt obliged and capable of conducting theological debates, Gregory is obviously critical of this phenomenon. However, theological debates amongst street vendors might also reflect cultural vitality in that people were indeed preoccupied with the hot theological (and hence political) topics of the day. Furthermore, Christians did not restrict their theological debates to their immediate theological and geographical circles. They also had the technical and financial means to broaden their geographical horizons, as is testified by Ammianus in his *Res Gestae* (see note to p. 35).

27 On the delegates' hierarchical order of appearance, see chapter II above.

Turning again to the auditory nature of this session, one could explain the inversion in the highly ceremonial nature of this particular session: having to announce each and every name out loud, the *notarius*, or any other imperial clerk, would have had to burden the imperial ears with the names of hundreds of junior clerics. Furthermore, by postponing the recitation of the imperial list, and with only thirty-eight imperial officials who needed to be announced,[28] a considerable shortening of time might be achieved between the announcement of the presence of the emperor and the start of his speech.

4. The Emperor Marcian's Speeches — General Features

The emperor's speech is a remarkable document which commands great attention, both for its content as well as for its stylistic features.[29] However, no less important is the fact that Marcian's speech was far from being monolithic and continuous: it exhibits countless features which we would, nowadays, readily classify as interruptions. Yet these 'interruptions', predominantly in the form of acclamations, are woven tightly into the fabric of the emperor's address to the council and are to be treated as an integral part of the episode as a whole.

Far removed from the popular image of Marcian as an unassuming, if not boorish, soldier,[30] first addressing the council in Latin and subsequently in Greek, the emperor displays linguistic virtuosity comparable to that of a trained rhetorician. When attempting to reconstruct Marcian's gestures, it would be most reasonable to assume that the Latin speech was addressed mainly to the ears and eyes of the representatives of Pope Leo, whom Marcian, concluding a long and prolific correspondence with the Pope,[31] wished to honour with a personal, tailor-made address in the Pope's native language.

This is a remarkable example of *language switch*,[32] an earlier example of which is recorded in association with Constantine, a Latin speaker, and his

---

28 Officially, the emperor is not included in the list, for his name and that of the empress are mentioned in a separate paragraph, thus stressing the status of the imperial couple as superior to that of the delegates.

29 Marcian's speech evokes lamentations on several fronts: first, it is regrettable that other aspects of his reign are far less fully documented, if at all. Second, that, unless transmitted through the filter of a favourable author, notably Eusebius' treatment of Constantine, Marcian's speech is unique in the pantheon of 'historical' — as opposed to 'rhetorical' — imperial speeches.

30 For example, A. A. Vasiliev flatly describes Marcian as 'capable, but modest' (Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol. 1 (Madison, 1927), pp. 130–133, esp. 130).

31 Correspondence was also carried out in Latin and required no subsequent translation into Greek, see Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*, p. 94.

32 Also see p. 152 above.

address in Greek to the delegates of Nicaea,[33] whereby the speaker, or more precisely, *sender* opts, for reasons of socialisation, for a language, other than his native or 'natural' language, or dialect.[34] Bearing in mind that in the mid-fifth century, Latin was still the official language of both parts of the empire,[35] Marcian's Latin address can be taken not only as a token of politeness towards the Westerners, but also and perhaps, mainly, as a symbol of the Byzantines' 'Roman' identity, demonstrated by the marginalization of Greek in formal and legal contexts.[36] When opting for Latin first, Marcian subsequently opted for extreme formality, by so doing hoping to anchor the proceedings of the Chalcedonian council as a formal promulgation, accepted by both emperors and their subjects.

Language switch falls under the phenomenon of *effective rhetoric*, whereby the speaker, building on the element of surprise, wishes to achieve an immediate impact on his audience by inducing, also through the unexpected use of a different language, feelings of awe, reverence, and even mockery.[37] What feelings were induced by Marcian's language switch is impossible to reconstruct in full. However, one can note that the emperor's Latin address drew public acclamation, apparently excited, yet standard in form:[38] 'Long live the emperor! Long live Augusta! To the Orthodox ones long life! He is the one son, Constantine. To Marcian, the new Constantine!'[39]

---

33 Cf. Cameron, 'Constantine', in: Young and Mitchell (ed.), *The Cambridge History*, p. 538.

34 Further discussion and examples are found in Coulmas, *Sociolinguistics*, pp. 111–125.

35 Dagron, 'Aux origines de la civilization Byzantine'. Something about the Byzantines' 'Roman' identity can be learnt from the fact that legal texts continued to be promulgated in Latin in completely hellenised contexts (a fact which the fourth-century rhetorician, Libanius, complains about). It is, again, extraordinary that Justinian's Novels, dated to the mid-sixth century, contain the first promulgation ever drafted in predominantly Greek.

36 On language choice as a marker of social stratification and social identity in Papua New Guinea, see Sankoff, *The Social Life of Language*, pp. 13–16.

37 Cases of effective rhetoric through *language switch* vary enormously in their context and application. Depending on the social situation, examples of language switch include the insertion of French words into a mundane English conversation, so as to display erudition and elegance; in migrant communities, using different languages with different members of one household; opting unilaterally for one specific language, not previously used in the conversation and deprived of an immediate linguistic context, as in cases when a foreigner uses the standard local language, but gets a reply in English. Designed, perhaps, to 'identify' the foreigner as such, the use of English in the latter case may induce anger on the part of the foreigner who attempted to speak in the local language. See also, Coulmas, *Sociolinguistics*, p. 111.

38 Roueché, 'Acclamations', pp. 182–184.

39 Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τοῦ βασιλέως. Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς αὐγούστας. τῶν ὀρθοδόξων πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη. εἶς υἱὸς Κωνσταντῖνος. Μαρκιανῶι νέωι Κωνσταντίνωι (VI.3).

The atmosphere, then, is that of exalted unanimity: *all exclaimed* — not only those who were in agreement with the imperial standpoint, but also those at either end of the dogmatic strife, i.e. Nestorians and Eutychians.[40] Interestingly, the word *all* here suggests either a rather considerable passive knowledge of Latin, or a prior knowledge on the part of the audience of the emperor's speech. From a dramatic and visual point of view, Marcian, assuming the role of the chief actor, used the pause supplied by the public acclamation to switch back to Greek, perhaps removing his gaze from the Western delegates, and turning it towards the Greek-speaking audience.[41]

Once more, Marcian's speech was hailed with unanimous and standard acclamation:

> To Marcian the new Constantine! Long live the emperor! Long live Augusta! To the orthodox ones long life! To Marcian the Christ-loving! May your rule continue throughout our lives, […] O you worthy of Orthodoxy, Christ-loving ones, may abundance be yours.[42]

This acclamation is one of many intermezzos in the course of the disputations whose many functions, not unlike the similar acclamation of emperors in the circus and theatres,[43] are both ceremonial and practical. The ceremonial functions of acclamatory hailing are rather obvious and, given the abundant existing sociological and historical literature on the subject,[44] are now almost self-explanatory: affirmation and reinstitution of authority on the part of the ruler, submission to authority, or its rejection, on the part of the ruled, expression of empathy or hostility — all tangible expressions of the relationship between ruler and ruled in essentially totalitarian, non-democratic, societies.

What can be said about the practical functions of acclamations? In public gatherings attended by the emperor or his representatives, acclamations have a gratulatory role: they are designed, among other roles, to mark the entering and departure of the emperor to and from the public setting, e.g. circus, theatre, or church council.[45] In this context, it would be unwise for the reader to assume any degree of spontaneity in the modern sense of the word, i.e. that which implies randomness in the choice of words and the time of execution.[46] In the

---

40 Cf. Rouché, *ibid.*, pp. 186–187.

41 For a discussion of the differences between the Greek and Latin versions see *Ancient Editorial Strategies* on p. 26 above.

42 Μαρκιανῶι νέωι Κωνσταντίνωι. Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τοῦ βασιλέως. Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς αὐγούστας. τῶν ὀρθοδόξων πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη. Μαρκιανῶι τῶι φιλοχρίστωι. διὰ βίου ἡ ἡμῶν Βασιλεία, ἄξιοι τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας. Φιλόχριστοι, ἄφθονα ἡμῖν (VI.6).

43 Cf. Cameron, *Circus Factions*, pp. 231–232.

44 See M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge, 1986).

45 Cf. Rouché, 'Acclamations', p. 183.

46 Compare with exclamations discussed on p. 137 above.

ancient world, acclamations, despite their passionate and excited appearance, were anything but spontaneous.[47] We know that even the shortest of acclamations reflects a fixed wording. In the same vein, acclamations following the physical entrance or departure of the emperor have a very specific and defined timing.

Similarly, acclamations which are shouted, for example, in anticipation of an imperial speech, or after its conclusion, have a gratulatory nature and hence, have a distinct and fixed timing. If wording and timing are to be taken as the principal markers of spontaneity, then acclamations such as those seen here are by no means spontaneous. Rather, they form an integral part of the ceremonial ritual. Paradoxically, the lack of spontaneity as it is understood in modernity, gives the crowd the mental space necessary to organize itself as a group. Quite contrary to recent stipulations regarding the existence of a 'cheer-leader', whose function was to oversee and orchestrate public acclamations,[48] it is plausible that, given the strict social etiquette which regulated crowd participation in events attended by the emperor, no such person would have been needed at all.

The section which follows features the address of Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, to Marcian, requesting permission to read aloud the Definition of Faith, agreed upon in the previous session. Curiously, and distinctly contrary to the prevailing custom, Aetius did not approach Anatolius, or any other official, with a request to address the emperor. Instead, Aetius treated the emperor with an unusual familiarity in that he dispensed with the services of the imperial official as the customary intermediary. His subsequent plea to go ahead with the reading of the text in question ('I have this to hand and, if it pleases the will of your serenity, I shall read it')[49] was directed to no less than the emperor himself, who, in all respects, as if assuming Anatolius' position, gave the cleric specific orders uttered in his own voice: 'read it!', Ἀνάγνωθι.

The emperor's speech, then, is far from being the event signalling the end of his role in the proceedings. The ceremonial magnitude of the occasion is demonstrated first in the marked *performative*: Aetius both announces his intention to read the Definition of Faith, rather than just proceeding to do so, and he awaits the emperor's verbal approval to carry out his intention. The dynamics

---

47 Affirming the rigid context in which acclamations were produced in ninth-century royal Byzantine ceremonies, McCormick states that it was the *praepositos*, the descendant of the late Roman *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, or chamberlain, who was entrusted with the task of composing the text of imperial victory acclamations (McCormick, *Triumphal Rulership*), pp. 222–223.

48 It is plausible that such a cheer-leader was more necessary in *less* formal and codified occasions for example, in the ancient hippodrome or, nowadays, in football matches, when the cheering is continuous and carried out simultaneously with the main activity in hand.

49 ἔχων τοῦτον μετὰ χεῖρας, εἰ παρίσταται νεύματι τῆς ὑμετέρας ἡμερότητος, ἀναγνώσομαι.

between Aetius and Marcian suggest that both had very specific roles in mind, performed in a pre-calculated manner. What, then, was Marcian's role in the sixth session? After having declared his *credo* Marcian would certainly have been expected to retreat into a more aloof and passive role, leaving the floor to Anatolius, or some other official.

The subsequent reading of the Definition of Faith and the detailed testimonials which ensued exemplify the position of Marcian as a divinely inspired witness to, and hence as the supreme arbitrator, of the matter in hand. To be sure, each and every delegate not only addressed his verbal confirmation to his fellow delegates, but also and mainly to the *persona* of Marcian, who, on this occasion, took the trouble to hear the phrase *I have subscribed* no less than some four hundred times.

Having finished uttering his speech, Marcian, as has been discussed in relation to other officials and delegates, must have taken his seat. He then made a point of hearing each and every delegate, each standing up and declaring submissively his position face to face with the seated emperor. The theological declaration of faith had become a personal declaration of faith to the emperor. There cannot be a more suitable analogy to illustrate the dynamics between the members of the triangle comprised of emperor, state officials, and crowd (here, clerical delegates) than the picture of the Roman general, marching across his troops, surveying them with his own very eyes, imposing his authority through his physical presence, but also lending personal authority to the soldiers' hope that their general is a worthy general, that they are ready for battle.

Upon hearing the declarations of each and every delegate individually, the emperor, again, rather than Anatolius, concluded this important and ceremonial part of the session in a direct address to the delegates. It was, in fact, an appeal to the audience to openly confirm as a group what each of them has just confirmed individually: 'Let the holy council say whether the definition which has now been read has been pronounced in accordance with the consensus of all the most sacred bishops.'[50] At first, the emperor's appeal to the collective body of delegates may seem redundant: what is the practical gain in declaring again as a group what each has just declared individually? However, in appealing to the audience as a group there is no doubt that the emperor wished to make a propagandist gain, for it was, in fact, an appeal for a public acclamation, a reconfirmation of the emperor's authority and that of *his* council. The delegates, to be sure, responded readily and enthusiastically. The public acclamation which followed was undoubtedly enthusiastic, however standard in its wording, style, and tone:

---

50 Λεγέτω ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος εἰ κατὰ συναίνεσιν πάντων τῶν ὁσιωτάτων ἐπισκόπων ὁ νῦν ἀναγνωσθεὶς ὅρος ἐξεφωνήθη (VI.10).

> We all believe accordingly, it begins, one faith, one opinion! We all hold the same. We have all assented and signed. We are all orthodox. This is the faith of the fathers. This is the faith of the apostles.[51] This is the faith of the orthodox. This faith has saved the world.[52]

In their acclamation the delegates confirm, again, the DNA of their communal being: their unity (here singled out in the word πάντες, expressed as a symmetrical tricolon),[53] the homogeneity of their faith (stressed as a variation on the same theme: 'one faith, one opinion', μία πίστις μία γνώμη, with the climax being the self-professed orthodoxy of all present, forming a unified body of believers: 'We are all orthodox', πάντες ὀρθόδοξοι ἐσμέν), and the sources of their authority[54] (the Fathers of the Church) whom the delegates are most tellingly mentioning here before the Apostles are mentioned, and, again, reverting to the idea of the community, the orthodox belief of their peers, '… of the fathers, … of the apostles, … of the orthodox': … τῶν πατέρων, … τῶν ἀποστόλων, … τῶν ὀρθοδόξων.

Having confirmed their faith with enthusiastic conclamations, it was next the turn of the Emperor himself (and subsequently, his spouse, the Empress Pulcheria), in acknowledgement of his role as the instigator of unity, who was made the focus of subsequent accalamations:

> To Marcian, the new Constantine, the new Paul, the new David! The years of David to the Emperor! (Grant), Lord, a pious life to him, the new Constantine, the new Marcian. You are the peace of the world. (Grant), Lord, a pious life to him. Your faith will protect you. You honour Christ and he will protect you. You have strengthened orthodoxy. You believe as did the apostles.[55]

---

51 If taken literally, the phrase *we have all assented and signed* may be taken as a proof that the council was attended solely by official, clerical or imperial delegates and that there were no lay onlookers present.

52 Πάντες οὕτως πιστεύομεν. μία πίστις μία γνώμη. πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ φονοῦμεν. πάντες συναινέσαντες ὑπεγράφαμεν. πάντες ὀρθόδοξοι ἐσμέν. αὕτη ἡ πίστις τῶν πατέρων. αὕτη ἡ πίστις τῶν ἀποστόλων. αὕτη ἡ πίστις τῶν ὀρθοδόξων. αὕτη ἡ πίστις τὴν οἰκουμένην ἔσωσεν (VI.11).

53 See pp. 136, 144, 146, and 171 above.

54 Compare *Marcian's Sources of Authority*, starting on p. 192 below.

55 Μαρκιανῶι νέωι Κωνσταντίνωι νέωι Παύλωι νέωι Δαυίδ. τὰ ἔτη τοῦ Δαυὶδ τῶι βασιλεῖ. εὐσεβῆ, κύριε, ζωὴν αὐτῶι, νέωι Κωνσταντίνωι, νέωι Μαρκιανῶι. ὑμεῖς ἡ εἰρήνη τῆς οἰκουμένης. εὐσεβῆ, κύριε, ζωὴν αὐτῶι. φυλάξει ὑμᾶς ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν. τὸν Χριστὸν τιμᾶις, αὐτός σε φυλάξει. τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν σὺ ἐβεβαίωσας. ὡς οἱ ἀπόστολοι, οὕτω πιστεύετε. τῆς αὐγούστης πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη. ὑμεῖς φωστῆρες τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας. διὰ ταῦτα πανταχοῦ εἰρήνη, τοὺς φωστῆρας τῆς εἰρήνης κύριε φύλαξον. τοὺς φωστῆρας τῆς οἰκουμένης κύριε φύλαξον. αἰωνία μνήμη νέωι Κωνσταντίνωι.

The issue of authoritarian figures surfaces time and again: the Emperor Marcian, according to those acclaiming him, derives his own authority from the fact that he himself chose to follow the 'right' sources of authority, beginning, quite astonishingly, with an imperial exemplum (Constantine), moving on to a central apostolic figure (Paul), and ending with a biblical exemplum (David), thus moving, from the delegates' perspective, backwards, from modernity to antiquity and Biblical times.[56] The towering figure of the emperor,[57] chairing the session almost single-handedly and actively evoking acclamations from the enthusiastic and eager clerical crowd, marked the high point of the Council of Chalcedon. This picture contains in a nutshell the essence of the relationship between emperor and subjects in Late Antique Byzantium: on the one hand, we have an emperor who is anxious to re-confirm his authority time and again, publicly, and in countless contexts, religious, military, and civil. On the other hand, there is always the bulk of masses, seeking contact with their ruler, be it in the army, the theatre, the circus, or the church council, looking up to him for reassurance, and lending (or denying) legitimacy to his reign via public acclamations.

We should now pause to say a few words about the nature of the acclamations in question. These, mostly standard in form and wording, often take up a space of not more than five lines. A few exclamations, however, are markedly longer and verbose, and though containing formulaic phrases, seem to be much more complex in terms of the arrangement of these phrases (alternating between praise of the emperor and his wife who is given the standard portrayal as Helena)[58], broader sets of images, and specific and elaborate content (for example, references to Nestorius and Eutyches). Such elaborate acclamations appear twice Νεστορίωι καὶ Εὐτυχεῖ καὶ Διοσκόρωι ἀνάθεμα. These acclamations, following the public recitation of the Definition, pressed for both the closure of the sixth session and, more importantly, the dismissal of the council as a whole:

> All exclaimed: 'Just is the decision of the emperor. O you [Marcian] worthy of the Holy One![59] One Easter for the whole world! Put an end to the misfortunes of the bishops. The Holy One will protect you. We beg you, dismiss us. You are pious, O emperor; dismiss us.'[60]

---

56 See discussion on historical *exempla* on p. 60 above (with footnotes).

57 In accordance with conventions (see discussion of seating arrangement above) the emperor must have stood up when addressing the council and resumed his seat, albeit special and central, when finishing his address. These visual mini-evocations of an imperial grand entrance had, no doubt, an important ceremonial role.

58 Πουλχερία νέα Ἑλένη. τῆς Ἑλένης τὴν πίστιν σὺ ἐπεδείξω. τῆς Ἑλένης τὸν ζῆλον σὺ ἐπεδείξω. ἡ ὑμετέρα ζωὴ πάντων ἀσφάλεια. ἡ ὑμετέρα πίστις δόξα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

59 i.e. according to Price and Gaddis, either the Trinity or St Euphemia.

60 Πάντες ἐβόησαν· Δικαία ἡ κρίσις τοῦ βασιλέως. ἄξιε τῆς ἁγίας [τριάδος]. ἓν πάσχα τῆι οἰκουμένηι. Τὰς περιστάσεις τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὑμεῖς κωλύσατε. ἡ ἁγία [τριὰς] φυλάξει σε. Δεόμεθα, ἀπόλυσον ἡμᾶς. Εὐσεβὴς εἶ, βασιλεῦ, ἀπόλυσον ἡμᾶς (VI.22)

Their wording was bold and uncompromising: 'To Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus anathema!' Paradoxically, the boldness of the delegates reflects nothing but their fatigue and their desperation to reach a consensus, based on their hope that now extremist views had finally been muted and silenced, and that the centrists, regardless of their initial point of departure, would surely emerge as homogeneous, mild, and reunited. In summation of this point, one could say that contrary to short acclamations, longer and more complex acclamations must have required preparation and prior agreement on their wording.[61] This observation should come as no surprise, given the official and ceremonial nature of the gathering and the obvious difficulty in controlling and orchestrating longer pieces of texts, sung in time, rhythmically,[62] and in unison. So much for the pomp and circumstance around the emperor's presence in a church council: what can be said, however, about the content of Marcian's speeches? Marcian, on his part, declared his first and foremost concern to be the consolidation of Christian orthodoxy.

Before we proceed to analyse Marcian's speech, the testimony of the (Latin) *Acts* regarding his bilingualism is rather striking and cannot be dismissed out of hand: *He* [Marcian] *delivered the following address to the council first in Latin and after the address in Latin then in Greek*.[63] The factual information which

---

61 Making a similar observation regarding a few remarkably long acclamations, MacMullen seems to imply a later interpolation: 'The Statement made is too long; we can't believe anyone shouted this, and most particularly, a mass of people would never choose sarcasm for its style of comment' (MacMullen, *Voting about God*, p. 87).

62 Averil Cameron places semi-metrical public chanting in the wider context of political and religious dialogues: '[…] but there is a great deal more evidence of songs, dialogues and organised and spontaneous acclamation on political and religious topics, especially from the fifth, and still more the sixth centuries; some of these, such as the so-called Akta dia Kalopodion and the factional acclamations, actually take the form of semi-metrical altercations between organised groups and spokesmen. Any public meeting could be an occasion for such chanting, from church councils to meetings of the senate, or to imperial occasions. Our evidence is particularly rich from the ecclesiastical assemblies of the fifth and sixth centuries — exactly the period when metrical dialogues and dramatic dialogues in homilies were becoming an established feature. (Cameron, 'Disputation', in: Reinink and Vanstiphout (ed.), *Dispute Poems*, pp. 98–99; with references to Al. Cameron, Circus Factions, pp. 231f., 245f., 318–333; Rouiché, 'Acclamations', pp. 181–190; P. Maas, 'Metrische Akklamationen der Byzantiner', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 21 (1912), pp. 28–51. On the *Akta dia Kalopodion*, see Michael and Mary Whitby, *The Chronicon Paschale* (Liverpool, 1989), pp. 113–116.

63 This is attested in Rusticus' version: *Dominus noster perpetuus augustus allocutus est sanctum synodum primum Latine et posmodum Graece [...]* The Greek version is less informative: Ὁ θειότατος καὶ εὐσεβέστατος ἡμῶν δεσπότης Μαρκιανὸς ὁ αἰώνιος αὔγουστος τὴν δύναμιν τῆς προτεταγμένης προσφωνήσεως καὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ προσεφώνησεν οὕτως· (VI.4).

can be deduced from the text is that Marcian did indeed deliver his speech in both languages (rather than have a clerk deliver a simultaneous translation). It is much more probable that Greek was Marcian's first language but, on the other hand, the army used Latin and again, it is not known whether there was a speech writer present. But in the course of Session VI he engaged in dialogue, in Greek, with the bishops.[64]

Coming back to the text, the brief passage cited above is extraordinary indeed, as it reflects not only Marcian's own education and that of officers in the public service, but also the dynamics of language switch where a preference for a particular dialect or language indicates a rhetorical agenda in that the speaker consciously adapts himself or herself to the particular audience he or she has in mind. Thus, in the case of a predominantly Greek-speaking audience (a situation which is largely described as *non-reciprocal intelligibility*),[65] choosing to address the council in Latin first could be seen as an attempt on Marcian's part to appease and please the Papal delegates.

5. Marcian's Speeches — Discourse Analysis

Marcian's first speech to the council began as follows:[66]

> When first we were chosen to reign by divine judgement, among so many pressing matters of state no issue gave us greater concern than that the orthodox and true Christian faith, which is holy and pure, should be instilled without ambiguity in the souls of all.[67]

This is a conventional opening which conforms in every detail with the language and tone of legal documents. As already mentioned above, most striking is the choice of Latin, here adopted by the emperor most markedly and remarkably in a live speech, rather than in the more academic and passive process of

---

64 See Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*, pp. 86–87.

65 Cf. J. B. Pride, 'Code-switching', in: *The Social Meaning of Language* (Oxford, 1971), p. 27.

66 As far as Marcian's speech(es) are concerned, the primary version is the Latin text (Rusticus' version), since the Greek version is a translation of Marcian's Latin address to the council.

67 *Vbi primum diuino iudico ad imperium sumus electi, inter tantas necessitates rei publicæ nulla nos magis causa constrinxit quam ut orthodoxa et uera fides Christiana, quæ sancta atque pura est, indubitata omnium animis insideret* (Ἐν προοιμίοις τῆς ἡμετέρας βασιλείας, θείαι ψήφωι ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν αἱρεθέντες, πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπασῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων φροντίδων οὐδὲν οὕτω καὶ βουλῆς καὶ σπουδῆς ἄξιον ἐνομίσαμεν ὡς τὸ περὶ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν ἁγίαν καὶ ἀληθῆ τυγχάνουσαν ὁμογνώμονας ἅπαντας εἶναι καὶ μηδὲν περὶ αὐτὴν ἀμφίβολον ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐγκαθεσθῆναι ψυχαῖς — VI.4).

drafting a law.[68] Another such common feature is the use of the plural form to denote promulgation issued by both Eastern and Western emperors. The plural form persists throughout the speech, e.g.:

> For this reason we were eager that the holy council should take place[69] […] for it was to confirm the faith and not to exercise power of any kind that we wished to attend the council according to the example of the religious prince Constantine […].[70]

And further on:

> It will be for the Divine Majesty to maintain firmly in perpetuity that which, with a holy mind, we desire to come about.[71]

Furthermore, the conventional wording of the opening lines, stressing the legitimacy of the emperors, the ever-pressing concern for state affairs, and the fatherly care for the souls of their subjects, is almost formulaic in nature, as it finds many parallels in the religious promulgations which are documented in the *Codex Theodosianus*.[72] Each and every word is carefully selected to serve the emperor's propagandist agenda as well as possible: the accession to the throne by divine decree — a statement which, no doubt, also embodies a sincere conviction;[73] the confidence and aptitude of an emperor who, deriving social authority from the *inherent sacredness of sovereign power*,[74] finds leisure and resources to deal with spirituality 'alongside so many pressing matters of state': *inter*

---

68 On the degree of the emperor's involvement in drafting of the law, issuing edicts and decrees, and sitting in judgement on what Fergus Millar describes as *formal sessions of a semi-public nature* see Millar, *The Emperor*, pp. 228–240, esp. 230; 252–259; 507–549.

69 *Qua de re sanctam synodum hoc videlicet proposito fieri studuimus* (ταύτην ἰάσασθαι βουλόμενοι τὴν ἀγίαν ἡμῶν ἠθροίσαμεν σύνοδον […]).

70 *Nos enim ad fidem corroborandam, non ad potentiam aliquam exercendam exemplo religiosi principis Constantini synodo interesse voluimus […]* (ἡμεῖς γὰρ βεβαιότα τοῖς πραττομένοις προσθήσοντες, οὐ δυνάμεως ἐπίδειξιν ποιησόμενοι παρεῖναι τῆι συνόδωι ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ὑπόδειγμα ποιησάμενοι τὸν τῆς θείας λήξεως Κωνσταντῖνον — VI.4). The actual absence of the Western emperor and the subsequent felicitations of Marcian and his Augusta may indicate the mental inclusion of Pulcheria in the college of emperors.

71 *Erit autem divinae maiestatis, id quod sancto animo fieri desideramus, in aeternum firmiter custodiri* (ἔσται δὲ τῆς θείας προνοίας τοῦθ' ὅπερ εὐσεβεῖ γενέσθαι προθέσει σπουδάζομεν, εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐπὶ τῆι παρ' ὑμῶν ὠφελείαι φυλαχθῆναι βέβαιον).

72 Ample comparable texts are contained in section XVI of the *codex Theodosianus* which is dedicated to religious promulgation.

73 Belief in the divine sanctioning behind the elevation of a ruler to the throne stretches beyond the confines of the ancient world. See E. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).

74 C. Geertz, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma. Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in: J. Ben David and T.N. Clark (ed.), *Culture and Its Creators. Essays in Honour of Edward Shills* (Chicago, 1977), pp. 150–171; Cf. *idem*, *Local Knowledge. Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology* (New York, 1983), pp. 121–146.

tantas necessitates rei publicae[75]— matters which, curiously enough, are never specified and are only mentioned in passing.[76]

Even in the opening lines, their wording is carefully concentrated on the expression of feelings: 'no issue gave us greater concern': *nulla nos magis causa constrinxit.*[77] This rhetorical emphasis on the imperial feelings is designed, so it seems, to project a self-image of a caring, yet resolute emperor. This rhetorical line is kept throughout the speech: 'we were eager': *studuimus* (βουλόμενοι); 'it is our concern': *stadium autem nostrum est*; 'we desire to come about': *desideramus*. Eagerness, concern, and desire are all associated with feelings, and designed to highlight initiative, courage, and resolution. Like a good father, the emperor is aware of everything which happens in his realm, from the marching of troops to the minute details of dogma. This sense of fatherly authority, conveyed in both subtle and bold expressions, is concerned with the initial convening of the council, as well as with the enforcement of its resolutions: '[we] may seem to have imposed a burden on you': thus tacitly referring to the emperor's ability to convene the council despite the delegates' initial unwillingness to do so.

A bolder attempt at displaying regal authority is the following prohibition of theological discourse,[78] which, in sociological terms, amounts to the exercise of social control by means of *linguistic sanctioning*:[79]

> […] even in the future no one should dare, on the subject of the birth of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to argue in a way contrary to what the apostolic preaching and the concordant ordinances of the 318 holy fathers are known to have bequeathed to posterity, in accordance also with the testimony contained in the letter sent to Flavian of holy memory, Bishop of the city of Constantinople, by holy Leo, Pope of the city of Rome, who governs the apostolic see.[80]

---

75 The Greek translation even stresses that matters of faith come *before* and *prior to* the affairs of the empire: πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπασῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων φροντίδων.

What could those problems be: barbarians at the door; a hostile Persian Empire; the consolidation of a brand new regime? Also see the introduction above. In any case, in order to achieve the most effective rhetorical impact, the promulgator, or speaker, usually remains vague and unspecific regarding the problems, imaginary or real, at hand.

76 Curiously enough, a similar 'rhetorical obscurity' is consistently maintained also in respect of the dogmatic issues in hand: the Definition of Faith, having been mentioned only once and carefully recited from an official paper.

77 οὐδὲν οὕτω καὶ βουλῆς καὶ σπουδῆς ἄξιον ἐνομίσαμεν.

78 See *Dogma as a No-go Zone* on p. 166 above.

79 See pp. 70–71 above.

80 *[…] et salvatoris nostril Iesu Chrisi aliter disputare quam apostolica praedicatio et institute trecentorum decem et octo sanctorum partum eidem convenientia posteritati tradidisse noscuntur, sicut etiam sancti Leonis papae urbis Romae, qui sedem apostolicam gubernat, missa ad sanctae memoriae Flavianum Constantinopolitanae urbis episcoporum testantur* (οὕτως τὸ ἀνθρώπινον θρησκεύειν γένος καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ πᾶσαν περιαιρεθῆναι τοῖς τολμῶσιν αὐθάδειαν περὶ τῆς γεννήσεως τοῦ δεσπότου καὶ σοτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

This passage is no different in style and tone to equivalent passages in legal documents. The recourse to sources of authority is also typical of legal documents whose scope for enforcement lies in their very authoritative and hence, legitimate, nature.

Marcian's Sources of Authority

What are Marcian's sources of authority? Arranged in a descending order of importance, Marcian names three sources of authority: the apostolic preaching, namely the letters of Paul, the decrees of the Council of Nicaea[81] (and subsequent councils in Constantinople and Ephesus)[82], and finally, the *Tome* of Pope Leo. The latter is a remarkable and indisputable piece of evidence of the status and prestige of the see of Rome in the East, which contributed to the Byzantines' conscious efforts to hold on to their all-round 'Roman' identity, while marginalizing Greek in formal contexts.[83] On a more practical level, it is clear that in his attempt to achieve a resolution of the theological and ecclesiastical problem in hand, Marcian treated Pope Leo more as an elderly, senior advisor, than as a cleric who was his subject.[84]

This expression of reverence towards Pope Leo may well have been motivated also by Marcian's wish to please his Western counterpart.[85] The reverence towards Pope Leo is amply illustrated in the emperor's extensive correspon-

---

ἕτερόν τι φρονεῖν ἢ διαλογίζεσθαι παρὰ τὰ κηρυχθέντα μὲν παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, παραδοθέντα δὲ νῦν συμφώνως παρὰ τῶν τῃ ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν τῶν ἐν Νικαίαι, ὅν τρόπον καὶ ἡ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου Λέοντος τοῦ τῆς βασιλίδος Ῥώμης ἀρχιεπισκόπου τοῦ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον κυβερνῶντος ἐπιστολὴ διαπεμφθεῖσα πρὸς τὸν τῆς εὐλαβοῦς μνήμης Φλαβιανὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῆς νέας Βασιλίδος Ῥώμης γεγονότα σημαίνει — VI.4).

81 In addition to the occasional references in the proceedings of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the events at the Council of Nicaea were summarized in part by Eusebius of Caesarea, an eye witness (*Life of Constantine* III.6), the church historians Socrates (*HE* I.8), and Sozomen (*HE* I.16–20), and by the later historians Theodoret (*HE* I.6–9) and Athanasius (*Ad afros epistula synodica,* and *De decretis*).

82 For the gradual process of the establishment of the ecumenical *regula fidei*, see H. de Halleux, 'La reception du symbole oecuménique', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 61 (1985), pp. 5–47.

83 See *The Two Romes: Byzantine and Roman Identities* on p. 58 above.

84 From a papal perspective, the Popes presumed their *auctoritas* to determine what the right faith was, whereas the emperors only possessed the *potestas* (and, one might add, the obligation) to enforce it (see V. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church* (Oxford, 2008), p. 75). A recent important study on Pope Leo is by S. Wessel, *Leo the Great and the Spiritual Rebuilding of a Universal Rome* (Leiden, 2008).

85 Marcian's wish to promote Leo's *Tome* can also be understood as a political ploy to gain the favour and recognition of the Western emperor, Valentinian III (Cf. H. Chadwick, 'The Chalcedonian Definition' in: *idem*, *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church* (Aldershot, 1991), ch. XVIII, pp. 3–12, esp. p. 8).

dence with the Roman Pope, in which linguistic manipulation was also applied time and again to define and re-define social standing and identity.

We have discussed how the emperor found in the gathering an occasion to display his authority, and how the delegates remained receptive, both actively and passively, to the ritualistic and ceremonial rules which governed the behaviour of all the participants. However, the problem in hand, the very reason for which all the participants had gathered together from all corners of the world, remains on the whole rather obscure. In other words, in no place throughout the proceedings of the sixth session did the emperor, or any other participant, outline, even in the most simple terms, the theological problem in hand.

To be sure, the emperor talked *about* the problem (i.e. the nature of Christ, or, in the emperor's own words, rebuking those who talk 'about the birth of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ': *de nativitate domini et salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi*, περὶ τῆς γεννήσεως τοῦ δεσπότου καὶ σοτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), but avoided discussing the details of the dispute. As mentioned above, the emperor stated his sanctioned sources of authority, but was careful not to make a full-fledged theological exposition by reminding his audience of the contents of these documents, let alone spelling out clearly his own personal view on the matter in hand. Marcian's speech, or speeches, was not used by the emperor as an occasion to give a real exposition of faith, nor to clarify or reinforce the imperial standpoint.

Rhetorical vagueness, marked throughout the emperor's speech, is strongly associated with ceremonial speech.[86] Details of any kind, origins of a dispute, the people involved, the course of events, past resolutions and so forth are by definition non-ceremonial and hence, are bound to damage the speaker's authoritative aura. In his speech, Marcian referred constantly to the attributives of the Christian faith being 'orthodox, true, holy, pure', *orthodoxa et vera fides Christiana, quae sancta atque pura est*,[87] yet he by no means took the opportunity to re-instate the principles of that very faith, now made obscure through 'the ingenuity and superfluous verbiage of others', *nonnullorum*

---

86 Rhetorical vagueness can be used as a marker in the sociolinguistic analysis of discourses: Rhetorical vagueness, or allusiveness, in the sense of avoiding details and circumventing the 'real' issue under discussion, is also recorded in modern royal or presidential speeches (for a study of the American presidency as a form of ceremonial kingship, see M. Novak, *Choosing our King* (New York, 1974). A modern ruler, for example, would not be likely to recapitulate in his or her annual address to the nation the vices of his personal adversaries, and a bitter national enemy would not be mentioned by his actual name.

Ceremonial allusiveness crosses boundaries of space and time: in contemporaneous Malagasy culture a speaker is obliged to 'wind his words' when addressing the village council (see E. Keenan, 'A Sliding Sense of Obligatoriness: The Polystructure of Malagasy Oratory', in M. Bloch (ed.), *Political Language*, pp. 93–112, esp. pp. 93–94.

87 […] περὶ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν ἁγίαν καὶ ἀληθῆ τυγχάνουσαν […].

ingeniis atque superfluosa verbositate and 'the perverse persuasiveness of various people', *diversorum pravis insinuationibus*. By merely pointing to his sources of authority, yet without referring to their specific content, Marcian seemed to distance himself from the theological dispute in hand. He addressed the council not as an emperor who was also a theologian, but as a fully fledged emperor, well informed and sufficiently erudite, yet aloof from and impatient with the current situation, whose rectification he was now demanding from his clerical subjects.

As mentioned above, Marcian was furious about the 'perverse persuasiveness of various people'. In the beginning of his speech, perhaps in reference to the notorious extortion habits of imperial officials,[88] Marcian rebuked the 'avarice or factionalism of certain persons', *avaritia vel studiis quorundam*, and concluded with a rebuke of the 'perversity and avarice of certain persons', *pravitate atque avaritia quorundam*, in an acrid manner which raises questions as to the monetary administration of ecclesiastical establishments (bishops' courts, and also local churches and monasteries) and their plausible necessity to resort to such measures. Marcian, however, is far from demonstrating the slightest tolerance of the clerics in question. The emperor here expresses clear agitation in the face of an anomaly which he couples with a marked moral shortcoming (perversity) which typifies his unnamed antagonists.

He summarized the root of the problem in a triad of vices, namely factionalism, patronage, and avarice which the emperor saw as his duty to eradicate vigorously and resolutely with the professed purpose of unearthing the truth, as if by means of cleansing it, to use Douglas' vocabulary,[89] from some metaphorical dirt.[90] Again, the principle of *rhetorical vagueness* was applied with no exception: no names were mentioned, no particular groups were indicated, and no specific examples of social agitation cited.[91]

---

88 Imperial officials who 'complemented' their meagre salaries by extracting money forcibly from citizens were the targets of laws intended to curb this phenomenon, most notably, the *Lex Iulia de Repetundis* (definitive version promulgated in 59 BC; see Garnsey and Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World*, p. 45).

89 See p. 195 below.

90 ἀναιρουμένης τοίνυν πάσης ἀτόπου σπουδῆς ἐκβαλλομένης τε ἁπάσης προστασίας καὶ τῆς ἀπληστίας χόραν ἐχούσης οὐδεμίαν, ἡ ἀλήθεια ταῖς ἡμῶν ἐκθέσεσι φανερούσθω.

91 Similar rhetorical tactics are applied in the refutation of heresies.

Heresy, the Removal of Pollution and
the Establishment of Social Order

Mary Douglas refers to the connection between our urge to remove dirt and what we might perceive as social anomaly: 'The reaction to dirt is continuous with other reactions to ambiguity or anomaly.'[92] And vice versa we could equally say that ambiguity and social anomaly are usually met with some kind of a 'cleaning operation' on our part. Now, here at least (as opposed to legislative texts, where language is everything but diplomatic), Marcian does not employ imagery of dirt. He does, however, refer to a situation of ambiguity which he promptly proposes to rectify. The misuse of theological discourse (and the disturbance of social order which resulted from it) lies at the heart of Marcian's agitation. Marcian's mission was not only to divert the theological discourse to its right path but also, and even more important, to reset patterns of social hierarchy and control, placing himself, the restorer of normality, at the very top of the social pyramid.[93] In this context, Marcian defines the problem as being those sophisticated, ill-willed people and the solution as being the restriction on theological debate, set by no other than himself.

Accordingly, in the following passage, Marcian refers to the genteel sophistication of his unnamed enemies, their rhetorical prowess, and their ability to influence those who are inferior to themselves:

> For up till now the simple-mindedness of some people has easily been deceived by the ingenuity and superfluous verbiage of others, and it is a familiar fact that dissensions and heresies have been generated by the perverse persuasiveness of various people.[94]

A few lines earlier, Marcian stated his concern lest 'the congregations should not be divided any longer by perverse teaching': ὥστε τῆς ἀληθείας εὑρεθείσης μὴ περαιτέρω τὰ πλήθη ὑποσυρόμενα φαύλαις τινῶν διδασκαλίας διχονοεῖν. The emperor was clearly irritated by what he perceived to be the intentional enticement and mental corruption of whole congregations by interested individuals.

---

92 M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London, 1966), p. 5.

93 For attitudes to dirt and attempts at cleaning and restoring order as mirroring designs of hierarchy or symmetry, see Douglas, *ibid.*, p. 4.

94 *Facile enim simplicitas quorundam hactenus nonnullorum ingeniis atque superflua verbositate decepta est et constat diversorum pravis insinuationibus dissensiones et haereses natas.* The Greek reads 'many people': Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἁπλότητι διανοίας πτοηθέντες ὑπὸ τινῶν περιττὰ καὶ σεσοφισμένα εἰσάγειν ἐπιχειρούντων εἰκότως ἠπάτηνται. Οὔκ ἐστι μὲν γὰρ ἀμφίβολον ὡς ἀτελέσι καὶ μοχθηρ<αῖς διαφόρ>ων ἐξηγήσεσιν αἵ τε διχόνοιαι καὶ πολλαὶ ἀνεφύησαν αἱρέσεις (VI.2).

Again, no clear reference as to who those people might have been is made, but the emperor's choice of words, describing the 'victims' of the scandal as 'simple-minded', ἁπλότητι διανοίας πτοηθέντες, leaves no doubt as to their identification as members of the monastic communities in Egypt and Palestine, where, prior to the convening of the Council of Chalcedon, severe riots erupted.[95] Marcian's accusations regarding avarice (in the sense of greed), patronage (in the sense of extortion), and financial corruption may be directed at specific individual leaders of urban ecclesiastical centres, but also, and perhaps mainly, at heads of monastic communities across Egypt and Palestine.

Yet another interesting rhetorical feature is Marcian's uneasiness with, and later, the straightforward prohibition of, public theological debates. These, the emperor seemed to maintain, were not suitable for the uneducated, whose limited mental and intellectual capacities were not fitted to dealing with the subtleties of Christian dogma,[96] whence the birth of heresies and errors: '[…] it is a familiar fact that dissensions and heresies have been generated by the perverse persuasiveness of various people'. In his second address to the council, Marcian's irritation turned into a fully fledged prohibition of public theological debates. Echoing the religious promulgation of his great predecessors, Marcian's second address to the council conformed in every respect and linguistic detail with laws, recorded in the *Codex Theodosianus,* which are concerned with Christian 'heretics' and pagans.[97] Thus Marcian:

> If anyone, whether in private life or involved in government service or belonging to the clergy, publicly gathers a mob and under the pretext of holding a disputation about the faith causes a disturbance, let him know that if he is enrolled as a private citizen he will be expelled from the imperial city, while if he is a public servant or cleric, he will endanger his service in the former case and his clerical rank in the latter and be subjected to other penalties.[98]

---

95 See note to p. 125 above.

96 For a further discussion of Marcian's 'legal' tone, see p. 189 above. A similar irritation at the fact that people took the liberty to discuss theological matters is also expressed by Gregory of Nyssa who, far from being delighted at the lively theological discourse which dominated the streets and market places, expresses considerable irritation and dismay (see note to p. 180 above).

97 Most famous is the edict promulgated in 416 by Theodosius II, prohibiting pagans to enter public and military service *(CTh.* XVI.10.21).

98 *Ergo si quis privatus aut militans aut in clero conunmeratus publice de fide multitudinem collagens sub intuitu disputationis tumultum fecerit, sciat quia qui privatus est, a regali civitate expelletur; qui militat, circa suam militiam et clericus circa proprium gradum periclitabuntur et aliis submittentur poenis* (Εἴ τις τοίνυν ἰδιώτης ἢ στρατείαι προσομιλήσας ἢ εἰς κλῆρον τελῶν δημοσίαι περὶ τῆς πίστεως ὀχλαγώγιον συναγαγὼν ἐν προσχήματι διαλέξεως θόρυβον ἐμποιεῖ, ἴστω ὡς ὁ μὲν ἰδιώτου τύχην ἐπιγραφόμενος τῆς βασιλίδος ἐξελαθήσεται πόλεως, ὁ δὲ στρατευόμενος περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ στρατείας καὶ ὁ κληρικὸς περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου βαθμοῦ κινδυνεύσουσι καὶ ἑτέραις ὑποβληθήσονται τιμωρίαις — VI.14).

At first, Marcian's focus seemed to be on the outcome of such gatherings, rather than on the acts of congregating and debating *per se*. However, who is to determine what constitutes a mob and what should be treated as a disturbance of public order? These terms remain dangerously open for the interpretation of the legislator who, here assuming the role of a dictator, was careful to leave a few windows open for subsequent rhetorical manipulation and other modes of subtle persuasion.[99]

Larson's Communication Test

In assessing the coercive methods applied within a group, we may consult Larson's 'communication and coercion-tests'.[100] These models, borrowed from the American legal system,[101] comprise sets of guiding questions:

> How does communication flow in a group? Which voices are allowed to be heard and why? Is there give-and-take or dialogue in conversation, or is information conveyed only in a monologue format? Is communication secret and esoteric or open and exoteric?

And in assessing degrees of coercion, he further asks:

> What mechanisms of authority are operative in a particular religious group; How is discipline defined and employed in a group? What is the threshold for obedience, or disobedience, within a group? How are members kept within the group and how are they excommunicated from the group? To what extent does a group make use of physical violence (including intimidation and terrorism)?[102]

Referring to these extreme cases in which bonds of affection and common ideals are directly aligned with bonds of loyalty, Jean-Paul Sartre famously coined the term 'fraternity terror'.[103] Needless to say, this form of terror can appear in contexts devoid of religious sentiments and even more often, as in Soviet Russia, in contexts of conscious and calculated denial and rejection of the latter. Thus, we see, how linguistic control could anticipate various forms of physical violence, typical of totalitarian societies, in which the prohibition of public discussion and debate are combined with restrictions on movement and as-

---

99 Here, Marcian does not merely command: 'You are not to discuss dogma in public!', but rather, carefully masks his sanctions with apparent care for public order and well-being.

100 Also see *The Audience as Senders or Receivers* on p. 88 above.

101 Also see *The Council as a Judicial Venue* on p. 157 above.

102 G. J. Larson, 'Terrorists, Mystics and Evangelists: Assessing the Competing Claims of Religion', in: C. Lamb and D. Cohen-Sherbok (ed.), *The Future of Religion: Post-modern Perspectives* (London, 1999), pp. 41–51, esp. pp. 46–47.

103 J.-P. Sartre, *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, vol. 1, trans. A. Sheridan-Smith (London, 1976), esp. pp. 437–444; 468–470.

sembling together, and in which the trafficking and dissemination of ideas are closely monitored.[104] In this respect, we see that fifth-century Byzantium was by no means a forerunner of modern democracy.[105] Repeated bans on the public exercise of theological disputation reflected the growing discomfort on the part of the ruling elites, ecclesiastical and imperial, with the fact that the principles of argumentative philosophy had been transferred to the realms of theological disputation and that people wished to gain the upper hand by applying 'dishonest' means of rhetorical manipulation. For Marcian and a long line of self-professed 'harmony seekers' the theological truth had to be gained through divine inspiration, rather by any other dialectical means.[106]

6. Concordia, Consensus, and Harmony, Again

To be sure, as far as the application of language and social control is concerned, restriction of one group is often paired with the granting of privilege to another.[107] In this context, one may acknowledge the fact that what Marcian sanctioned in positive terms, as discussed here, is no less important than what he sanctioned in negative terms, i.e. prohibition on public theological disputations. Marcian's authoritative recommendation is outlined in the conclusion to his first address to the council. After signalling the 'culprits' responsible for the current demise of the church, Marcian turned to sketching out the ideal situation, which was the restoration of things to their original state:

---

104 For the features of public discourse in modern totalitarian societies and its control, rather than complete annihilation, through various forms of artistic and literary censorship, see K. Bliss Eaton (ed.), *Enemies of the People. The Destruction of Soviet Literary, Theater, and Film Arts in the 1930s* (Evanston, 2001), esp. pp. xi–xxxii; On the term 'totalitarianism' as an invention of Mussolini, see J. Joll, *Europe Since 1870: An International History* (Harmondsworth, 1976), p. 268.

Control over public discourse is also typical of democratic, yet centralistic and ideologically oriented regimes. One such example taken from more recent history is the sanctioning by Ben Gurion, the first Israeli Prime Minister, of the prosecution and trial of Nazi war criminals. Wishing to protect the national psyche in the aftermath of Eichman's trial and subsequent execution, Ben Gurion decided to limit the public pre-occupation with sentiments of revenge to that specific and only public trial of Nazi criminals ever held in Israel (with the exception of the trial of John Demjanjuk, held in Israel in the eighties, a trial that never ended in an indictment, but in an extradition to the United States).

105 For the roles, administrative, social, and religious, of the Byzantine emperor and his officials in the *locus* of Constantinople see Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale*, pp. 77–115.

106 For a detailed discussion of the inherent contrast between polemical discourses and harmonious consent, see R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1995), pp. 217–229.

107 On language as a means of social control see for instance discussion of Bloch's observations on pp. 103–104 above.

It is our concern that through true and holy teaching each congregation in common accord should return to the same religion and practise the true catholic faith which you have expounded according to the teaching of the fathers.[108]

The concept of *ordo* as a marker of harmony and mental sobriety remained for Marcian the ultimate guide and goal.

His recommendation, a resolute expression of imperial will, came next:

Therefore with minds in concord may your *piety*[109] speedily so apply itself that, just as until very recent times errors were excised by the Nicene council and the true faith was known to all, so now also, when this holy council has dispelled the darkness that seems to have arisen in these last few years, as we said above, through the perversity and avarice of certain persons, what is decreed may be observed for all time. It will be for the divine majesty to maintain firmly in perpetuity that which, with a holy mind, we desire to come about.[110]

Marcian, addressing the delegates' *sense of piety or religion* and alluding, perhaps, to the communication evoked in mystagogical contexts[111] with the Holy Spirit,[112]

---

108 *[...] stadium autem nostrum est ut omnis populus per veram et sanctam doctrinam unum sentiens in eandem religionem redeat et veram fidem catholicam colat, quam secundum institutiones patrum exposueritis* (Τῆι δὲ ἡμετέραι γαληνότητι σπουδαῖόν ἐστι τοὺς δήμους ἅπαντας μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἔχοντας γνώμην τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ καθολικὴν θρησκείαν τε καὶ πίστιν σέβειν, ἣν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰ παραδοθέντα παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων δόγματα ἐξηγήσεσθε — VI.2).

109 Price and Gaddis translate the word *religio* as *sense of religion*. The Greek version reads εὐλαβείας which can be understood as 'piety'. According to both versions, it is obvious that the delegates were required to employ spiritual efforts, beyond what was prescribed by the plain customs of their professed Christianity.

110 *Concordantibus itaque animis religio vestra festinet quatenus sicut a Nicaena synodo usque ad proximum tempus erroribus amputates vera fides cunctis innotuit, ita et nunc per hanc sanctam synodum remotis caliginibus quae in his paucis annis, sicut superius dictum est, pravitate atque avaritia quorundam emersisse videntur, perpetuo quae statute fuerint, conserventur. Erit autem divinae maiestatis, id quod sancto animo fieri desideramus, in aeternum firmiter custodiri* (ἔργον τοίνυν γενέσθω τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐλαβείας ἵνα ὁμογνώμονι ψυχῆι καθάπερ ἐν τῆι Νικαέων ὁσιωτάτηι τῶν πατέρων συνόδωι φανερωθεῖσα ἡ πίστις πλάνης μὲν ἠλευθέρωσεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, εἰς φῶς δὲ προαχθεῖσα πᾶσιν ἐγνώσθη, παραπλησίως καὶ νῦν διὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας συνόδου πᾶν μὲν ἀμφίβολον ἐν τῶι ὀλίγωι τούτωι χρόνωι τεχθέν, καθὼς ἔφημεν, φαυλότητι τινῶν καὶ ἀπληστίαι περικοπῆι, εἰς ἀεὶ δὲ τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν δικαιούμενα φυλαχθείη — VI.2).

111 Also compare with Anatolius' communication discussed on p. 165 above.

112 Marcian's appeal to the delegates' inner religious *sensus* can be compared to the mystagogical teaching of Cyril of Jerusalem. Primarily addressed to catechumens and hence, carried out in liturgical contexts, Cyril's teaching stipulated a spiritual journey, culminating in communication with the Holy Spirit, whose prime prize is admittance to a metaphorical(?) harmonious paradise, complete with sweet smells and eternal, perpetual, light (see A. J. Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem. The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses* (Washington, D.C., 2001), pp. 162–187); H.M. Riley, *Christian Initiation. A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan* (Washington, D.C., 1974), pp. 381–412.

implored them to follow the example of the Nicene fathers: rely on your good religious instinct, eradicate the 'errors', and *maintain* your decisions *in perpetuity*.

The emperor, drawing a straight line between Nicaea and Chalcedon, insisted that the delegates should treat the present council as a defined liturgical locus — which, in turn, enabled and even triggered spiritual journeys of this kind. In attempting to confine the deliberations to the framework of the council, Marcian tied together the identification of the event as spiritual and metaphysical with his own pragmatic agenda, with the restriction of the debates to a specific timeframe and place as its basis.

This overt exercise of social control on Marcian's part, although being accompanied by a claim to spiritual guidance, is further accentuated in the commandment given to the delegates in the sentence which concludes the emperor's appearance before the council. Thus the emperor replied to the delegates' motion to conclude the council, now that a Definition had been reached:

> You are exhausted after enduring toil for a fair period of time. But remain three or four days longer, and in the presence of our most magnificent officials, move whatever proposals you wish; you will receive appropriate help. None of you is to leave the holy council until definitive decrees have been issued about everything.[113]

At a more superficial and immediate level, Marcian's rhetorical stress was clearly placed on the quest for a definite, resolute, and unchangeable solution. The delegates were granted a certain period of time, a time of imperial grace, if you like, in which ecclesiastical deliberations would be tolerable and even, encouraged.

Furthermore, the emperor backed up his commandment by referring to the physical support lent by the state which was to make both its human and pecuniary resources available to the clerics.[114] However, all this generosity would come to an end after the designated time. Then the emperor would consider the decrees which would be issued *about everything* as definitive - no more theological trifling, no more rifts concerning procedure and proper formalities, no more personal enmities woven into the fabric of the church.

---

113 *Loborastis multo spatio fatigationem perpessi, sustinete autem tres aut quattuor dies adhuc et praesentibus magnificentissimis iudicibus nostris singular quae vultis, digno auxilio merituri movete. Nemo autem ex vobis antequam detur de omnibus perfecta definitio, a sancta synodo discedat* (Κεκμήκατε τῶι καλῶι διαστήματι σκυλμὸν ὑπομείναντες· ἀναμείνατε δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἢ τέσσαρας ἔτι καὶ παρόντων τῶν μεγαλοπρεπεστάτων ἡμῶν ἀρχόντων ἕκαστα ὧν βούλεσθε, κινήσατε, τῆς προσηκούσης βοηθείας ἀξιωθησόμενοι. Μηδεὶς δὲ ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ τελείους τύπους πάντων δοθῆναι τῆς ἁγίας ἀναχωρήσηι συνόδου — VI.23).

114 Marcian's promise of help is a clear indication of imperial patronage which very often translated itself into funding clerical activities from the imperial purse, e.g. travel and lodging.

Taking again the self-nurtured image of the Roman and Byzantine emperors as *primi inter pares,* it would be reasonable to assume that in his dealings with the community of the Christian faithful Marcian, being a fellow Christian, would have been careful and apprehensive in presenting himself as an authoritative ruler. To be sure, standing before this particular audience, a community of Christians, the Byzantine emperor would have wished the coercive elements of his speech to appear as persuasion. However, when wearing the emperor's hat, there could be for the emperor some added advantages in appearing purely coercive in precisely this context.[115] Thus, the emperor imposed further debate, albeit along prescribed lines, to achieve the desired goal (i.e. reaching a doctrinal consensus).

With consensus on the minds and lips of everybody involved, one cannot but be slightly surprised at the emperor's insistence that the deliberations should continue after a supposed agreement on the text of the Definition of Faith has been reached. Being the highlight of the deliberations, the most obvious thing for the emperor to do would have been to conclude the deliberations, so as to avoid any newly conceived theological rupture. Marcian's resolute decision to have the deliberations continued, whereby all the *other* matters concerning the church were to be discussed, may help us to achieve a more nuanced image of the Byzantine emperor as defender of the Christian faith. To be sure, Marcian was not so naïve as to attribute the ecclesiastical discontent solely to theological and ideological differences. On the contrary: his rhetoric was dominated by a self-image of a fatherly figure, concerned with the unruly behaviour of the members of his household and with the disorderly state of affairs at the most basic level of the community (i.e. corruption, patronage, greed).

To be sure, Marcian never assumed the mantle of the *intellectual* theologian in that he never, aside from referring his audience to the sources of his authority, mentioned his own doctrinal musings, nor did he openly reveal the imperial theological stance. One could always dismiss Marcian's manifested reluctance to discuss theology as a token of the presupposed boorishness of an old soldier. But it would be wrong to underestimate Marcian. His fluency in Latin and his readiness to involve himself in ecclesiastical matters prove otherwise. If at all, Marcian shows clear signs of a leader, in possession of a well thought-out self-image. He created an image of himself which was considerably, though not entirely, different from that of Constantine.

To be sure, both emperors, following the pattern adopted by many other Byzantine emperors, have come to personify imperial rule wrapped in the philosophical-Christian mantle of order and harmony. Constantine styled him-

---

115 On the triangle comprising persuasion, force, and authority and their often blurred boundaries, see B. Lincoln, *Authority: Construction and Corrosion* (Chicago-London, 1994), pp. 4–6.

self as an active, fully engaged theologian, able to speak to the church Fathers as one of their own.[116] In line with a growing rejection of the cunning outcome which is the result of philosophical disputation, Marcian however promoted a more mystical vision of Christianity, underlined by his insistence that the bishops agree with each other, not only formally and not by winning over each other through sophisticated argumentation, but in earnest, and after undergoing a spiritual process whose end result was to be manifested in *concordia*.

The Christian emperor in Late Antiquity assumed a clear pastoral function. Constantine, if the author of the *Vita Constantini* is to be believed, famously branded himself 'bishop of those outside': τῶν ἐκτὸς ἐπίσκοπος[117] — a phrase which is tantalizing because of its obscurity, as much as it is revealing because of its personal tone and the obvious all-encompassing view with which the emperor perceived his community, here, most probably referring to no less than the entire corpus of citizens, pagans included.[118] Marcian, like many of his Byzantine peers, was expected to lead the Christian community into achieving a spiritual-mystical *concordia,* enabled through an inner, spiritual capacity, namely piety. This strong sentiment can be taken as the motive force behind a confident, ceremonious, and resolute performance on the part of the Byzantine emperor, as well as of his entourage.[119] Where *concordia* prevails, there divine Providence prevails also. Points of theology and local enmities are just the stuff of which disharmony is made — a guarantee of losing that elusive ideal of harmony.[120] As

---

116 See Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre*, pp. 141–168.

117 ἀλλ᾽ ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην (Eusebius, *VC* VI.24, ed. Heikel).

118 A more politically oriented view is that of H. Drake who believes that the phrase certainly shows an emperor who was reaching for a way to establish the same commonality with this class of Christian leaders which previous emperors had established with the senatorial class (see Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops*, pp. 227–228). Also see an earlier discussion by W. Seston, "Constantine as a 'Bishop'", *JRS* 37 (1947), pp. 127–131.

119 In this context, 'humility' rituals in which the Byzantine emperor adopted monastic habits, such as walking on foot in a procession, mark not the end of imperial ceremonial, but its unique development as a Christian imperial ritual in which the emperor played a crucial and exemplary role (for further discussion see C. Kelly, 'Stooping to Conquer', in: *idem* (ed.), *Theodosius II*, pp. 221–243). Van Nuffelen ('Playing the Ritual Game', ed. Crig and Kelly, pp. 189–190) discusses a seventh-century account in which Marcian is depicted as leading a procession on foot. He explains this behaviour as reflecting a merely political tactic, defensive and apologetic in nature (as if Tzar Ivan the Terrible and Prince Henry the Navigator, who famously took part in humility rituals, e.g. by wearing hair shirt, could ever be suspected of being meek). However, we see that the *Acts*, not discussed in the paper by Van Nuffelen just quoted, give a much fuller and complex picture of Marcian's behaviour in an authentic religious environment, where his political theory, with the emperor as *defensor fidei* at its heart, comes to the fore in a much more informative way.

120 A similar criticism of 'intellectual' Christianity, sprinkled with a dash of irritation, is expressed, for example, by Gregory of Nyssa (see note to p. 180 above).

opposed to Theodosius II, Marcian clearly distanced himself from the details of the various theological issues in hand. This strategy reflects both a rhetorical and tactical ploy, as well as a sincere conviction that divine Providence will eventually let itself be manifest and revealed if the debaters themselves, those bishops in charge of the Christian faith and its guardians, join together their collective efforts to resolve the problem.

The concluding paragraph in the emperor's speech is a plea to the bishops to re-find their *religio,* in the mystical sense of the word, being an inherent capacity which allows a person to re-connect with the divine and more precisely, with the Holy Spirit, especially and primarily, as was explicitly maintained by the early Fathers,[121] in the context of an ecumenical church council. Far from having recourse to any form of decision-making through majority vote, as is inferred from the ill-chosen title of MacMullen's *Voting about God*, Marcian's explicit and forceful preference is for a consensual decision which, if compared again, with similar phenomena in modern societies,

> is a most understandable reaction to an awareness of how divided and heterogenous a society modern India really is [in which] the notion of consensus is also encouraged […] by recalling the unity of purpose [for which reason] it is convenient not to have too good a memory [for example, of earlier divisive disputes in the context of India's struggle for independence].[122]

In this vein, Marcian, too, promotes a 'unity of purpose', a consensual notion whose aim was to blur and mask the innumerable theological and personal disputes within clerical circles, thus shrouding the resounding failures of past ecumenical councils in the mists of oblivion. The opening sentence serves as a framework for the whole paragraph, thus combining both the desired action and, pointing to the collective memory of future generations, the desired result: 'Therefore with minds in concord may your piety speedily so apply itself that […] what is decreed may be observed for all time.'

To conclude, the coupling of harmony and divine Providence is a recurring theme in the discourse of all delegates to the council. The presentation of the imperial self includes a great deal of rhetoric concerning the role of the Byzantine emperor as being the earthly personification of divine Providence, the enforcer of the rule of God on earth. None the less, Marcian's speech reveals a similar, and even greater, degree of preoccupation with this theme. He cultivates

---

121 In this sense, Marcian did not divert from the trodden path: the unshaken conviction on the part of the early Fathers that church councils were all inspired by Christ was traditionally linked with the Apostles (e.g. Matth. 18.20, Acts 1.15, 6.2, 15.6). For an overview of this tradition, also endorsed and promoted by Constantine, see Hefele, *Histoire des conciles*, Vol. 1, p. 2–3.

122 W.H. Morris-Jones, 'The Unhappy Utopia—JP in Wonderland', *Economic Weekly* 12(1960), pp. 1027–1031, esp. p. 1301.

the mystique of consensus throughout his speech,[123] implying time and again that consensus on doctrinal, and even procedural, issues *is* tantamount to the revelation of divine Providence and that he, Marcian, has a major role in bringing about its worldly manifestation.[124]

Perhaps in anticipation of Rousseau's ideas regarding the role of Nature in human societies, Marcian seems to replace Nature with divine Providence. His rhetoric is underlined by an almost mystical belief in the natural inclination of people's minds to reach unanimous decisions as a reflection of a 'spiritual' mental state, whether private or collective, reflecting and projecting peace, harmony, and even, physical order. The 'spontaneity' associated with public hailing and public acclamation (regarding, for example, the emperor's person, but also regarding the sobriety embedded in the 'orthodox' Christian faith) alludes to the almost mystical approach which underlined the perception of consensus procedures in ancient gatherings. Thus, an ecumenical gathering comes to project the same ideals which underline other types of liturgically oriented gatherings, with communion as their most evident pinnacle. Such gatherings were, and still are, a perfect reflection of the Christian *civitas,* embodying the collective of mystically inspired individuals.

B. Imperial Correspondence: The Sociolinguistic Angle

By contrast to the paucity of historical sources documenting Marcian's reign, we find ourselves relatively spoiled for choice when it comes to imperial correspondence (and its papal counterpart) from this period. A sample of three letters issued by Marcian prior to the council may serve as an initial starting-point, though a modest one, in any future fuller attempt at analysing this wealth of 'material' from socio-anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives.[125]

---

123 A term discussed by Bailey, 'Decisions in Councils and Committees', in: Banton (ed.), *Political Systems*, pp. 2–5.

124 The cultivation of the ideal of consensus and its mystification should by no means be associated only with ancient socio-political behaviour. In this context, one could most profitably recall, for example, the exhortations of Jayaprakash Narayan, the great Indian social reformer who, in the aftermath of Indian's independence, argued that communities work harmoniously in a spontaneous and natural way, lest they are disturbed by parliaments, politics, and majority votes which, in turn, are bound to lead to even more disruption (see J. Narayan, *A Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity* (Wardha, *c*.1960), pp. 47–51).

125 The texts in the original languages are found in Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, 2.3.1, and 2.4; trans. in Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1 (for documents which preceded the council), and vol. 3 (for documents issued after the council). See also the helpful survey *ibid*., vol. 3, pp. 157–192. Concentrating on the council as a ceremonial climax and in view of limiting the scale of our discussion, the few documents discussed here date to the period prior to the council.

In his first letter to Pope Leo,[126] Marcian, adorning himself and his imperial colleague, as well as his addressee, with the formulaic ceremonial titles usually attributed in these circumstances, does not waste any time in corroborating his imperial authority through a range of authoritative sources: God's providence, the *excellent* senate, and finally, the *entire* army. Remarkably arranged in a descending degree of importance: the first —in which Marcian most meaningfully switches to the singular form — and most important of all, highlights the determining role of the Christian emperor as *defensor* and *custos fidei*, the second subtly points to the qualities of the senate as an elitist, able, and sober, 'rational', council; the third alludes to popular support.

Marcian's first address to Pope Leo, in which the latter is requested to lend his support to the convening of an ecumenical council, is nothing short of a succinct, yet breathtaking in its vision, description of the imperial *ordo*, as it is perceived and formulated by the emperor himself. Marcian's *ordo* is, no doubt, totally governed by and committed to the Christian cause. It is in a 'totalizing' Christian context that Marcian sees fit to expound his world-order to the bishop of Rome in a letter which is, above all, a statement designed to mark the boundaries of authority and control, as well as to outline the common cause which, to Marcian's mind, united all the other objectives. To be sure, throughout his short communication, Marcian was careful not to endorse an authoritative, but rather an accommodating[127] stance in which both he and Pope Leo had an equal share, each in his own domain, in the realisation of the Christian ideal, with the *perfect peace* being its ultimate goal:

> Therefore, on behalf of the venerable and catholic religion of the Christian faith, by the help of which we trust that the strength of our power will be directed, we believe it to be proper that your holiness, possessing primacy in the episcopate of the divine faith, be first addressed by our sacred letters, urging and requesting your holiness to entreat the eternal deity on behalf of the stability and state of our rule, so that we should have such a purpose and a desire that, by the removal of every impious error through holding a council on your authority, perfect peace should be established among all the bishops of the catholic faith, existing unsullied and unstained by any wickedness.[128]

---

126 Text: ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 17 (*Leonis Ep.* 73; dated to September 450). The original language of the correspondence between Leo and Marcian was most probably Latin; hence Price and Gaddis translate from the Latin version, *The Acts*, vol. 1, 92–93.

127 For *rhetoric of deferral* see pp. 101, 151, and 154 above.

128 *[…] unde pro reuerenda et catholica religione Christianorum fidei, cuius auxiliis uirtutem nostrae potentiae confidimus gubernari, tuam[que] sanctitatem principatum in episcopatu diuinae fidei possidentem sacris litteris in principio iustum credimus adloquendam, inuitantes atque rogantes ut pro firmitate et statu nostri imperii aeternam diuinitatem tua sanctitas deprecetur, ut et tale propositum atque desiderium habeamus quatenus omni impio errore sublato per celebrandam synodum te auctore maxima pax circa omnes episcopos fidei catholicae fiat ab omni scelere pura et intemerata consistens* (Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 17).

Returning here to the plural form, Marcian acknowledges Christianity as the guiding light of his regime and the source of his imperial power. His language focuses on *propriety* and the execution of things in their good order which comprises the following elements: recognizing the supremacy of the papal see and acknowledging its authority; seeking the blessing of the Pope and his prayer for the well-being of the empire; outlining the concrete measures which needed to be taken in order to ensure earthly prosperity, with a general 'cleaning operation', designed to exclude heresies and improprieties from the definition of the faith, and in which all the parties, ecclesiastical and imperial, had a designated function.

Signed by Marcian alone and bearing a reduced titulature,[129] the second imperial letter to Pope Leo, dated November 450,[130] is less formalistic and more intimate in tone:

> Your holiness can be confident about our zeal and prayer, since we wish the true Christian religion and the apostolic faith to remain firm and be preserved with a pious mind by all people; indeed we are in no doubt that the solicitude of our power depends on correct religion and propitiating our Saviour.[131]

Yet, again, the purpose of this imperial communication remains twofold: conceptual affirmation of all the integrative parts of the *civitas dei*, backed by a concrete request from the pope, this time that he should officially announce or renounce his own participation in the forthcoming council. Firmness rather than confusion, a shared piety rather than erroneous individualism and above all, the emperor's acknowledgement of the tight connection between the success of his regime and his commitment to achieving ecclesiastical peace.

As the short text unfolds, Marcian's intimate tone becomes deferential and meek. The emperor beseeches Pope Leo to make up his mind about whether he would wish to attend the council in person, and if possible, to make his decision known to him as soon as possible, so that the imperial administration would be able to continue at full speed with its preparations for the forthcoming council:

> It remains that, if it should please your beatitude to come to these parts and hold a council, you should deign to do this through love of religion; your holiness will

---

129 Marcian to Leo, the most devout bishop of the church of the most glorious city of Rome.

130 Text: ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 18 (*Leonis Ep.* 76); trans. Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 93.

131 *De studio et oratione nostra sanctitas tua non dubitat quoniam ueram Christianorum religionem et apostolicam fidem firmam uolumus permanere et ab omni populo pia mente seruari; denique sollicitudinem nostrae potentiae ex recta religione et propitiatione saluatoris nostri consistere non ambigimus* (Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 18).

certainly satisfy our desires and will decree what is useful for sacred religion. But if it is burdensome for you to come to these parts, may your holiness make it clear to us in your own letter, with the result that our sacred letters may be sent to all the East and to Thrace and Illyricum […][132]

In this manner Marcian was making himself, by his own admission, directly and squarely dependent on the Pope's position, not only in terms of the degree of his personal involvement, but also in terms of his general approval of the council, which controlled the sending of invitations to bishops from all corners of the world. Such deference is, no doubt, very different from the authoritative stance adopted by Anatolius, the senior imperial officer, in his dealings with most bishops, however senior, who attended the council.

In a third letter, the last to be discussed here,[133] Marcian, speaking also on behalf of his co-emperor, addressed the community of metropolitans throughout the realm, and officially summoned them to attend the forthcoming council. Marcian's priorities and religious *credo* were reiterated:

> Before all matters the things of God should be given priority, for we are confident that, when almighty God is propitious, the commonwealth is both protected and bettered.[134]

Marcian's religious principles were firmly anchored in a communal ideal, according to which doing and thinking things which were pleasing to God had positive consequences (and vice versa), first and foremost on the collective of Christians, as opposed to the benefits or calamities which might befall Christians as individuals.

The more technical prescriptions which follow next reveal the sociological dynamics of an ecumenical, 'totalizing', council and the mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion which are outlined as its goals:

> Therefore your holiness should exert yourself to come to the aforesaid city of Nicaea by the Kalends of September with whatever most beloved of God bish-

---

132 *superest ut si placuerit tuae beatitudini in his partibus aduenire et synodum cele-brare, hoc facere religionis affectu dignetur: nostris utique desideriis uestra sanctitas satisfa-ciet et sacrae religioni quae utilia sint, decernet. si uero hoc onerosum est ut tu ad has partes aduenias, hoc ipsum nobis propriis tua sanctitas litteris manifestet, quatenus in omnem Ori-entem et in ipsam Thraciam et Illyricum sacrae nostrae litterae dirigantur, […]* (Schwartz, *ACO* 2.3.1, p. 18).

133 Greek text: ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. 27–28 (and 52) and cf. also the Latin versions in *ACO* 2.3.1, pp. 19–20, and *ACO* 2.2, p. 95. English translation from the Greek of *ACO* 2.1.1, pp. 27–28, by Price and Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, 98–99.

134 Τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπάντων δεῖ προτιμᾶσθαι τὰ θεῖα· τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ τοῦ παντοκράτορος εὐμενοῦς καθεστῶτος τὰ τῆς κοινῆς πολιτείας καὶ φυλάττεσθαι καὶ βελτιοῦσθαι θαρροῦμεν (ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, p. 27).

ops you choose and whomever from the churches in the care of your priesthood you consider to be trustworthy and equipped for the teaching of the orthodox religion.[135]

With an eye to achieving consensus, the *via aurea* sought by elite councils, Marcian was empowering the metropolitans, but at the same time, also imposing clear restrictions on the identity of the would-be delegates: whether Miaphysites or Dyophysites, participants should be *trustworthy and equipped*, or in other words, not too extreme in their positions, of sober yet elastic minds — minds which could, by the end of the journey, find a common ground.

---

135 ὅθεν ἡ ἁγιότης ἡ σὴ μεθ᾽ ὧν ἂν ἀρέσῃι θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων καὶ οὓς ἂν ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν φροντίδα τελουσῶν τῆς σῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀξιοπίστους καὶ [οὓς] πρὸς τὴν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου θρησκείας διδασκαλίαν ἐμπαρασκεύους ὑπάρχειν δοκιμάσῃ, ἐπὶ τὴν προειρημένην Νικαέων πόλιν ἐντὸς Καλανδῶν Σεπτεμβρίων ἐλθεῖν σπουδασάτω (ed. Schwartz, *ACO* 2.1.1, p. 27–28).

V. Conclusions

Marcian's commitment to Christianity and to the Christian establishment was manifested first and foremost, in his personal appearance before the council. When Marcian delivered his speech, he must have had the examples, not only of Constantine, but also of his hugely successful and imposing predecessor, Theodosius II, before him.[1] Marcian himself, we ought to remember, could not have known that his regime (and his life) would end in less than six years, and that generations of historians would judge his regime to be short and negligible. Alas, it is only thanks to historical perspective that we can now state with a fair amount of certainty that if it had not been for the Council of Chalcedon, Marcian's name would be no more than a minor element amongst the grander names of Roman and Byzantine emperors of the period. Standing before the elite of his administration and before the heads of the church, Marcian had all the motivation and reason to address his subjects with confidence, true or masqueraded, reserved for those who intended to remain on the political stage for many years to come.

Form communicates asserts O'Barr in the introduction to his 1982 study on language strategy in the court room.[2] We have seen that *form communicates* not only in verbal, but also in non-verbal means, such as gestures, and ostentatious indications of hierarchy, such as seating arrangements and the right in itself to take to the floor as a speaker. The fields of sociology and cultural anthropology have yielded knowledge largely based upon observations of tribal, non-European, and non-urban societies, such as those found in Papua New Guinea, and Ghana, though more recently, focusing, for example, on issues of dialect, also of urban communities in and around the big cities, and in the countryside of European countries, such as Ireland and the UK. Being able to apply these studies to the study of an ancient society, such as fifth-century Byzantium, should be taken both as proof and as encouragement for us not to forget that 'dead' societies, too, were once exploding with the dreams, aspirations, and fears of 'real' and living people.

An ecumenical gathering is, or was, first and foremost, a social event, pregnant with the ideals which shaped the Christian experience, but versatile in its minute interpretations. Being primarily social and communal events, church

---

1 On the literary use of historical *exempla* and their function as inductive arguments, see G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus. The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 256–296 .
2 Cf. O'Barr, *Linguistic Evidence,* pp. 1–5.

gatherings, as opposed to the solitary forms of monasticism, embodied and promoted the ideal of the Christian community as an amalgamation of individuals undergoing a continuous spiritual and meditative process. In the Council of Chalcedon, Marcian, a Christian emperor and *defensor fidei*, sought both to make his newly gained power manifest ceremonially and publicly, and also to serve as a catalyst to a process at the end of which *all* would be found in a spiritual state worthy of communion — the pinnacle of any liturgical experience. When insisting, in the sixth session, on the delegates continuing their deliberations despite the apparent agreement between the parties, Marcian, a supposedly boorish soldier, proved that his main interest was that the Christian community should achieve genuine *concordia* and *ordo*, rather than manifesting them superficially.

Marcian's insistence on a consensual decision also points to the social dynamics underlying mass gatherings on the scale of the Council of Chalcedon. To be sure, the Council of Chalcedon reflected all the characteristics of an elite gathering: ostentatious hierarchy, a high level of formality and manifestation of ceremonial behaviour, and a consensual goal whose innate improbability, given the large number of delegates, points to a pre-meditated agenda and its imposition by the 'real' decision-makers, i.e. the emperor and his entourage.

Marcian wished to impose his own version of a Christian 'world order' — to use the similarly totalizing terminology used by recent American presidents, Bush Senior and Junior — but, in fact, created a hotbed for ideological and religious frictions for centuries to come. Totality has the innate characteristic of creating and re-creating *social cleavages*, those weak lines along which a group might split up acrimoniously. The elite, comprising senior clergy and state officials, were indeed visible, verbal, and fully engaged in the social and intellectual processes which unfolded in the restricted space and *locus* of the council. However, the forceful presence in the background of hundreds of less prestigious delegates continued to be felt in public acclamations, but even more so in their subsequent contribution to the propagation of more ecclesiastical dissent, when they returned to their respective homes in remote provinces, uninhibited by the centrifugal forces applied by the imperial authorities, and free to translate the great social feast that the Council of Chalcedon was, into individual experiences and interpretations.

In conclusion, we must think of 'Christianity' as an umbrella term, encapsulating a whole range of social, as well as religious, ideals. The social aspects of Christianity are manifold and versatile. However, in their most formalistic and ceremonial forms, these social aspects have come to be identified with a succession of ecumenical councils, which typified Christianity as an organized religious system throughout antiquity and beyond.

VI. Epilogue:
Discussing Religion in a Gadamerian Culture

> Counter-secularisation is at least as important a phenomenon in the contemporary world as secularisation.
>
> Peter Berger, *'Secularism in Retreat'*

Religion in its manifold definitions and senses — a system of thought; a system of practices and rites; psychic, emotional, and personal; organized and visibly structured; occult and secretive; ceremonial and public — has never, I dare say, throughout human history been far away from our intellectual and, more significantly, our emotional and social lives. Religion is such a potent social phenomenon that it is always there, even when it is absent, or rather, assumed and declared to be absent, a delirious phantom from darker, less enlightened ages.

Kathleen Bliss, a theology professor who, in the mid-twentieth century, spent many years in India, perhaps to this day, the hotbed *par excellence* of religious devotion and fervour,[1] describes the universal, penetrating nature of religion as follows:

> But whether they are for it or against it, whether they think it true or false or uncertain or indifferent, people yet believe that the word 'religion' identifies for them something that is or was.[2]

In other words, whether sympathetic or critical, engaged practitioners or distant analysts, people are never truly 'free' from the constant existence of the religious bug: if they practise religion, they obviously need it; if they don't, even then, they often feel the need to coldly ignore it, or aggressively deny it.

The practice of religion, especially in the so-called 'West'— to use a monolithic term which actually masks a very fragmented reality — has obviously gone through considerable changes. Taken from the perspective of religious practitioners, these changes have amounted to an ongoing 'crisis'. Others, less emotionally or practically engaged, and more academically driven, have set about either cutting through the ailing body, or dissecting the metaphorical corpse,

---

1 See, for example, G. J. Larson, *India's Agony over Religion* (Albany, 1995), esp. pp. 119–141.
For a vivid discussion of Egypt and, perhaps, Israel,— which could be justifiably considered as the Middle-Eastern contemporary equivalents to India, see G. Kepel, trans. P. Ghazaleh, *Bad Moon Rising: A Chronicle of the Middle East Today* (London, 2003).

2 K. Bliss, *The Future of Religion* (London, 1969), p. 1.

of religion. Innumerable volumes, by now representing a genre in itself, bear the title of *The Future of Religion.* What started in the 60s of the last century as a genuine soul-searching by religiously committed scholars of religion — who ought, perhaps, to have presented their agonies more accurately by contemplating the future of the *Christian* religion —turned in the hands of social scientists, philosophers, and literary critics into a scientific field of investigation, in which a systematization of our knowledge of religion as a social and cultural phenomenon was attempted.

To discuss religion in a scientific context is to think about religious phenomena and analyse them using those intellectual platforms which allow, and even postulate, losing all prejudices, both negative *and* positive, towards religion and its practitioners:

> One of the main methodological problems in writing about religion scientifically is to put aside at once the tone of the village atheist and that of the village preacher, as well as their more sophisticated equivalents, so that the social and psychological implications of particular religious beliefs can emerge in a clear and natural light.[3]

That said, I still believe that, even if one concedes that no human creature can ever 'rid' himself of his own cultural 'baggage', the route to this utopian and illusive 'natural light' must lie in clarifying one's stance vis-à-vis the religious phenomena — behaviour, discourse, ideology— which one proposes to investigate.

Take, for example, an ancient religious council with all its ceremony, clamour, and theological disputes which are only vaguely understood by a modern researcher. To be sure, there is a great chance that to modern eyes, the excitement, over-reaction, and general 'irrationality' which seem to dominate ancient church councils, may prove to be difficult to decode. As a result, bewilderment and the adoption of a judgemental stance, the fruits of post-modernist insistence on coming between God and man, are certain to follow suit.

Nietzsche, Martin Friedrich Heidegger, and Jacques Derrida,[4] as well as Hans-Georg Gadamer,[5] John Dewey, and Benedetto Croce[6] — are all, with various degrees of agreement among themselves,[7] forerunners and prominent champions of post-modernist, deconstructionist thought. However refreshing and inventive their ideas might be, one could and should question the applicability of their teachings, when it comes to the study of societies which were,

---

3 Geertz, 'Religion as a Cultural System', in: *The Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 87–125, esp. 123.

4 J. Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. G. Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore, 1976 [1967]).

5 H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (2nd ed.; New York, 1988 [1960]).

6 B. Croce, *History as the Story of Liberty*, trans. S. Sprigge (New York, 1941 [1938]).

7 On the real-time debate between Gadamer and Derrida, see E. Clark, *History, Theory, Text. Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA/London, 2004), pp. 135–137.

or still are, ignorant of post-modernism. Take, for example, the Nietzschean-Gadamerian notion of the 'death of God', a post-metaphysical world view which

> fundamentally aims at an ontology of weakening that reduces the weight of the objective structures and the violence of dogmatism.[8]

And further on:

> The principal characteristic of the Gadamerian culture of dialogue is no doubt the nihilistic and sceptical character imparted to it by the achievements of deconstruction.

However much we are entitled and obliged to find new ways of interpreting our own world, the question remains whether our eagerness to weaken existing structures does not pose a methodological fault when studying the lives of people who never knew that they would be living in a weakened, deconstructed world, a utopian world which is believed by some to be 'beyond ideology'[9]. Do such nihilistic notions actually promote our understanding of people who, like the ancients, still live in a metaphysical world and even, actively promote their religious ideologies by way of 'counter-secularization'?[10] To be sure, for the greater part of modern humanity, let alone that of ancient times, the idea of God is far from being a 'weakened concept': it is still very much alive, and so is the sharp contrast between the Godly and the human, the divine and the profane, the good and the bad.

Plato's metaphysical legacy, it seems, still holds sway in peoples' universal, intuitive psyche. One might ask whether we could ever successfully decode the psyche of our religious ancestors, by studying ancient and other historical texts, while at the same time ignoring the very building blocks from which their reality was formed. In other words, the question is whether it is at all constructive to apply post-modernist approaches to the study of ancient religious texts and the societies which generated them. I should think that in most cases, the answer would be negative.

The intellectual circles mentioned here are not the subject of criticism *per se*. However, a few of their overenthusiastic and undiscerning followers seem to be responsible for producing *ad absurdum* a tension between rhetoric, the manner

---

8 R. Rorty, G. Vattimo, *The Future of Religion*, ed. S. Zabala (New York, 2004), p. 9.

9 See, for example, the notion of optimism reflected by N. Smart in his *Beyond Ideology: Religion and the Future of Western Civilization* (San Francisco, 1980).

10 A metaphysical dichotomy is still very much applied in R. Niebuhr's description, published in the 50s, of 'current' American stances in his *The Godly and the Ungodly. Essays on the Religious and Secular Dimensions of Modern Life* (London, 1958), pp. 1–13. A more recent overview of 'counter-secularizations' is by G. Kepel, *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World*, trans. A. Braley (Pennsylvania, 1994); P. L. Berger, 'Secularism in Retreat', *The National Interest* 46 (1996/7), pp. 3–13.

in which things are said and conceptually conceived, and the 'reality' — fixed and solid for the subjects of our investigation, but to us always a subjective construction — that rhetoric claims to represent. As Elizabeth Clark rightfully notes,[11] post-modernist innate scepticism has led, especially in the United States, to a situation in which textual analysis is no longer productive, as it often leads to yet more circular scepticism. In a post-modern world in which language is no longer considered a reliable gateway to the construction of peoples' reality as they perceive it in their minds, and in which nothing, including their rhetoric, is to be 'believed,' we often find ourselves chasing after the wrong kind of truths — not those held by the historical subjects of our investigation, but our own self-made, 'weakened' and thus, unattainable, truths.

---

11 Clark, *History, Theory, Text*, pp. 1–8.

Bibliography

A. Ancient Literature

Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, ed. E. Schwartz (Berlin, 1927-); translated and annotated by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 3 vols. (Liverpool, 2005).

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae,* ed. and trans. J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus* (LCL; 2nd ed.; London and Cambridge, MA, 1956–58).

Codex Justinianus in: *Corpus iuris civilis*, ed. P. Krüger et al., vol. 2 (Berlin, 1929, repr. 1968).

Codex Theodosianus, ed. Th. Mommsen and P. M. Meyer (Berlin, 1905); trans. C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code* (Princeton, 1952).

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Vita Constantini,* ed. I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke* (Leipzig, 1902).

Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* ed. and trans. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*, vol. 1 (rev. ed.; Paris, 2011); trans. M. Whitby (Liverpool, 2000).

John Malalas, *Chronographia,* ed. J. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (CFHB 35; Berlin, 2000); trans. E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, R. Scott (BAus 4; Melbourne, 1986).

John Zonaras, *Epitomae historiarum,* ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst (Bonn, 1897).

Leo of Rome, *Letters* in *PL* 54 and *ACO* 2.4 (Berlin, 1932); trans. C. L. Feltoe, *The Letters and Sermons of Leo the Great Bishop of Rome* (NPNF 2.12; New York, 1895).

Priscus of Panium, ed. K. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. IV (Paris, 1868).

Procopius of Caesarea, *De aedificiis,* ed. J. Haury, *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, rev. G. Wirth, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1962–4); trans. H. B. Dewing (London, 1914–40).

Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* ed. G. C. Hansen, *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1995); trans. A. C. Zenos, *The Ecclesiastical History by Socrates Scholasticus* (NPNF 2.2; New York, 1890).

Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* ed. J. Bidez, rev. G. C. Hansen, *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1995); trans. C. D. Hartranft, *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen, Comprising a History of the Church from A. D. 323 to A. D. 425* (NPNF 2.2; New York, 1890).

Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Letters,* ed. Y. Azéma, *Théodoret de Cyr: Correspondance,* 4 vols. (Paris, 1955–98); trans. B. Jackson, *The Ecclesiastical History, Dialogues, and Letters of Theodoret* (NPNF 2.3; New York, 1892).

–, *Haereticarum fabulorum compendium, PG* 83, pp. 336–556.

Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, *Theophanis Chronographia*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883–85, rp. Hildesheim, 1963); trans. C. Mango and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, A. D. 284–813* (Oxford, 1997).

B. Modern Literature, Translations, and Reference Works

Abrahams, R. D., 'Black Talking on the Streets', in: Bauman and Sherzer (ed.), *Explorations* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 240–262.

Adorno, T. W. and E. Frenkel-Brunswick, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York, 1950).

Allen, P., *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* (Leuven, 1981).

–, 'The Definition and Enforcement of Orthodoxy', in: Cameron and Garnsey *et al.* (ed.), *CAH* 14, pp. 811–884.

Amirav, H., *Rhetoric and Tradition: John Chrysostom on Noah and the Flood* (Leuven, 2003).

–, 'Political and Social Networks in the Council of Chalcedon: The Imperial Commission', in: J. Baun *et al.* (ed.), *StPatr* 45 (Leuven, 2010), pp. 139–145.

–, and H.-M. Kirn, 'Notes on the Reformation, Humanism, and the Study of Hebrew in the Sixteenth Century: The Case of Theodore Bibliander (1505–1564)', *Church History and Religious Culture* 87 (2007), pp. 161–171.

Angelidi, C., *Pulcheria. La Castità al Potere* (Milan, 1998).

Austin, J.L., *How to Do Things with Words* (rev. ed.; Oxford, 1976).

Bailey, F.G., 'Decisions in Councils and Committees', in: M. Banton (ed.), *Political Systems and the Distribution of Power* (London, 1965), pp. 1–20.

–, *Stratagems and Spoils: A Social Anthropology of Politics* (4th impr.; Oxford, 1990).

–, *Treasons, Stratagems, and Spoils: How Leaders Make Practical Use of Beliefs and Values* (Boulder, 2001).

Banton, M. (ed.), *Political Systems and the Distribution of Power* (London, 1965).

Bauman, R. and J. Sherzer (ed.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking* (Cambridge, 1974).

Ben David, J. and T.N. Clark (ed.), *Culture and Its Creators. Essays in Honour of Edward Shils* (Chicago, 1977).

Berger, P.L., 'Secularism in Retreat', *The National Interest* 46 (1996/7), pp. 3–13.

Bettelheim, B., *A Good Enough Parent* (London, 1987).

Bevan, G.A., *The New Judas: The Case of Nestorius in Ecclesiastical Politics, 428–451 CE*, forthcoming in Late Antique History and Religion (Peeters Publishers).

–, *The Deep Politics of Chalcedon* (forthcoming).

Bingham, J., *Antiquities of the Christian Church,* vol. 2 (London, 1843).

Bitton-Ashkelony, B. and A. Kofsky, *The Monastic School of Gaza* (Leiden, 2006).

Bliss, K., *The Future of Religion* (London, 1969).

Bloch, M., *Political Language and Oratory in Traditional Society* (London, 1975).

–, 'Decision-making in Councils among the Merina of Madagascar', in: Richards and Kuper (ed.), *Councils in Action* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 29–62.

Bourdieu, P., *Homo Academicus*, trans. P. Collier (Cambridge, 1998).

–, *Langage et pouvoir symbolique* (rev. ed.; Paris, 2001).

Bowersock, G.W., P. Brown and O. Grabar (ed.), *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World* (Cambridge, 1999).

Bowman, A., *et al.* (ed.), *CAH* 12. *The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193–337* (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 2005).

Bragg, M., *The Book of Books. The Radical Impact of the King James Bible 1611–2011* (London, 2011).

Brock, S., 'Greek into Syriac and Syriac into Greek', in: *idem*, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*, ch. II.

–, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London, 1984).

Brown, R. and A. Gilman, 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity', in: Sebok (ed.), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, MA, 1960), pp. 253–276.

Browning, R., *Justinian and Theodora* (London, 1971).

Burgess, R.W., 'The Accession of Marcian in the Light of Chalcedonian Apologetic and Monophysite Polemic', *BZ* 86/87 (1993–4), pp. 47–68.

Cameron, Av., *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley, 1991).

–, 'The Construction of Court Ritual: the Byzantine *Book of Ceremonies',* in: Price and Cannadine (ed.), *Rituals of Royalty* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 106–136.

–, *The Byzantines* (Oxford, 2006).

–, 'The Writing of History', in: *eadem*, *History as Text*, pp. 1–10.

–, 'The Reign of Constantine, A. D. 306–337', in: Bowman *et al.* (ed.), *CAH* 12, pp. 90–109.

–, 'Education and Literary Culture', in: Cameron and Garnsey (ed.), *CAH* 13, pp. 665–707.

–, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity* (London, 1994, rev. ed. 2011).

–, 'Disputation, Polemical Literature and the Formation of Opinion', in: Reinink and Vanstiphout (ed.), *Dispute Poems* (Leuven, 1991), pp. 91–108.

–, 'Constantine and the Peace of the Church', in: Mitchell and Young (ed.), *The Cambridge History* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 538–551.

–, 'Enforcing Orthodoxy in Byzantium', in: Cooper and Gregory (ed.), *Discipline and Diversity* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 1–24.

–, and P. Garnsey (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History* 13 (Cambridge, 1998).

–, *et al.* (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History* 14 (Cambridge, 2000).

Cameron, Al., *Circus Factions* (rev. ed.; Oxford, 1999).

Cannadine, D. and S. Price (ed.), *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge, 1987).

Catling, R. W. V. and F. Marchand (ed.), *Onomatologos* (Oxford, 2010).

Cerfaux, L. and J. Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilization Gréco-Romaine* (Turnhout, 1956).

Chadwick, H., 'The Chalcedonian Definition', in: *idem*, *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church,* no. XVIII (Aldershot, 1991), pp. 3–12.

–, *The Church in Ancient Society: from Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2001).

Chilton, P., *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* (London, 2004).

Chitty, D. J., *The Desert a City: An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism under the Christian Empire* (Oxford, 1966).

Chomsky, N., *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague, 1957).

Clark, E., *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA – London, 2004).

Clayton jr., P. B., *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus* (Oxford, 2005).

Cooper, K. and J. Gregory (ed.), *Discipline and Diversity* (Woodbridge, 2007).

Coser, L. A., *The Functions of Social Conflict* (London, 1956).

Coulmas, F., *Sociolinguistics. The Study of Speakers' Choices* (Cambridge, 2005).

Crabbe, A., 'The Invitation List to the Council of Ephesus and Metropolitan Hierarchy in the Fifth Century', *JTS* n.s. 32 (1981), pp. 369–400.

Croce, B., *History as the Story of Liberty*, trans. S. Sprigge (New York, 1941 [1938]).

Dagron, G. 'Aux origines de la civilization Byzantine: Langue de culture et langue d'État', in: *idem*, *La romanité chrétienne en Orient*, Chapter I.

–, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1974).

–, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantin* (Paris, 1996).

Delmaire, R., 'Les dignitaires laïcs au concile de Chalcédoine', *Byzantion* 54 (1984), pp. 141–175.

–, *Les responsables des finances impériales au Bas-Empire romain (IVe-VIe s.): études prosopographiques* (Brussels, 1989).

–, *Les institutions du Bas-Empire romain* (Paris, 1995).

Derrida, J., *Of Grammatology,* trans. G. Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore, 1976 [1967]).

Destephen, S., *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, vol. 3: *Diocèse d'Asie* (Paris, 2008).

Dijk, T. van, *Discourse and Power* (New York, 2008).

–, *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach* (repr.; Cambridge, 2009).

–, *Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk* (repr.; Cambridge, 2010).

Douglas, M., *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London, 1966).

–, *Natural Symbols. Explorations in Cosmology* (rev. ed.; New York, 1973).

–, *How Institutions Think* (Syracuse, 1986).

–, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford, 1999).

Doval, A. J., *Cyril of Jerusalem. The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses* (Washington, D. C., 2001).

Drake, H. A., 'The Impact of Constantine on Christianity', in: Lenski (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 111–136.

–, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore-London, 2000).

Durkheim, E., *The Rules of Sociological Method,* trans. S. A. Solovay and J. H. Mueller (8th ed.; Glencoe, 1938).

Ervin-Tripp, S. M., 'Sociolinguistics', in: Fishman (ed.), *Advances in Sociology* (The Hague, 1971), pp. 15–91.

Fairclough, N., *Language and Power* (London, 1989).

–, *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.; London-New York, 1997).

Festugière, A.-J., *Éphèse et Chalcédonie: actes des conciles* (Paris, 1982).

Fishman, J. A. (ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, vol. 1 (The Hague, 1971).

Foucault, M., *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (originally published in French in 1969; trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith; London-New York, 2002).

Fowden, G., 'Religious Communities', in: Bowersock, Brown and Grabar (ed.), *Late Antiquity*, (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 82–106.

Frend, W. H. C., *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Century* (London, 1972).

Gadamer, H.-G., *Truth and Method* (2nd ed.; New York, 1988 [1960]).

Galdwin, T. and W. C. Sturtevant (ed.), *Anthropology and Human Behaviour* (Washington, D. C., 1962).

Garnsey, P., *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1970).

Garnsey, P. and C. Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World* (Cambridge, 2001).

Gavins, J., *Text World Theory: An Introduction* (Edinburgh, 2007).

Geertz, C., *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973; rev. ed. London, 1993).

–, 'Linguistic Etiquette', in: Pride and Holmes (ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (Middlesex, 1960), pp. 167–175.

–, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma. Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in: Ben David and Clark (ed.), *Culture and Its Creators* (Chicago, 1977), pp. 150–171.

–, *Local Knowledge. Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology* (New York, 1983).

Geis, M. L., *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction* (Cambridge, 1998).

Ghaly, M., 'Muslim Perspectives on Cloning. Human Cloning Through the Eyes of Muslim Scholars. The New Phenomenon of the Islamic International Religioscientific Institutions', *Zygon* 45 (2010), pp. 7–35.

Goffart, W., *Barbarians and Romans, A. D. 418–584: The Techniques of Accommodation* (Princeton, 1980).

Goffman, E., *Interaction Ritual* (Chicago, 1967).

–, *Forms of Talk* (Philadelphia, 1981).

Goldstein, K. M. and S. Blackman, *Cognitive Style. Five Approaches and Relevant Research* (New York, 1978).

Graumann, T., 'Theodosius II and the Politics of the First Council of Ephesus', in: Kelly (ed.), *Theodosius II* (Berkeley, CA, 2013), pp. 109–129.

Gray, P. J., *The Defence of Chalcedon in the East* (Leiden, 1979).

–, 'Barbarians and Ethnicity', in: Bowersock Brown and Grabar (ed.). *Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 107–129.

Grig, L. and G. Kelly (ed.), *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2012).

Grillmeier, A. and H. Bacht (ed.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3 vols. (Würzburg, 1951–54).

Grillmeier, A. and Th. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. I and II.1–4 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1979–2002).

Guinot, P., *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr* (Paris, 1995).

Gumperz, J. J., *Language in Social Groups* (Stanford, 1971).

Halleux, H. de, 'La reception du symbole oecuménique', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 61 (1985), pp. 5–47.

Harris, J., 'Men Without Women: Theodosius' Consistory and the Business of Government', in: Kelly (ed.), *Theodosius II* (Berkeley, CA, 2013), pp. 67–89.

Hefele, C. J. and H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, vols. I (trans. and rev. ed.; Paris, 1907); II.2 (Paris, 1908); XI.2 (Paris, 1952).

Hellensleben, M. (ed.), *Performative Body Spaces. Corporeal Topographies in Literature, Theatre, Dance, and the Visual Arts* (Amsterdam-New York, 2010).

Herrin, J., *The Formation of Christendom* (Oxford, 1987).

Hezser, C., *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine* (Tübingen, 1997).

Honigmann, E., 'The Original Lists of the Members of the Council of Nicaea, the Robber-Synod, and the Council of Chalcedon', *Byzantion* 16 (1942–43), pp. 20–80.

–, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 5 (1950), pp. 209–279.

Horn, S. O., *Petrou Kathedra: Der Bischof von Rom und die Synoden von Ephesus (449) und Chalcedon* (Paderborn, 1982).

Hughes-Freeland, H., *Ritual, Performance, Media* (London, 1998).

L'Huillier, P., *The Church of the Ancient Councils: the Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils* (Crestwood, 1996).

Hymes, D., 'The Ethnography of Speaking', in: T. Galdwin and W. C. Sturtevant (ed.), *Anthropology and Human Behavior* (Washington, D. C., 1962), pp. 13–53.

Jones, A. H. M., *The Later Roman Empire AD 284–602. A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey,* vol. 1 (Oxford, 1964).

Jones, R. H., *Discourse Analysis. A Resource Book for Students* (London, 2012).

Kantorowicz, E., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).

Keenan, E., 'A Sliding Sense of Obligatoriness: The Polystructure of Malagasy Oratory', in: M. Bloch (ed.), *Political Language* (London, 1975), pp. 93–112.

Kedar, B. Z., 'Croisade et Jihad vus par l'ennemi', in: *idem*, *Franks, Muslims, and Oriental Christians* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 345–355.

–, *Franks, Muslims, and Oriental Christians in the Levant* (Aldershot, 2006).

Kelly, C. (ed.), *Theodosius II. Rethinking the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA, 2013).

–, 'Stooping to Conquer: The Power of Imperial Humility, in: *idem* (ed.), *Theodosius II* (Berkeley, CA, 2013), pp. 221–243.

Kelly, G., *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge, 2008).

Kepel, G., *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World*, trans. A. Braley (Pennsylvania, 1994).

–, *Bad Moon Rising*: *A Chronicle of the Middle East Today,* trans. P. Ghazaleh (London, 2003).

Klauser, Th., 'Akklamation', in: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 1 (Stuttgart, 1950), pp. 216–233.

Kuper, A., *The Reinvention of Primitive Society: Transformations of a Myth* (2nd ed.; London-New York, 2005).

–, *Culture. The Anthropologists' Account* (Cambridge, MA, 2000).

Labov, W., 'Phonological Correlates of Social Stratification', in: *American Anthropologist* 66 (1964), pp. 164–176.

Lamb, C. and D. Cohen-Sherbok (ed.), *The Future of Religion: Post-modern Perspectives* (London, 1999).

Larson, G. J., 'Terrorists, mystics and evangelists: assessing the competing claims of religion', in: Lamb and Cohen-Sherbok (ed.), *The Future of Religion* (London, 1999), pp. 41–51.

–, *India's Agony over Religion* (Albany, 1995).

Lehmann, W. P., 'Saussure's Dichotomy between Descriptive and Historical Linguistics', in: Lehmann and Malkiel (ed.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics* (Austin, 1968), pp. 3–20.

–, and Y. Malkiel (ed.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics* (Austin, 1968).

Leibniz, G. W., *New Essays on Human Understanding,* ed. and trans. P. Remnant and J. Bennett (Cambridge, 1996).

Lenski, N., *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (Cambridge, 2006).

Levinson, S. C., *Pragmatics* (Cambridge, 1983).

Liebeschuetz, W., *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (Oxford, 1990).

Lim, R., *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1995).

Lincoln, B., *Authority: Construction and Corrosion* (Chicago-London, 1994).

Maas, P., 'Metrische Akklamationen der Byzantiner', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 21 (1912), pp. 28–51.

MacCormack, S. G., *Art and Ceremony in Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1981).

Mackay, C., *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (London, 1841, repr. Ware, 1995).

MacMullen, R., *Voting about God in Early Church Councils* (New Haven/London, 2006).

–, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Cambridge, MA, 1966).

Mandouze, A. (ed.), *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire* (*PCBE*): *Prosopographie de l'Afrique Chrétienne* (303–533) (Paris, 1982).

–, *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire: Prosopographie de l'Italie Chrétienne*, 2 vols. (Paris, 2000).

Mann, M., *A History of Power from the Beginning to A. D. 1760,* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1986).

Magdalino, P. (ed.), *New Constantines. The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1993).

Martindale, J. R., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1980).

McCormick, M., *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge, 1986).

Mellinkoff, D., *The Language of the Law* (Boston, 1963).

Menze, V., *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church* (Oxford, 2008).

Millar, F., *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408–450)* (Berkeley, 2006).

–, 'Bishops and their Sees at the Sixth Session of the Council of Chalkedon: the Near Eastern provinces', in: Catling and Marchand (ed.), *Onomatologos* (2010), pp. 568–577.

–, 'Linguistic Co-existence in Constantinople: Greek and Latin (and Syriac) in the Acts of the Synod of 536 C. E.', *JRS* 99 (2009), pp. 92–103.

–, 'Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church under Justinian: Two Synods of C. E. 536', *JRS* 98 (2008), pp. 62–82.

–, 'Repentant Heretics in Fifth-Century Lydia: Identity and Literacy', *Scripta Israelica Classica* 23 (2004), pp. 111–130.

–, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (2nd ed.; London, 1992).

Mitchell, M. and F. Young (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity,* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 2006).

Momigliano, A., 'Koine eirene, pax Romana, pax Christiana', in: *idem, Nono contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (ed. R. Di Donato; Rome, 1992), pp. 409–423.

Morris-Jones, W. H., 'The Unhappy Utopia—JP in Wonderland', *Economic Weekly* 12 (1960), pp. 1027–1031.

Movak, M., *Choosing our King* (New York, 1974).

Müller-Wiener, W., *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls* (Tübingen, 1977).

Narayan, J., *A Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Policy* (Wardha, *c.* 1960).

Nicholas, R. W., 'Factions: a Comparative Analysis', in: Banton (ed.), *Political Systems* (London, 1965), pp. 21–61.

Niebuhr, C., *The Godly and the Ungodly: Essays on the Religious and Secular Dimensions of Modern Life* (London, 1958).

Niebuhr, H. R., *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York, 1929).

Nuffelen, P. van, 'Playing the Ritual Game in Constantinople', in: Grig and Kelly (ed.), *Two Romes* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 183–200.

O'Barr, W. M., *Linguistic Evidence. Language, Power, and Strategy in the Courtroom* (Cambridge, MA, 1982).

Parkin, D., *The Rhetoric of Responsibility*, in: Bloch (ed.), *Political Language* (London, 1975), pp. 113–139.

Person, R. E., *The Mode of Theological Decision Making at the Early Ecumenical Councils* (PhD. Diss., Basel, 1978).

Peterson, E., *Εἷς θεός: epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Göttingen, 1926).

Pourkier, A., *L'Hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine* (Paris, 1992).

Price, R., 'The Council of Chalcedon (451): A Narrative', in: Price and Whitby (ed.), *Chalcedon in Context* (Liverpool, 2009), pp. 70–91.

–, 'Truth, Omission, and Fiction in the Acts of Chalcedon', in: Price and Whitby (ed.), *Chalcedon in Context* (Liverpool, 2009), pp. 92–106.

–, and M. Whitby (ed.), *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400–700* (Liverpool, 2009).

Price, S., *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1984).

–, 'From noble funerals to divine cult: the consecration of Roman Emperors', in: Cannadine and Price (ed.), *Rituals of Royalty*, pp. 56–105.

Pride, J. B., *The Social Meaning of Language* (Oxford, 1971).

–, and J. Holmes (ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (rep. Middlesex, 1960).

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R., *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (London, 1945).

Rapp, C., *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2005).

Reinink, G. and H. L. J. Vanstiphout (ed.), *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Medieval Near East* (Leuven, 1991).

Richards, A. and A. Kuper (ed.), *Councils in Action* (Cambridge, 1971).

Riley, D., *Impersonal Passion: Language as Affect* (Durham-London, 2005).

Riley, H. M., *Christian Initiation. A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan* (Washington, D. C., 1974).

Rokeach, M., 'The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism', *Psychological Review* 61 (1954), pp. 194–204.

Romaine, S., *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Oxford, 1994).

Rorty, R. and G. Vattimo, *The Future of Religion*, ed. S. Zabala (New York, 2004).

Ross-Taylor, L. and R. T. Scott, 'Seating Space in the Roman Senate and the *senators pedarii*', *TAPA* 100 (1969), pp. 529–582.

Roueché, C., 'Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire: New Evidence from Aphrodisias', *JRS* 74 (1984), pp. 181–199.

Ruffini, G., *Social Networks in Byzantine Egypt* (New York, 2008).

Samuel, V. C., *The Council of Chalcedon Re-examined* (Madras, 1977).

Sankoff, G., *The Social Life of Language* (Pennsylvania, 1986).

–, 'A Quantitative Paradigm for the Study of Communicative Competence', in: Bauman and Sherzer (ed.), *Explorations* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 18–49.

Sartre, J.-P., *Critique of Dialectical Reason,* vol. 1, trans. A. Sheridan-Smith (London, 1976).

Saussure, F. de, *Cours de linguistique générale* (Paris-Lausanne, 1916, 5e éd. 1968).

Schieffelin, E., 'Problematizing Performance', in: Hughes-Freeland (ed.), *Ritual, Performance* (London, 1998), pp. 194–207.

–, 'Performance and the cultural construction of reality', *American Ethnologist* 12 (1985), pp. 707–724.

Schneider, A. M., 'Sankt Euphemia und das Konzil von Chalkedon', in: Grillmeier and Bacht (ed.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, vol. 1 (Würzburg, 1951), pp. 291–302.

Schor, A., *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria* (Berkeley, 2011).

Schwartz, E., *Über die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalcedon, Nicaea und Konstantinopel* (Abh. d. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Abt. N. F. 13; Munich, 1937).

Searle, J. R., *Speech Acts* (Cambridge, 1969).

Sebok, T. A. (ed.), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, MA, 1960).

Seston, W., 'Constantine as a "Bishop", *JRS* 37 (1947)

Smart, N., *Beyond Ideology: Religion and the Future of Western Civilization* (San Francisco, 1980).

Smith, N. and D. Wilson, *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution* (Bloomington, 1979).

Spanneut, M., *Le Stoïcisme des pères de l'église* (Paris, 1957).

Stark, R. and W. Sims-Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion. Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation* (Berkeley, 1985).

Ste Croix, G. E. M., 'The Council of Chalcedon', repr. in: Whitby and Streeter (ed.), *Christian Persecution*, *Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy* (Oxford, 2006), 259–319.

Stockwell, P., *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction* (London, 2002).

–, *Sociolinguistics. A Resource Book for Students* (London, 2007).

Tajfel, H., 'Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour', in: *Social Science Information* 13 (1974), pp. 65–93.

Talbert, R. J. A., *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton, 1984).

Treadgold, W., *A Concise History of Byzantium* (New York, 2001).

Vasiliev, A. A., *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol. 1 (Madison, 1927).

Watts, E., 'Theodosius II and his Legacy in Anti-Chalcedonian Communal Memory', in: Kelly (ed.), *Theodosius II* (Berkeley, CA, 2013), pp. 269–284.

Weber, W., *Economy and Society: an Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, trans. G. Roth and C. Wittich (New York, 1968).

Weckwerth, A., *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden im Spiegel ihrer Akten* (Münster, 2008).

Wessel, S., *Leo the Great and the Spiritual Rebuilding of a Universal Rome* (Leiden, 2008).

Whitby, M. and M. Whitby, *The Chronicon Paschale* (Liverpool, 1989).

Whitby, M. and J. Streeter (ed.), *Christian Persecution, Martyrdon and Orthodoxy* (Oxford, 2006).

White, H. C., L. Breiger *et al.*, 'Social Structure from Multiple Networks', *American Journal of Sociology* 81 (1976), pp. 730–780.

–, 'Pattern Across Networks', *Society* (1975), pp. 68–73.

Williams, S. and G. Friell, *The Empire at Bay* (London, 1994).

Abbreviations

ACO	*Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*
AGWG	Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
AJS	*American Journal of Sociology*
BAus	Byzantina Australiensia
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
CHC	*Cambridge History of Christianity*
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CHRC	*Church History and Religious Culture*
CJ	*Codex Justinianus*
CTh	*Codex Theodosianus*
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
HE	*Historia Ecclesiastica*
Ep.	*Epistula*
FHG	*Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
LAHR	Late Antique History and Religion
PG	*Patrologia Graeca*
PL	*Patrologia Latina*
PLRE	J. R. Martindale (ed.), *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1980).
PR	*Psychological Review*
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*
SIC	*Scripta Israelica Classica*
StPatr	*Studia Patristica*
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
VC	*Vita Constantini*

Index of Subjects and Themes

Index of Personal and Place Names

Index of Modern Authors

(as discussed in the main text)