



Juvenal of Jerusalem

Ernest Honigmann

Dumbarton Oaks Papers, Vol. 5 (1950), 209-279.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0070-7546%281950%295%3C209%3AJ0J%3E2.0.CO%3B2-B>

Dumbarton Oaks Papers is currently published by Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/doaks.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JUVENAL OF JERUSALEM

ERNEST HONIGMANN

CONTENTS

I. The time before the Council of Ephesus (431)	211
II. The Council of Ephesus in 431	221
III. From 432 to 449	225
IV. The "Robber-Council" of Ephesus (August 8-22, 449)	233
V. From 449 to 451	237
VI. The Council of Chalcedon (451)	240
VII. The Palestinian Insurrection (451-453)	247
VIII. From 454 to 458	257
IX. Juvenal in the later Monophysitic literature	262
X. Juvenal's legendary role in the Chalcedonian literature	266
APPENDIX I: The creation of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem	271
APPENDIX II: Inscription of Thecla, abbess of the monastery of Juvenal (eighth century)	275
Chronological Table of Juvenal's Time	277
Bibliography of Ancient Sources	277

I. THE TIME BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS (A.D. 431)

IT WAS probably in A.D. 422 that Juvenal succeeded Praylius as bishop of Jerusalem, for according to Zacharias Rhetor¹ he was bishop for thirty-six years. The statement of Cyril of Scythopolis saying that Juvenal died "in the forty-fourth year of his episcopate"² is certainly incorrect, since it would make his episcopate begin in 414, that is to say, at the time of John, Praylius's predecessor. For Praylius was consecrated in A.D. 416–417.³ Other authors give as duration of Juvenal's episcopate either forty years,⁴ which seems to be a round number instead of thirty-six, or thirty-eight years.⁵ This latter duration would be compatible with the approximate time of Praylius's episcopate; but since the same authors maintain that Praylius was bishop for twenty years,⁶ we cannot have much confidence in their figures. As the result of his miscalculations, Theophanes makes Juvenal die in the second year of Emperor Zeno,⁷ that is, seventeen years too late. It is therefore wiser to accept the chronology of Zacharias Rhetor, the earliest of the authors mentioned.

Considering his name, we may suppose that Juvenal was of Roman extraction; it is very probable that he understood Latin very well.⁸ If we can trust one of the Monophysitic tales about the "apostate" Juvenal, he lived before his episcopate in a monastery near Jerusalem.⁹

Juvenal's chief object was the elevation of his famous see from its subordinate or at least ambiguous position as suffragan to the metropolitan of

¹ Zach. Rhet., HE, II, 4; CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 126.28 [88.5]: "and in Jerusalem Jubenalios thirty-six years, who attended three synods, since the number of his years was great."

² Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita S. Euthymii*, 33, ed. Schwartz, TU, 49, p. 51.23–52: τὸν τεσσαρακοστὸν τέταρτον . . . πληρώσας ἐνιαυτόν. Cf. Schwartz, *ad loc. cit.*

³ *Coll. Avell.*, 46, CSEL, 35, p. 106.10, ed. O. Guenther.

⁴ Agapius (Mahbūb) of Manbij (ed. Cheikho, CSCO, *Scr. Arab.*, ser. III, t. V, textus [Beryti, 1912], p. 310.2, 315.11; PO, 8, p. 409.419 [149.159]) has forty years, and Michael Syrus in his Chronicle both forty years (II, p. 15; *Syr.*: IV, p. 171) and thirty-six years (II, p. 34; IV, p. 183). Felix Haase, *Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach oriental. Quellen* (Leipzig, 1925), p. 221, is incomplete. The Chronicle of the monk of Qarthamīn gives thirty-nine years (CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. IV, p. 216.21 [165.12]).

⁵ ἔτη λη': Theophanes, *Chron.*, ed. de Boor, p. 93.29, 96.31, 98.9, 103.25, 106.23, 110.17, 113.15, 114.33, 117.23, 119.9, 120.22, 122.19. Nicephorus, *χρον. σύντ.*, ed. de Boor, p. 125.23.

⁶ ἔτη κ': Theophanes, p. 83.17 and often. Nicephorus, p. 125.21.

⁷ Theophanes, p. 122.16–20; cf. de Boor, vol. II of his edition, p. 471. Besides, he reports Juvenal's death and Anastasius's succession under his twenty-third year (p. 112.14–15).

⁸ See below, p. 223.

⁹ See below, p. 263, n. 11. According to Theodore of Trimitheus ("De vita et exilio S. Ioannis Chrysostomi," 12, PG 47, col. LXIII), Bishop Silvanus of Jerusalem (who never existed) sent the Tall Brethren together with his reader Juvenal to the capital. They went there indeed from Jerusalem in 400 (Opitz, RE, V A, col. 2156), but Theodore's account is not reliable.

Caesarea, fixed by the seventh canon of the Council of Nicaea,¹⁰ to one of the primary places of the Eastern Church.

The exceptional position of Jerusalem during the first centuries is revealed by many facts before and after A.D. 325. The council in A.D. 195 concerning the Easter question was presided over by both Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem.¹¹ Dionysius of Alexandria (A.D. 247–264) mentions Mazabanes of Jerusalem among the outstanding Oriental bishops, probably because of the reputation of his see.¹² The three councils of Antioch on the baptism of heretics and against Paul of Samosata were attended by both the bishop of Jerusalem and the metropolitan of Caesarea; but while in A.D. 251 they are mentioned in this order: Theoctistus of Caesarea, Mazabanes of Aelia, in 264 and 265 the order is reversed: Hymenaeus of Jerusalem, Theotecnus of Caesarea.¹³ Eusebius, himself metropolitan of Caesarea, mentions (if he really is the author of the *Vita Constantini*) a letter written by Constantine the Great to his own contemporary “Macarius [of Jerusalem] and the other bishops of Palestine,” he himself being included among “the others.”¹⁴ Already at the time of Eusebius there existed complete lists of the former bishops of Jerusalem analogous to those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch.¹⁵

Since Caesarea was a metropolis depending on the archbishop of Antioch,¹⁶ Juvenal recognized that it was not sufficient to struggle against

¹⁰ The seventh canon of Nicaea, in Mansi, *Conciliar. collect.*, II, col. 672; ed. V. Benešević, “Ioannis Scholastici synagoga L titularum,” t. I (*Abh. Bayer. Acad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, N.F., Heft 14 [1937]), p. 32.6–8: ‘Ἐπειδὴ συνήθεια κεκράτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀρχαία, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλία ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι, ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ μητροπόλει σφζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος. “Since custom and ancient tradition have established that the bishop in Aelia be honored, let him have the succession of honor, safeguarding, however, the domestic right of the metropolis.” The “succession of honor” usually is interpreted to mean the honorary precedence, as a member of general councils, of the bishop of Aelia immediately after the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, while provincial councils of Palestine were mostly presided over by the metropolitan of Caesarea. The consecration of bishops for the cities of Palestine was at the beginning certainly the exclusive privilege of the metropolitan. The anomaly of this status was felt during the whole of the fourth century and involved an ambiguity that led to much friction between the two sees. Cf. below, pp. 215–217.

¹¹ Eusebius, HE, V, 23.3, vol. II, p. 488.24, ed. E. Schwartz; vol. I, p. 504.5–6, ed. Kirsopp Lake.

¹² Eusebius, HE, VII, 5.1, vol. II, p. 638.19, ed. Schwartz.

¹³ Eusebius, HE, VII, 5.1–2, 28.1, 30.2, ed. Schwartz, t. II, pars II (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 638, 702, 706.

¹⁴ Eusebius (?), *Vita Constantini*, III, 52, p. 99.21–22, ed. I. A. Heikel (Leipzig, 1902): *Νικητῆς Κωνσταντίνος Μέγιστος Σεβαστὸς Μακαρίῳ καὶ λοιποῖς ἐπισκότοις Παλαιστίνης.*

¹⁵ Cf. C. H. Turner, “The Early Episcopal Lists, II: The Jerusalem List,” *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, I (1900), 529–553.

¹⁶ In *civil* administration Palestine always belonged to the Dioecesis Orientis with Antioch as capital. Cf., e.g., ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 65.7–8 (*Gesta Chalcedon.*, I.4): καὶ τῶν . . . ἐπισκόπων τῆς τε Ἀνατολικῆς καὶ . . . τῶν διοικήσεων ἄνευ τῶν Παλαιστινηῶν. This also was the ecclesiastical status during the fourth century. Cf. Jerome, *Contra Ioann. Hierosol.* [written in

his metropolitan, as did some of his predecessors,¹⁷ but he coveted what was later called “patriarchal dignity,” — “supermetropolitan” or “exarchical” rights — even claiming (at least occasionally) jurisdiction over the see of Antioch, capital of the whole “Oriental Diocese.” His claims were supported by the following facts.

(1) The rapidly growing importance of Constantinople as “preëminent see” (in the sense of the later “patriarchate”), expressed by the third canon of the council of Constantinople in 381¹⁸ — hardly half a century after the foundation of the new capital — and later corroborated by an edict of the council of Chalcedon, the wrongly so-called twenty-eighth canon of this council.¹⁹

(2) The partition of Palestine into three provinces, which had diminished the importance of Caesarea and thus also that of Jerusalem,²⁰ destined to occupy henceforth the second place only in Palaestina I, its hierarchical relations to the two new capitals of Palaestina II and III being, moreover, indeterminate.

397 according to G. Rauschen, *Jahrb. d. christl. Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius d. Gr.* (Freiburg, 1897), p. 554; in 398: S. Vaillhé, *EO*, XIII (1910), p. 330b, n. 1], *PL*, 23, col. 407 A: Jerusalem belongs to Caesarea and Caesarea to Antioch. The same, *Epist.* 82, 8, ed. I. Hilberg, *CSEL*, 55, p. 144.21 (written at the latest in 393: Rauschen, *loc. cit.*, p. 553): the bishop Jerusalem has no authority in the territory of Eleutheropolis. The *monasterium peregrinorum* at Bethlehem, where Jerome was staying, was not subject to the jurisdiction of Jerusalem. In about 415 Pope Innocent I wrote to Archbishop Alexander of Antioch concerning the authority of the Antiochene see over the whole (Oriental) diocese (*Epist.* 24, 1, *PL*, 20, col. 547 B–548 A = JK 310). He mentions that “divisis imperiali iudicio provinciis” two metropolises had been erected, but that, nevertheless, he (Innocent) opposed the appointment of two metropolitan bishops. The Cyprians should not continue to neglect the Nicaean canons by consecrating bishops, etc. The authority “super dioecesim . . . , non super aliquam provinciam constituta” of course included the three provinces of Palestine.

¹⁷ See below, pp. 215–217.

¹⁸ Concession of the honorable preëminence after the bishop of Rome to the bishop of Constantinople, this city being the “New Rome”: Τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην (canon 3 Concil. Constantinop., ed. Benešević, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, N.F., Heft 14 [1937], p. 33.9–10).

¹⁹ The Greek text in *ACO*, t. II, vol. I, pt. III, p. 88.29 [447.29]–89.12 [448.12] (*Act. Chalc.* 17, 8); English transl. e.g., in A. Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (New issue, London, 1929), pp. 37–38. Against the wrong designation, “28th canon of Chalcedon,” cf. E. Schwartz, *Sitz.-Ber. Berlin. Akad.*, 1930, p. 612; *Byz. Ztschr.* 34 (1934), p. 132.

²⁰ The exact date of the partition cannot be established. Jerome says in his *Liber hebraicarum quaestionum in Genesim*, ad Gen. 21,30 (p. 33, ed. P. Lagarde = *PL*, 23, col. 1019 A), written between 386 and 392: “Quae provincia ante non grande tempus ex divisione praesidium Palaestinae Salutaris est dicta.” The same name was given to other provinces after the division of the former units, such as Macedonia, Galatia, Phrygia, and Syria Salutaris (created pro salute Caesaris, according to E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Abt.*, N.F., Heft 13 [1937] p. 73, n. 1). The three Palestines are first mentioned in 409 (*Cod. Theod.* VII, 4. 30). In about 358–360 Libanius in a letter to the governor of Palestine speaks of a dismemberment of the government (τομὴν τῆς ἀρχῆς) and of the possibility that someone could “saw Palestine into even more parts” (κὰν εἰς πλείω τις διαπρίσῃ τὴν Παλαιστίνην, *Epist.* 334, ed. Foerster = 337,

(3) The difficulties which embarrassed the bishops of Antioch in the first half of the fifth century favored Juvenal's aspirations. His ally was Saint Cyril of Alexandria, not because of a personal predilection, but because they were struggling against a common enemy. In 431, John of Antioch set up a rival "conciliabulum" in favor of Nestorius against the Cyrillians of Ephesus. In 449, even Domnus of Antioch was among the accused bishops and was deposed. In 451, Antioch was represented by archbishop Maximus, whose consecration by Anatolius of Constantinople, the former apocrisiarius of Dioscorus of Alexandria,²¹ had been performed in violation of the canons²² in the lifetime of Domnus; thus he was somewhat compromised, though acknowledged both by Pope Leo and by the Emperor Marcian; besides he was very peaceable and compliant.

In 431 Juvenal motivated his claims by asserting his supremacy over the bishop of Antioch, who should "show obedience [and reverence] to the [Apostolic See of Great Rome, which is present at our session, and] to the Apostolic (See) of the Holy Church of God at Jerusalem";²³ for, according

ed. Wolf). By this partition Elusa had fallen to "the other's share" (τῷ ἐτέρῳ), probably Cyril (cf. Seeck, RE, XII, col. 175, s.v. Kyrillos, no. 4). Cf. G. R. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanius* (Berlin, 1868), p. 241 sqq. P. v. Rohden, *De Palaestina et Arabia provinciis Romanis* (Diss. Berol., 1885), p. 22 sq. R. E. Bruennow and A. v. Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia*, III (Strassburg, 1909), pp. 277–280. R. Devreesse, "Le Christianisme dans le Sud-Palestinien (Négeb)," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 1940, pp. 235–237. The list of the members of the Council of Constantinople in 381 does not mention any bishop of Palaestina Salutaris, the later Palaestina Tertia; the bishop of Scythopolis (no. 10), afterwards capital of Palaestina II, figures in the midst of the other Palestinian bishops, all of whom came from the part of Palestine which later constituted the province Palaestina I.

²¹ Dioscorus himself had consecrated him, at least according to Theodorus Lector, quoted in the Acts of the seventh Oecumenical synod, Mansi, XII, col. 1042 B = PG, 86, col. 217 CD, 220 A = frg. 21, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodn. Prosv.*, t. 333 (St. Petersburg, 1901, I), Otd. klass. filol., p. 12. But this is hardly possible, cf. L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, III, p. 423, n. 2; T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), p. 269, n. 39. Theodorus Lector seems even to date his consecration at Flavian's lifetime in 449 (κατὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Πρωτογένους καὶ Ἀστερίου). E. Schwartz (*Byz. Ztschr.*, 1934, p. 141) changes κατὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν into μετὰ τ.ὑ. (i.e., 450), since, according to him, Anatolius was consecrated in June 450. But this postconsular date for 450 instead of "Valentiniano et Avieno coss." could hardly be used by Theodorus Lector, who wrote about seventy years later; moreover, the words "for he did not foresee the future" (τὸ γὰρ μέλλον ἡγγόει) seem to imply that Theodorus speaks of the time before the Latrocinium.

²² S. Leo, *Epist.* 104, 106 = *Collect. Grimanica*, 54, 56, ACO, t. II, vol. IV (1932), p. 57.7, 60.6.

²³ Ἐχρῆν μὲν Ἰωάννην τὸν . . . ἐπίσκοπον Ἀντιοχείας . . . εἰς ἀπολογίαν τῶν ἐπαγομένων αὐτῷ δραμεῖν [καὶ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον συνεδρεύοντα ἡμῖν τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης] καὶ τῷ ἀποστολικῷ τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ἀγίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας (θρόνῳ) ὑπακοῦσαι [καὶ τιμῆσαι], παρ' ᾧ μάλιστα ἔθος αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀντιοχέων θρόνον ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς ἀκολουθίας καὶ παραδόσεως ἰθύνεσθαι καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ δικάζεσθαι (*Coll. Vatic.*, 89,6, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 18.30–19.1). The words included in brackets are an interpolation inserted in order "to mitigate Juvenal's presumption" (E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, 32.2 [Munich, 1925], p. 5, n. 2, and ACO, *loc. cit.*, adnotatio).

to the "Apostolic order and tradition," the see of Antioch should "be corrected and judged" by that of Jerusalem.

This is obviously an allusion to the so-called Apostolic synod at Jerusalem in about A.D. 48, which settled the dispute arisen at Antioch concerning the observation of the Mosaic Law (Gal. 2; Acts 15); but in fact the representation of this meeting as a quarrel between Jerusalem and Antioch about hierarchical rights would have been misleading.²⁴

The struggle between Caesarea and Jerusalem during the fourth century was almost always mingled with doctrinal disputes. In about 333 or 334 Macarius of Jerusalem intended to consecrate Maximus bishop of Lydda, suffragan city of Caesarea;²⁵ but the inhabitants of Jerusalem preferred to appoint him coadjutor of Macarius, whom he shortly after succeeded.²⁶ In 346 Maximus convoked a council of sixteen bishops to Jerusalem in favor of Saint Athanasius, present there, his metropolitan Acacius of Caesarea favoring Arianism.²⁷ Saint Cyril, canonically consecrated bishop of Jerusalem by the bishops of Palestine,²⁸ was soon after in dispute with his metropolitan, Acacius of Caesarea, regarding the interpretation of the seventh canon of Nicaea. Fighting out at the same time a doctrinal quarrel, Cyril and Acacius tried to depose each other with different accusations. At this time Cyril first claimed for Jerusalem metropolitan rights, stressing that his bishopric was an apostolic see.²⁹ After his several depositions Cyril was replaced by Arian bishops ordained by Acacius of Caesarea and his successors,³⁰ while, for their part, Cyril of Jerusalem, his successor Eutychius, and Cyril again after his return designated Philumenus, Cyril, and Gelasius of Caesarea.³¹ In 381, after the victory of the Nicæan orthodoxy, both Cyril of Jerusalem and his nephew, Gelasius of Caesarea, were members of the

²⁴ Cf. M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, III (Paris, 1740), col. 111 B; E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 32.2 (Munich, 1925), p. 5: "mit deutlicher Berufung auf das neutestamentliche Apostelconcil."

²⁵ Sozomen., II, 20, PG, 67, col. 984 B, who reports it as a rumor (λόγος); repeated by Niceph. Callist., HE, 14,39, PG, 146, col. 1189 D.

²⁶ V. Laurent, "Makarios," *Lexicon f. Theologie u. Kirche*, VI (1934), col. 813.

²⁷ Athanas., "Apol. contra Arian.," PG, 25, col. 340 B, 353 A = *Athanasius Werke*, ed. H.-G. Opitz, I, p. 126, 131; Socrat., HE, II, 24, PG, 67, col. 261 B.

²⁸ Letter sent by the Council of CP (381) to Pope Damasus, Mansi III, col. 585.

²⁹ Sozomen., HE, IV, 25, PG, 67, col. 1196 A: *ὡς ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ ἡγούμενος*. Theodoret HE, II, 26.5-11, p. 157.9-158.18, ed. Parmentier. Theodoret regrets their "struggle for primacy" (p. 157.19: *περὶ πρωτείων φιλονεικούντων*). This struggle was also mentioned by Theodore of Mopsuestia in the fifth book of his treatise against the Eunomians (H.-G. Opitz, RE, V, A, col. 1876.4-8, s.v. Theodorus, 48 [Anagnostes]; cf. col. 1888.7-12, s.v. Theodorus, 49 [of Mops.]), according to a note in *Cod. Barocc.* 142, fol. 218r. Cf. Theodoret, HE, ed. Parmentier, p. XCI-XCII and 157.19.

³⁰ Epiphanius, *Panarion*, haer. 66, 20, 3, t. III, p. 47.14, ed. K. Holl; Euseb.-Hieronym., *Chron.*, p. 237.5-6, ed. R. Helm; Sozomen., HE, IV, 30, PG, 67, col. 1208 A.

³¹ Epiphani., *Haeres.*, 73, 37, 5, ed. K. Holl, t. III, p. 312.5-8.

second ecumenical council, Cyril occupying the first place, certainly according to the "succession of honor" proclaimed by the seventh Nicaean canon.³² As to the report by Marcus Diaconus in his *Vita Porphyrii*, according to which the priest Porphyrius of Jerusalem was appointed bishop of Gaza by metropolitan John of Caesarea and the Gazaeans in this city,³³ it is preferable to leave this case unsolved, since it is very doubtful whether Bishop John is to be regarded as a historical personage;³⁴ it is, however, true that this story could hardly be invented any more at a time when the bishops of Jerusalem were accustomed to consecrate the Palestinian bishops. At the time of John of Jerusalem (386–416), who inclined to the Origenistic and Pelagian errors,³⁵ the predominance of Caesarea was again firmly established: both the synodical letter sent in September 400 by Theophilus of Alexandria to the council *in encaeniis* at Jerusalem (Aeliae) and the answer of the Palestinian bishops mention Eulogius of Caesarea in the first place and John of Jerusalem in the second.³⁶ The same order appears in the enumeration of the fourteen bishops gathered in 415 at Lydda-Diospolis.³⁷ Between September 404 and June 407 John Chrysostom wrote a letter to Eulogius of Caesarea³⁸ in which he asserted that doubtless "all the . . . bishops in Palestine will follow in your footsteps,"³⁹ while the following letter to John of Jerusalem⁴⁰ contains no similar allusion. It was however just at the time when John seems to have been satisfied with a secondary role that the bishop of the far-distant Hippo stressed the importance of Jerusalem as a see of Apostolic origin. In 401, Saint Augustine wrote: "Cathedra tibi quid fecit ecclesiae Romanae in qua Petrus sedit et in qua hodie Anastasius [399–401] sedet, vel ecclesiae Hierosolymitanae in qua Iacobus sedit et in qua hodie Iohannes sedet, quibus nos in catholica unitate conectimur et a quibus vos nefario furore separastis?"⁴¹ If in about 417

³² Council of 381, Greek list, ed. C. H. Turner, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, 15 (1914), p. 168, no. 4,5 (read Γελάσιος instead of Πελάγιος). Latin list, ed. Turner, *Eccl. Occid. Mon. Iur. Antiqu.*, t. II, pars III, p. 434; Syriac list, ed. F. Schulthess, *Abh. Ges. Wiss. Götting.*, N.F. 10, 2 (1908), p. 113 sq.

³³ Marcus Diaconus, *Vita Porphyrii*, 16, ed. H. Grégoire and M.-A. Kugener (Paris, 1930), p. 14.

³⁴ Grégoire and Kugener, *ibid.*, p. xxxvii–xxxix, lxxiii, n. 2; F. Diekamp, *Analecta patristica* (Rome, 1938), pp. 17–18.

³⁵ Grégoire and Kugener, *ibid.*, p. lxxiv–lxxix.

³⁶ S. Hieronymus, *Epist.* 92, 93, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL, 55 (Vienna-Leipzig, 1912), pp. 147.7–8, 155.6.

³⁷ S. Augustinus, *Contra Iulianum Pelagianum*, I, 5, 19; 7, 32; PL, 44, col. 652, 663.

³⁸ S. Ioann. Chrysost., *Epist.* 87, PG, 52, col. 654.

³⁹ Πάντες οἱ κατὰ τὴν Παλαιστίνην . . . ἐπίσκοποι ἔψονται σου τοῖς ἔχνεσιν.

⁴⁰ S. Ioann. Chrysost., *Epist.* 88, PG, 52, col. 654–655.

⁴¹ S. Augustinus, *Contra Litteras Petiliani*, II, 51, 118, ed. Petschenig, CSEL, 52 (1909), p. 88.15–19.

Praylius of Jerusalem consecrated Dominus, "the twice married", metropolitan of Caesarea,⁴² this only shows that the bishops of Caesarea and Jerusalem kept to the custom of mutual ordination, which possibly implied the aim at emancipation from any interference on the part of the archbishop of Antioch. It can hardly be interpreted as a sign of ambition on the part of Praylius, since it was only natural that the *πρωτόθρονος* of the province participated in the consecration of his metropolitan.⁴³

Juvenal's immoderate claims not only menaced Antioch and Caesarea, but also offended the pope of Rome and Cyril of Alexandria. Leo the Great even reproached him with having forged documents in support of his aspirations,⁴⁴ and Saint Cyril, though wanting him as a useful ally, nevertheless "shuddered at his unlawful attempts."⁴⁵ In another letter to the priest and abbot Gennadius, Cyril also blames Juvenal's ambition, but wishes to avoid any friction;⁴⁶ he recommends that his correspondent should not sever his relations with Proclus because he was in communication with Juvenal.⁴⁷

Since in spite of all these disparaging remarks Juvenal's pretensions did not provoke any open remonstrance, it is quite obvious that he was backed by some "pragmatical" or "divine" letters, that is to say, edicts of Emperor Theodosius II, though the text of these edicts is not preserved in the Codex

⁴² Theodoret, *Epist.* 110, PG, 83, col. 1305 C.

⁴³ Tillemont, *Mémoires*, XV, 202; S. Vailhé, EO, 13, p. 331 a.

⁴⁴ Leo Magnus, *Epist.* 119, 4, to Maximus of Antioch, PL, 54, col. 1044 A [JK, 495] = *Collectio Grimanica*, 66, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 74.13-15: Iuvenalis episcopus ad obtinendum Palaestinae provinciae principatum credidit se posse proficere et insolentes ausus per commenticia scripta firmare.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 74.15-17: "Quod sanctae memoriae Cyrillus Alexandrinus episcopus merito perhorrescens, scriptis suis mihi quid praedicti cupiditas ausa sit, indicavit et sollicita prece multum poposcit ut nulla illicitis conatibus praebereetur assensio." This letter of Cyril, known only by Pope Leo's quotation, is usually supposed to have been written to Leo as archdeacon, thus before 440; cf. e.g. Tillemont, *Mém.*, XIV, p. 452; T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), p. 35, n. 13. Mgr. L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, III (5th ed., Paris, 1929), p. 459, n. 5, prefers a later date (440 or 441) when Leo was already pope. Tillemont (*loc. cit.*) also took this possibility into consideration.

⁴⁶ S. Cyrillus, *Epist.* 56, ad Gennadium presbyterum et archimandritam, PG, 77, col. 320 B = *Codex Vatican. gr.* 1431, no. 38, ed. E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss.*, 32, 6 (Munich, 1927), p. 17.18-22. Schwartz (p. 91) supposes that this letter was written at the beginning of Proclus's episcopate (434-447) and that Gennadius was the leader of a community of hermits in Palestine who had refused obedience to Juvenal because he had no metropolitan jurisdiction over them. He reproached the new bishop of Constantinople for having acknowledged Juvenal by sending him a *synodica* announcing his election. Gennadius can hardly be identified with the later patriarch of Constantinople (April 450-July 3, 458), as some scholars assumed (cf. Tillemont, *Mém.*, XVI, p. 68); see F. Diekamp, *Analecta patristica* (Rome, 1938) = *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, Num. 117, p. 54.

⁴⁷ S. Cyrillus, *Epist.* 56, *loc. cit.*: καὶ ταῦτα γράφω μαθὼν ὅτι ἡ σὴ θεοσεβεία λελύπηται εἰς τὸν ὁσιώτατον καὶ θεοσεβέστατον ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ συλλειτουργὸν ἐπίσκοπον Πρόκλον ὡς λαβόντα πρὸς κοινωνίαν τὸν τῆς Αἰλιέων ὄν οἱ μὲν τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεσμοὶ τῆς Παλαιστίνης ἡγούμενον οὐκ ἴσασι, ἐγείρει δὲ πρὸς ἀχάλιον τοῦ πράγματος ἐπιθυμίαν φιλοδοξία διάκενος πικρὸν ἔχουσα τέλος.

Theodosianus. But the wording of Juvenal's agreement with Maximus of Antioch on October 23, 451, clearly implies their existence.⁴⁸ As to the date of these edicts, it can merely be stated that some of them probably preceded the council of Ephesus in 431, since at that time Juvenal already enjoyed preëminence over the Palestinian provinces which could not be explained without the existence of such imperial decrees. In their wording they probably resembled the decree *De metropoli Beryto*.⁴⁹

These considerations show that during the first ten years of his episcopate Juvenal had already attained considerable results from his ambitious intrigues. Unfortunately little is known of these ten years up to A.D. 431.

At the request of Abbot Euthymius, in about 425 Juvenal appointed the chief of a Saracen tribe called Aspebetus,⁵⁰ the father of Terebon, under the Christian name Peter, to be first bishop of the "Camp of the Saracens" (Παρεμβολαί).⁵¹ The "camp" was situated three hours east of Jerusalem at the place of the actual Bīr az-Zarra'a.⁵² This event cannot be dated exactly,

⁴⁸ *Concil. Chalced. act.*, VIII, 17, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 7.3-5 [366.3-5]: ἀργούντων κατὰ τὴν κέλευσιν τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εἰσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότον πάντων τῶν πραγματικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλως πορισθέντων τοῖς μέρεσι θείων γραμμάτων καὶ τῶν περιεχομένων αὐτοῖς προστίμων ταύτης ἔνεκεν τῆς ὑποθέσεως. *Versio a Rustico edita*, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars III, p. 10.24-26 [449.24-26]: "vacantibus secundum iussionem sacratissimi et piissimi nostri domini omnibus pragmaticis et aliter acquisitis a patribus [*postulatur* partibus, Schwartz] sacris litteris et multis quae continentur in eis ob hanc causam." Cf. *Collectio Vatic.*, 5, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars II, p. 20.37-39 [112.37-39]: "convenit etiam et omnia quae hic acta sunt et pragmatice gesta et multa vel si quid aliud sive per episcopos sive per imperatores aut iudices facta sunt utrisque partibus, vacua esse omnino."

⁴⁹ *Cod. Iustin.*, 11, 22 (t. II, p. 434, ed. P. Krueger, 10th ed., Berlin, 1929): "Impp. Theodosius et Valentinianus AA. Hormisdæ, pp. Propter multas iustasque causas metropolitano nomine ac dignitate Berytum decernimus exornandam iam suis virtutibus coronatam. igitur haec quoque metropolitanam habeat dignitatem. Tyro nihil de iure suo derogatur. sit illa mater provinciae maiorum nostrorum beneficio, haec nostro et utraque dignitate simili perfruatur." E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss.*, 32, 2 (1925), p. 3; N.F. 13 (1937), p. 45, n. 5, says: "der Satz Tyro . . . derogatur ist schwerlich original," but the preceding as well as the following sentence require it. Obviously the decree was issued before the Latrocinium, whose minutes Eustathius of Berytus signed among the metropolitans, while the synod which transferred the bishoprics of Northern Phoenicia to him (*Acta. Chalc.*, 19, 19, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 106.9 [465.9]) was under Anatolius of CP and Maximus of Antioch in 450. E. Schwartz's dating (*loc. cit.*: after Oct. 26, 448) results from a confusion of ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 19.24 [378.24] with line 26 (Sept. 1, 448; but this date is wrong; cf. his *Praef.*, p. XXIV sq.)

⁵⁰ ὁ Ἀσπέβητος, i.e., as it seems, the Persian title *spahbedh* of a commander-in-chief (cf. E. Schwartz, "Kyrillos von Skythopolis, TU, 49, 2 [1939], p. 259, s.v. Ἀσπέβητος).

⁵¹ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthym.*, 15, TU, 49, 2, p. 25.5. Cf. Symeon Metaphr., PG, 114, col. 676. Cyril calls Juvenal at this occasion "patriarch" (p. 25.4, 5; 26.26), but elsewhere "archbishop" (p. 26.17, 24; 33.2, 28; 49.4; 51.23), or "bishop" (p. 48.29).

⁵² Cf. S. Vaillhé, "Le Monastère de S. Théoctiste et l'évêché de Paremboles," ROC, 3 (1898), pp. 68-70; L. Féderlin, "Mémoire sur les Paremboles," in R. Génier, *Vie de S. Euthyme le Grand* (Paris, 1909), pp. 104-111; F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine*, II (Paris, 1938), 200. Πιέρος ἐπίσκοπος Παρεμβολῶν figures in the list of the members of the council of Ephesus in 431: cf. E. Gerland and V. Laurent, *Corpus Notitiarum Episcopatumum*,

but in any case it took place before the consecration of the church in the lavra of Saint Euthymius on May 7 either 428 (*indictio* XI) or 429 (the fifty-second year of Euthymius), which is later recorded.⁵³ Whether this appointment constituted a violation of the rights of the bishop of Caesarea is not quite clear, since Parembolae apparently belonged to the municipal area of Jerusalem and, on the other hand, Peter's consecration could be justified by the necessity of appointing an Arabic-speaking bishop for his tribe. Thus Peter could be considered as a kind of coadjutor of Juvenal.

In 428 or 429 Juvenal went to the lavra of Euthymius in order to perform there the consecration of the church mentioned above.⁵⁴ Accompanied by the chorepiscopus-archimandrite Passarion⁵⁵ and by the famous priest and "church teacher" Hesychius,⁵⁶ he consecrated on May 7 the church built by Bishop Peter of Parembolae. There he ordained as priests Euthymius's pupils, Dometianus of Melitene and Domnus, the future patriarch of Antioch. Shortly before the synod of 431, Juvenal ordained Stephen of Melitene and Cosmas of Cappadocia deacons of the Holy Anastasis.⁵⁷

Dealing with Juvenal's activities at the time before the council of Ephesus, we also shall enter into a discussion about his pretended consecration of Phoenician and Arabian bishops. If his disregard of the rights of the metropolitan of Caesarea, as expressed by the creation of the bishopric of Parembolae, seems to be blamable, it could have been an extremely serious interference with the jurisdiction of the see of Antioch if Juvenal really had consecrated several bishops in the provinces of Arabia and Phoenicia I and II. When discussing his attempts to create his "patriarchate," almost all

vol. I: *Les Listes conciliaires* (Kadiköy, 1936), p. 80, no. 175. Cf. below, p. 221, n. 6, and p. 225. The *Notitia dignitatum* (Or. XXXIV, 48) mentions a *Cohors prima salutaria inter Aeliam et Hierichunta* (p. 74, ed. O. Seeck). F.-M. Abel (*loc. cit.*, II, p. 179) supposes that it was stationed at Qal'at ed-Damm.

⁵³ Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthym.*, 16, p. 26.21, ed. Schwartz.

⁵⁴ Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthym.*, 16, pp. 26.17-27.4.

⁵⁵ Πασσαρίων. Cf. also Theophan., p. 86.31, ed. de Boor. [John of Bêth Rufinā], *Life of Peter the Iberian*, ed. R. Raabe (Leipzig, 1895), p. 35.8 [38 ult.]. "Passerio et Avitus presbyteri" (415): Orosius, *Liber apologeticus*, 6, 1; 7, 6, ed. C. Zangemeister, CSEL, 5, pp. 610.3, 612.17; F. Delmas, EO, 3 (1899-1900), pp. 162-163.

⁵⁶ Ἡσύχιος: Theophan., p. 83.6, 92.20, ed. de Boor; *Chronic. Pasch.*, vol. II (Bonn, 1832), p. 116, ed. Dindorf (εἰς τὴν γέννησιν); Concil. V, Mansi IX, col. 248 sq.; Tillemont, *Mém.*, XIV, pp. 227-232; R. Devreesse, *Rev. Bibl.*, 33 (1924), pp. 498-521; Ch. Tcherakian, *Le Commentaire sur le livre de Job par Isychius prêtre de Jérusalem*, text arménien (Venice, 1913); A. Vaccari, "Esichio di Gerusalemme e il suo 'Commentarius in Leviticum,'" *Bessarione*, 22 (1918), pp. 8-46; O. Stählin, *Altchristl. griech. Lit.* (Munich, 1924), p. 1485 sq.; O. Bardenhewer, *Gesch. d. altkirchl. Lit.*, IV (1924), pp. 257-261; K. Jüssen, "Die dogmatischen Anschauungen des Hesychius von Jerusalem," *Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie*, H. 17, 20 (Münster, 1931, 1934); Th. Hermann, *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, 51 (1932), p. 322-323 (Hesychius claimed by the Monophysites as their fellow-believer).

⁵⁷ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 20, p. 32.23-25, ed. Schwartz. Cf. below, p. 228, n. 28.

modern scholars⁵⁸ reproach him for these arbitrary acts. As proof of their opinion they refer to a request addressed by several bishops of the Oriental Diocese to Emperor Theodosius II in 431.⁵⁹ It is true that the signatures to this request are not preserved,⁶⁰ but the heading of this letter states that it was the first petition (*petitio, contestatio, δέσις*) of the seven Oriental bishops sent to the Emperor from Chalcedon (September 431), because they were not allowed to enter Constantinople. These seven bishops were John of Antioch, John of Damascus, Paul of Hemesa, Macarius of Laodicea, Apringius of Chalcis, Theodoretus of Cyrrhus, and Helladius of Ptolemaïs, as we know from other documents.⁶¹ The wording of the quoted passage is as follows: "At nos qui(dem quibus)dam [*var. ex nobis quidam*] a pientissimo Iuvenale Hierosolymitanorum olim ordinatis siluimus."⁶² Shortly afterwards they continue: "et nunc quoque illius studia et praestigias tales per Phoenicem secundam et Arabiam non ignoramus."⁶³ But in 1920 Eduard Schwartz published the Greek original of this letter,⁶⁴ where the two quoted sentences run as follows: ἡμεῖς δὲ ἤδη μὲν τῶν παρὰ τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου Ἰουβενάλιου τοῦ Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν πρώην ἐγχειρισθέντων ἠσυχάσαμεν,⁶⁵ and καὶ νῦν αὐτοῦ σπουδὰς τινὰς καὶ φαντασίας τοιαύτας κατὰ Φοινίκης ἐκατέρας καὶ Ἀραβίας οὐκ ἀγνοοῦμεν.⁶⁶

There exists another Latin translation of the same letter, made by the Deacon Rusticus in his *Synodicon*,⁶⁷ where the quoted passages are translated as follows: "Nos vero olim quidem, dum quaedam praesumpta sint a reverentissimo quondam Hierosolymitanorum Iuvenali, quievimus," and "et nunc quasdam festinationes et fantasias eius huiusmodi contra utramque Phoenicem et Arabiam minime ignoramus."⁶⁸

Both the Greek original and the better translation made by Rusticus show that in the corresponding passage of the *Collectio Winteriana* the word ἐγχειρισθέντων ("set upon, attacked") is wrongly rendered by "ordi-

⁵⁸ Tillemont, *Mém.*, XIV, pp. 452, 482; XV, p. 202, first recognized, however, with his usual perspicacity, that the passage is "sans doute mal traduit et mal copié," and for this reason expressed himself with more caution than modern scholars like Vailhé or Kattenbusch.

⁵⁹ Former editions: Labbe, *Concilia*, III, col. 728; Mansi, IV, col. 1402 D.

⁶⁰ F. Kattenbusch, *Realencykl. f. protest. Theol. u. Kirche* (3rd. ed.), IX, p. 660.40.

⁶¹ *Collectio Vaticana*, 96, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, pp. 36.41–37.8. The eighth delegate, Himerius of Nicomedia, arrived somewhat later at Chalcedon.

⁶² *Collect. Winteriana*, 15, 4, ACO, t. I, vol. V, pars II, p. 371.5.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 371.7.

⁶⁴ *Collect. Atheniensis*, 62, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, pp. 72–73; first published by E. Schwartz in his "Neue Akten zum ephesenischen Konzil von 431," *Abh. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, 30, 8 (1920), pp. 16–17.

⁶⁵ *Collectio Atheniensis*, loc. cit., p. 73.16–17.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 73.18–20.

⁶⁷ *Collectio Casimensis*, 121, ACO, t. I, vol. IV, pars II, pp. 71–73.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 73.1–5.

natis”⁶⁹ and the words Φοινίκης ἐκατέρας apparently are mistaken for “Φ.ἐτέρας, per Phoenicem secundam.”

It is not known how Juvenal tried to justify his claims for the two Phoenicias and Arabia, nor whether he enforced these claims by any actions. But we certainly can acquit him of one reproach: since in the two passages quoted above his former machinations are merely opposed to his present claims, there is no further reason to assume that before A.D. 431 he ever consecrated bishops in the three provinces of Arabia and Phoenicia I and II.

II. THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS IN A.D. 431

In A.D. 430, Pope Caelestinus held a synod in Rome which declared Nestorius, archbishop of Constantinople, a heretic, and menaced him with deposition unless he would repudiate his errors within ten days. In his letters of August 10, 430, the Pope announced the resolutions of this synod to the ecclesiastical leaders of the Eastern Empire, among them Juvenal of Jerusalem.¹ Towards the end of 430, Cyril of Alexandria forwarded the papal letters to John of Antioch and to Juvenal; Cyril added a letter of his own to each of them.² In the former he mentions Juvenal as the bishop τῆς Αἰλιέων,³ as he calls Jerusalem also in his letter to Gennadius.⁴

By an imperial decree of November 19, 430, the council of Ephesus was convoked for June 7, 431 (Pentecost). Nestorius arrived at Ephesus shortly after Easter (April 19), Cyril of Alexandria came about Pentecost (June 7), and Juvenal on the fifth day after Pentecost (June 12).⁵ He was escorted by the following Palestinian bishops:

From Palaestina I: Ῥωμανὸς Ῥαφίας, Παυλι(νι)ανὸς Μαιουμᾶ, Παῦλος Ἀνθηδόνος, Φείδος Ἰόππη, Αἰάνης (or Αἰανὸς) Σγκαμαζόνος, Θεόδωρος Γαδάρων (Palaest. I or II?), Λητόιος Λιβιάδος, Νετίρας Γάζης, Πέτρος Παρεμβολῆς (or -λῶν).⁶

From Palaestina II: Πουφίλος Γάβων.

⁶⁹ Confused with χειροτονηθέντων. Already four lines before (ACO, t. I, vol. V, pars II, p. 371.1) the Greek διὰ τῶν ἐπιχειρηθέντων is rendered by *per ordinatos*.

¹ JK, 373; *Collectio Veronensis*, 6, ACO, t. I, col. II, pp. 21.1–22.20; cf. *Collect. Casinensis*, 13, ACO, t. I, vol. III, p. 37.21; Greek translation: *Coll. Vatic.*, 12, ACO, I, vol. I, pars I, pp. 90.5–91.33; *Coll. Segueriana*, 18, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, p. 5.5; *Coll. Atheniens.*, 9, *ibid.*, p. 32.31.

² *Collectio Vaticana*, 13, 15, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars I, pp. 92.1–93.3, 96.28–98.3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 92.27.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 217, n. 47.

⁵ Socrates, HE, VII, 34,2, PG, 67, col. 813 C.

⁶ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthym.*, 20, pp. 32.25–33.6, ed. Schwartz.

From Palaestina III: Ἀβδελᾶς or Θεόδουλος Ἐλούσης, Θεόδωρος Ἀριωνίδης, Ἰωάννης Αἰγυοστοπόλεως, Σαΐδας Φαινοῦς.⁷

At the occasion of his departure the great Euthymius recommended the Saracene bishop Peter of Parembolae to follow by all means both Cyril of Alexandria and Acacius of Melitene, who were orthodox and had struggled against ungodliness.⁸ It is somewhat surprising that Euthymius did not mention the Palestinian leader Juvenal as one of the models of orthodoxy. Cyril of Scythopolis has perhaps preferred to pass him over because of the role played by him at the Robber-Synod of Ephesus.

On June 21, three bishops of the Oriental party, Tranquillinus (of Antioch in Pisidia), Alexander (of Apamea in Syria), and Helladius (of Tarsus), addressed a warning (*contestatio*), signed by sixty-eight bishops, to Cyril and Juvenal, asking them to wait three more days for the arrival of John of Antioch together with the Oriental bishops.⁹ The address of this document shows that from the very beginning of the council Juvenal was considered the second leader of the Cyrillian assembly. The *Corpus canonum* of Antioch, in which lists of the members of several councils are preserved, does not contain any complete list of those of the Council of Ephesus; only the beginning of a list figures in one of the manuscripts containing this collection of canons in Syriac translation.¹⁰ The first six members are there enumerated in the following order: Caelestinus of Rome, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Memnon of Ephesus, Theodotus of Ancyra, Acacius of Melitene.

From all these testimonies it becomes obvious that at this time Juvenal already occupied the rank of an archbishop, though by some chance he is never so styled in the minutes of the Council. Of course, Cyril far surpassed Juvenal in personality; but if on June 22 Bishop Saidas of Phaeno in Palaestina Salutaris calls the latter "our bishop Juvenal,"¹¹ this cannot be interpreted as being opposed to "our archbishop Cyril," as Kattenbusch assumes.¹² For in fact Saidas does not call Cyril "archbishop," but either "bishop"¹³ or simply Cyril.¹⁴ Besides the parallelism of the adjectives ἀγιώτατος καὶ θεο-

⁷ Cf. E. Gerland and V. Laurent, *Corpus Notitiarum Episcopatumum*, vol. I (1936), pp. 78–80, nos. 164–177; the authors wrongly attribute *Parembolae* (no. 175) to Palaestina III; in fact his place among the bishops of Palaestina III resulted from an "association de circonstances" (F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine*, II [Paris, 1938], p. 200, n. 10).

⁸ Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthym.*, 20, p. 33.2–6.

⁹ *Collect. Casinens.*, 82, ACO, t. I, vol. IV, pp. 27.23–30.40.

¹⁰ *Cod. Paris. syr.* 62, fol. 154r–v, ed. F. Schulthess, *Abh. Ges. Wiss. Götting.*, N.F. 10, 2 (1908), p. 149.28–33.

¹¹ παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν Ἰουβενάλιου, *Coll. Vatic.*, 45, 82, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars II, p. 25.3.

¹² F. Kattenbusch, *Realencykl. f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, 3rd. ed., IX, p. 660. 44–49.

¹³ *Coll. Vatic.*, loc. cit., p. 25.2: codd. VPA.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*: codd. SD.

φιλέστατος and ὀσιώτατος καὶ θεοσεβέστατος,¹⁵ shows that in his opinion the two leaders occupied the same rank; for these epithets had hardly a different significance.¹⁶

Among the bishops who were present and signed the minutes of the session of June 22 as well as that of July 22, Juvenal always signed immediately after Cyril,¹⁷ with the exception of the list of subscriptions of July 22, when, after the arrival of the three papal legates (July 10), one of them, bishop Arcadius, signed before him, while the names of the two others figure after his name. Juvenal's seat between the papal legates probably implies his familiarity with the Latin language, which, as Tillemont had already remarked,¹⁸ seems also to be proved by the following passage. When on July 10 the Notarius Siricius had read the letter of Pope Caelestinus in Latin ('Ρωμαϊστί), Juvenal approved its contents even before all the other bishops asked to read it in a Greek translation.¹⁹ The next day he addressed the papal legates as spokesman of the council.²⁰

On June 21 and 22, three delegations of bishops were sent to Nestorius to summon him to justify himself before the council; but he refused. Referring to this in the first session of June 22, Juvenal declared that, though only three summons were required by the ecclesiastical rules, they would have tried to summon him for a fourth time, "but since a crowd of soldiers which surrounded his own house according to the report of the bishops who went there, permits no one to enter there, it is clear that he does not refuse with good conscience to betake himself to the holy synod."²¹ Nestorius later quoted these words of Juvenal (as far as I have included them between quotation marks) in the so-called *Bazaar of Heraclides* in order to show that, far from having menaced his opponents, he himself had needed military protection against his persecutors.²²

In the same session a letter of Nestorius was read, and when Cyril asked whether its contents were in agreement with the orthodox creed of Nicaea, Juvenal was the first to answer in the negative and to declare: "I anathema-

¹⁵ Applied to Juvenal here as well as by Cyril to archbishop Proclus of Constantinople (cf. above, p. 217, n. 47).

¹⁶ Cf. E. Schwartz, ACO, t. II, vol. VI, pp. 155-157.

¹⁷ *Collectio Vatic.*, 33, 62, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars II, pp. 3.10, 55.2; *Collect. Athen.*, 73, 79, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, pp. 85.1, 112.1.

¹⁸ Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, p. 196.

¹⁹ *Collect. Vatic.*, 106, 6, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 54.20-22.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 106, 26, ACO, t. I, col. I, pars III, p. 59.14-20.

²¹ *Collect. Vatic.*, 43, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars II, p. 12.20-23.

²² Nestorius, *Πραγματεία Ἡρακλείδου*, Syriac text, ed. P. Bedjan, *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (Leipzig and Paris, 1910), p. 199; transl. by G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson (Oxford, 1925), p. 135.

tize those who believe in this way.”²³ He signed Nestorius’s deposition immediately after Cyril.²⁴

On July 17, when Cyril mentioned the sentence of deposition pronounced by John of Antioch and his followers against him and Memnon of Ephesus, the synod declared John of Antioch and thirty-three Oriental bishops excluded from their communion. Juvenal signed this document in the first place, after him the three papal legates, finally the rest of the bishops, 198 in all.²⁵ In two letters to the emperors Theodosius and Valentinianus his signature appears in the first place,²⁶ since the deposed Cyril preferred to abstain from signing them. As we have mentioned above, Cyril’s name still figures in the lists of July 22; but after his deposition by an Imperial *sacra*²⁷ and his imprisonment Juvenal undoubtedly was the leader of the Cyrillian council.²⁸ When the Emperor convoked eight members of each party to a conference, Juvenal as well as two of the papal legates were among those of the Cyrillian party;²⁹ Verinianus of Perge then replaced Juvenal as leader of the assembly in Ephesus.³⁰

The discussions of the conference took place at Chalcedon after September 11, 431. But the Emperor soon returned to Constantinople, permitting only the Cyrillian delegates to follow him to the capital in order to consecrate there a new bishop instead of the deposed Nestorius. At this time the Antiochene party, in a letter addressed to the Emperor, complained of Juvenal’s attempts to obtain the jurisdiction over the provinces Phoenicia I and II and Arabia.³¹

As one of the eight Cyrillian delegates, Juvenal took part in the consecration of Maximianus of Constantinople on October 25, 431.³² Thereafter a synod was held in the capital which Juvenal attended, and his signature comes first in a letter to the Pope.³³ In his answer of March 15, 432, Pope Caelestinus places Juvenal’s name after those of his own legates.³⁴ Cyril,

²³ *Collect. Vatic.*, 47, 3, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars II, p. 31.18–20.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 62, *loc. cit.*, p. 55.2.

²⁵ *Collectio Vatic.*, 90, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 26.1.

²⁶ *Collectio Vatic.*, 92, 102, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, pp. 30.30, 48.34.

²⁷ *Collectio Vatic.*, 93,3, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 31.23. Juvenal’s name there appears in the twentieth place of the addressees (*Coll. Vat.*, 93, 1, p. 31.6), whose names are certainly not arranged according to their hierarchical order.

²⁸ Cf. C. J. v. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, II (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1875), p. 226.

²⁹ *Collectio Vatic.*, 95, 108, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, pp. 34.1, 65.16.

³⁰ *Collectio Vatic.*, 95, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 35.2.

³¹ See above, pp. 219–221.

³² Socrates, HE, VII, 37, 19, PG, 67, col. 825 A; *Collectio Vatic.*, 109, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 67.6–7.

³³ *Collectio Athen.*, 84, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, p. 124.29.

³⁴ *Collectio Athen.*, 85, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, p. 125.35.

writing to those who had consecrated Maximianus, put Juvenal's name ahead of the other seven addressees.³⁵ In other documents issued by bishops of the Eastern Empire, Juvenal's name figures immediately after that of Maximianus; e.g., in a letter sent by Maximianus, the seven delegates of the Ephesian council, and the other members of the *σύνοδος ἐνδημούσα* at Constantinople to all provinces,³⁶ of which one specimen is preserved under the special title: "Synodical letter to the bishops of Old Epirus,"³⁷ or in the address of a libel of Bishop Peter of Traianopolis, announcing his repentance.³⁸

From the Pope's answer just mentioned we can infer that in March 452 Juvenal and the other delegates still stayed — or were supposed to stay — at Constantinople. The Pope died soon after, probably on July 26;³⁹ his successor Xystus was consecrated on July 31.

III. FROM 432 TO 449

Between 432 and 449 only a few events in Palestine can be exactly dated. The Saracene bishop Peter, who had played a rather active role at Ephesus,¹ reported after his return about all that had happened there to the great Euthymius,² who was very angry at the conduct of John of Antioch. He tried to dissuade John's nephew Domnus, who was deacon in Euthymius's lavra, from going to Antioch; but Domnus disregarded his advice and went to the capital of the Orient, where, in A.D. 441–442, he succeeded his uncle, as Euthymius had prophesied to him.³

The most important event between the two councils of Ephesus was the first journey of Empress Eudocia to Jerusalem in 438–439, undertaken in order to keep a vow. Cyril of Alexandria went to Antioch to salute her and accompanied her to Jerusalem, where he took part in the solemn ceremonies in honor of her arrival.⁴ At her request, he attended on May 15, together with numerous Egyptian bishops, the interment of the relics of Saint Stephen and consecrated the church of the protomartyr which she had built north of the city; on the next day he also buried by request of Melania the bones of the Persian martyrs and of the forty martyrs of Sebastia in another

³⁵ S. Cyril, *Epist.* 32 = *Collect. Athen.*, 90, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, p. 137.15.

³⁶ *Collect. Athen.*, 91, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, p. 137.34–37.

³⁷ *Collect. Vatic.*, 113, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 70.10.

³⁸ *Collect. Athen.*, 93, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, p. 139.3.

³⁹ Cf. Tillemont, *Mém.*, XIV, pp. 503, 737–739.

¹ ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VIII, Index, p. 22, s.v. Πέτρος Παρεμβολών.

² Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 20, p. 33.7–10, ed. Schwartz.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 33.10–28.

⁴ "John of Nikiu," ed. H. Zotenberg, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXIV, 1^o partie, p. 350; H. Vincent and F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem*, t. II, fasc. IV (Paris, 1926), p. 748, n. 2.

church on the Mount of Olives.⁵ Juvenal, who is not mentioned in this connection, apparently played only a secondary role there.

It was probably to this stay in the Holy City that Cyril referred in his seventieth letter "to the clergymen and to Priest Lampon" by the initial words: "When I stayed in Aelia."⁶

At the same time Melania stayed in Jerusalem. From there she went in 438 to Sidon to meet there the approaching Empress, and accompanied her again in 439 from Jerusalem to Caesarea.⁷ On December 25 of the same year she celebrated at Bethlehem the birth of Christ.⁸ From another source we know that Juvenal first introduced at Jerusalem the celebration of the birth of the Lord.⁹ This obviously means that in accordance with the Roman and common use he constituted it as a special feast on December 25, while before his time it had coincided with Epiphany (January 6). The homily by which this innovation is attributed to Juvenal figures among the works of Basilius of Seleucia, probably erroneously;¹⁰ unfortunately the time of its composition cannot be fixed exactly; but in any case it was written by a contemporary of Juvenal. According to this text the older church of Saint Stephen was constructed by Juvenal, "him who now ($\nu\nu\nu$) occupies the famous and glorious throne of Saint Jacobus, Juvenal, a man in whom survive the wisdom, morality, conduct, purity, renown, piety of the aforementioned Jacobus, since he is a perfect imitator of his love of God, he who also began to celebrate the glorious, salutary, and adored birth of the Lord." Tillemont who did not doubt Basil's authorship, was perhaps right in assum-

⁵ [John of Bēth Rufinā] *Life of Peter the Iberian*, ed. R. Raabe (Leipzig, 1895), p. 33[37]. The date indicated by the editor (p. 37, n. 5) is not exact. The first stay of the Empress at Jerusalem was in 438-439; cf. Theophanes, *Chron.*, p. 92.25-39, ed. de Boor; Seeck, RE, VI, col. 907.

⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist.* 70, PG, 77, col. 341 A-C; ed. E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, 32, 6 (Munich, 1927), pp. 16.26-17.10, no. 37. This letter belongs to the period when Cyril openly attacked the dogmas of Theodore of Mopsuestia, i.e., between January 438 and 441-442 (E. Schwartz, *loc. cit.*, p. 93). See also H. Vincent and F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem*, t. II, fasc. IV (Paris, 1926), p. 748, n. 2.

⁷ M. Card. Rampolla del Tindaro, *S. Melania giuniore, senatrice romana . . .* (Rome, 1905), *Vita*, ch. 58, 59, Latin text, pp. 33.7, 39; 34.1; Greek text, pp. 75.23, 77.1.

⁸ *Vita Melaniae*, 63, Latin text, p. 36.30-33; Greek text, p. 79.20-23. Cf. *Anal. Boll.*, 22, p. 44.

⁹ Pseudo-Basilius of Seleucia, *Homil.* 41, PG, 85, col. 469 A (often quoted as "Orat. XLII," e.g. by Vincent-Abel, *Jérusal.*, II, p. 762, because of the headings of the pages misprinted by Migne). Cf. Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, p. 206; S. Vailhé, EO, 8 (Paris, 1905), pp. 212-218; Card. Rampolla, *S. Melania giuniore* (Rome, 1905), pp. 268-270, nota XLIV; H. Kellner, *Heortologie* (3rd ed., Freiburg, 1911), p. 114; H. Usener, *Das Weihnachtsfest*, I. Teil (2nd ed. Bonn, 1911), pp. 331-347. D. Bernard Botte, O.S.B., "Les origines de la Noël et de l'Épiphanie," *Textes et études liturgiques*, I (Louvain, 1932), p. 19. For a homily of Chrysippus of Jerusalem, probably spoken on December 25, see A. Sigalas, *Byzantinisches Archiv*, Heft 7 (Leipzig, 1921), pp. 5-6.

¹⁰ Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, p. 345; O. Bardenhewer, *Gesch. d. altkirchl. Lit.*, IV, p. 302.

ing that the sermon was spoken at Jerusalem in Juvenal's presence.¹¹ The church of Saint Stephen mentioned in the homily must be distinguished from his basilica built by Eudocia and dedicated on June 15, 460, four months before her death, under Juvenal's successor, Anastasius.¹²

The Life of Saint Melania shows that the feast of Christ's birth on December 25 was introduced in Jerusalem before A.D. 439. It is doubtful, however, whether Juvenal's innovation had lasting success. Cosmas Indicopleustes (about A.D. 550) claims that the Jerusalemites (*οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται*), referring to Saint Luke, did not celebrate Christ's birth on December 24 (*sic!* *Χοιὰκ κη'*), but on Epiphany, "following not an exact reckoning, but a probable conjecture";¹³ on December 25 they celebrated instead a feast of King David and James, the brother of the Lord.¹⁴ The existence of this feast is also attested by Hesychius of Jerusalem¹⁵ and by the Armenian Ananias of Shirak.¹⁶ In about 862 (in any case between 855 and 876)¹⁷ Bishop John of Nicaea in his¹⁸ answer to Catholicos Zachary of Great Armenia, who had asked him why an "apostolic constitution, written by James, prescribed to celebrate birth and baptism on January 6,"¹⁹ quoted a letter sent by Cyril of Jerusalem to Pope Julius (thus supposedly in about 348–352) by which this bishop complained of the difficulty of celebrating on the same day the baptism on the Jordan, and the birth at Bethlehem, and asked the pope to inquire about the exact date of the birth in the writings of the Jews brought by Emperor Titus to Rome.²⁰ The same apocryphal letter, though with several textual variants, is quoted in an anonymous "necessary narration" (*ἀναγκαία διήγησις*) of the same manuscript (fol. 120); but in this case it is quoted as a letter of Juvenal of Jerusalem to Julius of Rome, who lived a century before him.²¹

¹¹ Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, p. 206.

¹² Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthym.*, 36, p. 54.4, ed. Schwartz; Evagrius, HE, I, 20–22, pp. 29–33, ed. Bidez and Parmentier.

¹³ Cosmas Indicopl., *Topogr. Christ.*, 5, PG, 88, col. 197 C = ed. E. O. Winstedt (Cambridge, 1909), p. 139.8–12.

¹⁴ Concerning this feast cf. C. Erbes, "Das syrische Martyrologium und der Weihnachtsfestkreis," II, *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, 26 (Gotha, 1905), especially pp. 31–45.

¹⁵ Hesych. Hiersol. *apud* Photium, *Bibl. cod.* 275, p. 511 a, ed. Bekker = PG, 104, col. 241 B–D.

¹⁶ Anania Širakac'i, "About the Epiphany of our Saviour," transl. by F. Conybeare, *The Expositor*, 1896, No. XXIII, pp. 321–337, quoted by Erbes, *loc. cit.*, pp. 25–32.

¹⁷ Cf. V. Grumel, EO, 32 (1933), p. 169. Cyril Martindale (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, III [London, 1908], p. 725) twice calls John of Nicaea "John of Nikiu."

¹⁸ Spurius? Cf. Krumbacher-Ehrhard, *Gesch. d. byz. Lit.*, p. 78.

¹⁹ PG, 96, col. 1437 A–1440 A.

²⁰ *Cod. Paris. gr.* 900 (*Medic.-Reg.* 2428, s. XV) fol. 149, ed. F. Combefis, *Auctarium Bibl. Patr. Gr.* III, p. 298 sq. = PG, 96, col. 144 B = PL, 8, col. 966 A.

²¹ Cotelier, *Patr. Apostol.* I (*Amsterdam* 1724), p. 316, n. 64 = PG, 1, col. 861–862, n. 64 = PL, 8, col. 966 B.

Let us now return to Saint Melania. Returning from Bethlehem she fell sick, and after five days of illness she felt death approaching. On the sixth day, that is, on December 31, the bishop, Juvenal,²² came to see her. She recommended the priest (Gerontius) and the monastery to his care and asked him to pray for her. Then she received the eucharist by his hand.²³ According to the Roman use, she wanted to communicate once more in the hour of her death. Therefore the bishop remained there and again offered her the consecrated wafer, whereupon she kissed his right hand.²⁴ After her death the bishop and all those who were present prayed for her soul, as she had asked them.²⁵

It is remarkable that the biographer always refers to Juvenal as “the bishop”; his name does not occur in the work, while Cyril, for example, is mentioned by name.²⁶ Since the author was probably Gerontius, who after 451 separated from Juvenal’s communion, this omission of Juvenal’s name is possibly a sign of Gerontius’s resentment against him.

Between the years 432 and 449, Juvenal consecrated the former deacon²⁷ Stephen of Melitene as bishop of Jamnia and ordained the Cappadocian Cosmas, priest, appointing the latter at the same time “guardian of the Holy Cross” (σταυροφύλαξ) of the Anastasis.²⁸

Not long before 449, as it seems, Juvenal intended the consecration of a bishop for a new bishopric which he probably had planned to erect, and which certainly has never existed, at least under the original name.

In the libels (λίβελλοι) against Domnus of Antioch, presented by the priest and monk Marcellus and read on August 22, 449, before the council assembled at Ephesus, there occurs the following passage concerning the “Nestorian” Uranius of Hemesa: “who also in the city of Arcae in the other [viz. Phoenician] province enthroned now [i.e., shortly] the venerable Timothy, who ought to have been consecrated bishop of Psalton in Palestine by our father and bishop Iubenalius, but whom the godfearing bishop Domnus transferred in violation of the [ecclesiastical] canons to Arcae, ordering Uranius to do nothing more than to lay hands on him.”²⁹

²² In addition the whole clergy of Eleutheropolis arrived. On this account, the author of the Greek Life of Melania in *cod. Paris.* 1553 (s. XIV), fol. 286–301, which was edited wrongly as one of the *Vitae* by Symeon Metaphrastes, assumed that “episcopus” meant the bishop of Eleutheropolis (PG, 116, col. 792 D).

²³ *Vita Melaniae*, 67, Latin text, p. 39.5,8; Greek text, p. 83.1–6, ed. Rampolla.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 68, Latin text, p. 39.27–32. This is the first attestation of this custom; cf. Rampolla, *loc. cit.*, nota XLI, pp. 257–259.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 68, Latin text, p. 40.2; cf. the Greek text, p. 84.5.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 34, Latin text, p. 19.32; Greek text, p. 60.11.

²⁷ Cf. above, p. 219, n. 57.

²⁸ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 20, p. 33.28–31, ed. E. Schwartz.

²⁹ Syriac translation of the acts of August 22, 449, ed. J. Flemming, *Abh. d. Kön. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl.*, N.F. 15, 1 (Berlin, 1917), p. 126.1–4 [127.1–6].

Psalton (Ψάλτων) probably means Σάλτων,³⁰ that is, the Σάλτον Γερα-
 ριτικόν in Palaestina I.³¹ According to Sozomenus,³² the Palestinian Silvanus,
 having practiced asceticism in Egypt and having visited Mount Sinai, re-
 turned to Gerara where, toward the end of the fourth century, he founded
 a great monastery.³³ He probably was the same Silvanus who was the first
 bishop of Pharan.³⁴ According to John of Bēth Rufinā³⁵ the monastery of
 Silvanus, "the father of the monks," was near Aphthā, a village of Salton
 (τοῦ Σάλτων).

It is doubtful whether, after Timothy's departure, Juvenal ever founded
 this bishopric; if so, it may have been the same as Gerara where Marcian
 was bishop in 451. In the Syriac transcription of the list of the members of
 the Council of Chalcedon, contained in the Corpus canonum of Antioch, his
 name is written "Marci(a)nus bishop of Ἰδιώτα,"³⁶ in the Latin transcription
 "Marcianus Diotanus."³⁷ In a common declaration (χάρτης) written by the
 Palestinian bishops he is called Μαρκιανὸς ἐπίσκοπος Ἰωτάπης.³⁸ Both in the
 list of the Corpus canonum and in the quoted declaration this city, which
 corresponds to Gerara in the other lists, is attributed to Palaestina III, which
 seems to contradict the identification of the bishopric of Salton or Psalton
 with the Saltus Gerariticus in Palaestina I.

³⁰ The initial Π or Ψ can be explained in different ways: Ψάλτων could have been formed
 on the analogy of names like Ψάρος, Ψιττακηνή, besides Σάρος, Σιττακηνή, or the Greek copyist
 may have derived it from the word ψάλτης, "harpist" (cf. κώμη Ὀρχηστῶν, *Vita S. Andreae*
Stratel., 9, PG, 115, col. 605 B, or Κιθαρίζων in Armenia?). Perhaps the initial Π is merely
 an anticipation of that in "Palestine" (G. Hoffmann apud Flemming, *loc. cit.*, p. 178 ad p.
 127.3).

³¹ Georgius Cyprius, v. 1027 (in *Hieroclis Synecd.*, ed. E. Honigmann [Brussels, 1939],
 p. 67); Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine*, II, p. 173.

³² Sozom., HE, VI, 32, PG, 67, col. 1392 C; cf. IX, 17, *ibid.*, 1629 B.

³³ ἐν Γεράροις ἐν τῷ χειμάρρῳ.

³⁴ *Apophthegmata patrum*, PG, 65, col. 312 A, 408 B-412 C. Cf. R. Devreesse, *Rev. Bibl.*,
 49 (1940), p. 205.

³⁵ John of Bēth Rufinā, *Plerophoriae*, 48, PO, VIII, p. 100 [500]; in his *Vita Petri Iberi*
 (p. 47.5 [47 ult.] ed. R. Raabe) John also mentions the "great Silvanus, who is known every-
 where." Other texts about him: Nau, PO, VIII, p. 178-180 [578-580].

³⁶ F. Schulthess, "Die syrischen Kanones . . .," *Abh. Kgl. Ges. Wiss. Götting.*, N.F. 10, 2
 (1908), p. 136, no. 139.

³⁷ ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars II (1936), p. 70.13 [162.13], no. 131.

³⁸ *Acta Chalced.*, IV, 9, 114, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 103.13 [299.13]. Schwartz
 changes it into Ἰωτάνης because of the form Ἰεττάν (Euseb., *Onom.*, p. 108.8, ed. Kloster-
 mann); but the ν is not justified. Cf. the *Codex Alexandrinus*, where the biblical Yutta (Josh.
 15, 55; 21, 16; πόλις Ἰούδα: Luke 1.39), today Yaṭṭa or Yuṭṭa, is transcribed Ἰεττά. Ἰωτάπης
 corresponds to the Latin "Iliota" (ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars II, p. 110.26 [369.26]). E. Schwartz
 explained Ἰδιώτα, Iliota, as il-Yuṭṭā; I formerly opposed his identification because Yuṭṭā never
 has an article (*Byzantion* XII [1937], p. 344; cf. also A. Alt, *Journ. Pal. Or. Soc.*, XVII [1937],
 p. 230), but it certainly is correct, for the place Idiota (or Iota?) is also mentioned in the
Notitia Dignitatum (*Oriens* XXXIV, 37, p. 74, ed. O. Seeck; cf. his *Index geographicus*, p.
 288, s.v. Idiota, p. 289, s.v. *Iota).

A few years after her first visit in 438–439,³⁹ Empress Eudocia went to Jerusalem again, choosing the Holy City as her permanent residence,⁴⁰ where she remained until her death (October 20, 460), adorning it with many splendid buildings.⁴¹ The events of these years clearly show that she exercised a great influence on the contending religious parties in Palestine, especially after the council of Chalcedon.

On June 27, 444, Cyril of Alexandria died. He was succeeded by his former archdeacon, Dioscorus. In the capital the eunuch Chrysaphius, the grand chamberlain of the Emperor, directed the affairs of the Empire after 441. His godfather⁴² was the old priest Eutyches, archimandrite of the monastery of Job in the seventh quarter of Constantinople,⁴³ where for about thirty years he had directed more than three hundred monks and achieved great influence in monastic circles. As an extreme opponent of Nestorius,⁴⁴ Cyril had esteemed him so highly that he had sent him a special copy of the minutes of the Council of Ephesus,⁴⁵ while Pope Leo the Great, in a letter written to him on June 1, 448, though praising his zeal as persecutor of the Nestorian heresy, cautiously declared that he needed more detailed information about certain criticisms made against him.⁴⁶ He later acknowledged that, from lack of information, he had long been unaware why Eutyches displeased the catholics.⁴⁷ Eutyches was accused of Apollinarian-

³⁹ In 441 or 442 according to Seeck, RE, VI, col. 908; in 443 or 444 according to E. Schwartz, "Kyrillos of Skythopolis" (TU, 49, 2), p. 363, n. 2. These years seem to be preferable, for Peter the Iberian, who left Jerusalem not long after Eudocia's arrival (John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, p. 49 [50], ed. Raabe), was ordained priest there in 445 (*ibid.*, p. 51 [52], cf. p. [52], n. 3).

⁴⁰ Because of her health she often stayed at Maḥōzā, the harbor of Iamnia (Yamnīn) in an imperial estate (*Vita Petri Ib.*, p. 126.5, 9, 10 [114]). She also possessed the villages of Ganthā (John Ruf., *Plerophor.*, 20, PO, VIII, p. 39.8–9) and Kephār Ṭurban (John Ruf., *On the death of Theodosius, bishop of Jerusalem*, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. XXV, p. 26.19 [18.15]). The village Bēth Ṭafṣā, 5 miles north of Jerusalem, belonged to the Tribune Elias, a member of her household (*Vita Petri Iberi*, p. 96.22–23, 98.3 [92, 93]).

⁴¹ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthym.*, 35, p. 53.5–13; *Vita Ioannis Hesychnast.*, p. 204.8–9, ed. Schwartz.

⁴² Liberatus, *Breviarium* 11, ACO, t. II, vol. V (1936), p. 114.34.

⁴³ Theodorus Lector, frg. 14, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Zhurn. Min. Nar. Prosv.*, 333 (1901), *Klass. philol.*, p. 11; Nicetas Choniates, *Thesaur.*, 9, 1, PG, 140, col. 37 D. In fact Job is perhaps the name of Eutyches's successor as abbot (cf. *Act. Chalced.*, act. I, 552, 36; IV, 63, 105, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 147.1; pars II, p. 114.22 [310.22], 119.28 [315.28]).

⁴⁴ Concil. Ephes., *Coll. Vatic.*, 107, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars III, p. 63.23; Conc. Chalced., ACO, t. II, vol. VI, indices, pp. 75 and 125–126, s.v. *Εὐτυχῆς πρεσβύτερος καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίτης*.

⁴⁵ *Gesta Ephesi*, 157, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 91.12.

⁴⁶ Leo, *Epist.* 20 [JK, 418] = *Collectio Grimanica*, I, ACO, t. II, vol. IV (1932), p. 3.1–11; Greek version: ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II (1933), p. 45.5–14 [241.5–14]; T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), p. 214.

⁴⁷ Leo, *Epist.* 34 [JK, 428] = *Coll. Grimanica*, 13, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 16.25–26: "diu apud nos incertum fuit quid in ipso catholicis displiceret."

ism by both Archbishop Domnus of Antioch ⁴⁸ and his former friend, Bishop Eusebius of Dorylaeum. Eusebius presented a libel of accusations against him ⁴⁹ to a *σύνδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, which met in Constantinople November 8–22, 448, and condemned him after his “Monophysitic” confession. ⁵⁰ No Palestinian bishop was among the thirty-two members of this synod, but the acts of Eutyches’s deposition were possibly sent to Juvenal for his signature, as they were to Domnus of Antioch, ⁵¹ who signed them. After the synod Eutyches appealed to the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica. ⁵² Knowing that he was favored by the Emperor and by influential personages like Chrysaphius, Eutyches also lodged an appeal to the Emperor, claiming that the minutes of the synod had been falsified. On April 13, 449, these charges against the preceding synod were verified. On April 27 there was an investigation to determine whether the sentence (*τύπος*) of deposition against Eutyches had been dictated by Archbishop Flavian of Constantinople before the final session in which it had been proclaimed. ⁵³ On these two days the committee of inquiry was composed of twenty-eight and thirty-five bishops respectively, among them two Palestinians, Natiras of Gaza and Paul of Anthedon, ⁵⁴ both of whom had already attended the council of Ephesus in 431. ⁵⁵ In addition, Bishop Timothy of Arca in Phoenicia was present, who had also attended the meetings of November 448 and who had called himself, in his signature of April 13, “bishop of Arca, the Palestinian.” ⁵⁶ After the reading of his deposition on April 13, 449, Eutyches again declared that he appealed to “the holy synod of the bishop of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica.” ⁵⁷ Though there exists no express evidence about Juvenal’s own attitude at this time, these facts clearly imply that he favored Eutyches and besides, perhaps, that he was gaining influence in the neighboring province of Phoenicia I.

On March 30, 449, before the two inquiries of April 13 and 27, the Em-

⁴⁸ Facundus Hermian., *Pro defens. trium capit.*, VIII, 5; XII, 5; PL, 67, col. 723 C sq., 852 A. Cf. J. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme sévérien*, Univers. Cathol. Lovaniensis, Dissertations, ser. II, t. IV (Louvain, 1909), p. 4.

⁴⁹ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 225, 230, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, pp. 100.17–101.5, 16–30.

⁵⁰ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 551 ACO, *loc. cit.*, p. 145.10–19.

⁵¹ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 884, ACO, *loc. cit.*, p. 182.17–19.

⁵² *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 818, ACO, *loc. cit.*, p. 175.31–32.

⁵³ A detailed study of these events was published by Ed. Schwartz, “Der Prozess des Eutyches,” *Sitz.-Ber. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, 1929, Heft 5.

⁵⁴ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 558, 555, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, pp. 150.16, 18; 149.13, 14.

⁵⁵ See above, p. 221.

⁵⁶ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 552, no. 6 (without indication of his see); 558, no. 11 (*τῆς Ἀρκηνῶν πόλεως*); 555, no. 18 (*τῆς Ἀρκ. πόλ. Παλαιστίνου*; cod. M. wrongly *ἐπαρχίας Παλαιστίνης*), ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 145.25, 150.15, 148.25–26; cf. my remarks in *Byzantion*, XVI (1944), p. 66, and above, pp. 228–229.

⁵⁷ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 818, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 175.30–32.

peror had sent a letter to Dioscorus of Alexandria summoning him to come with ten metropolitans⁵⁸ and ten bishops of his diocese to Ephesus to participate there on August 1 in a great synod;⁵⁹ similar letters were doubtless directed to the other archbishops. In another letter sent on May 15 to Dioscorus as well as to Juvenal the Emperor announced his intention to invite the priest and archimandrite, Barsumas.⁶⁰ Before the synod Dioscorus had resumed communion with Eutyches in spite of his condemnation by Flavian.⁶¹ In a letter to Dioscorus, written according to the Syriac translation of the minutes on August (Āb) 6, while Timothy Aelurus dates it in June (ḥezirān), the Emperor bestowed the supreme authority and presidency⁶² of the synod upon Dioscorus, adding that Archbishop Juvenal of Jerusalem and Archbishop Thalassius (of Caesarea in Cappadocia) would agree with him in their zeal for orthodoxy.⁶³ A similar letter was addressed to Juvenal himself.⁶⁴ Consequently Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Thalassius were the three leaders of the "Latrocinium,"⁶⁵ although only Dioscorus and Juvenal are mentioned as such.⁶⁶ Accordingly, their names figure in the lists of both sessions in first place. Juvenal therefore occupied a higher place than the exarch of the Pontic diocese; obviously his position is that of a "patriarch" according to the terminology of a later period. The imperial letter quoted is the first official document still preserved in which he is called "archbishop"; in the first session of the council Alypius, bishop of Bacatha, also calls him "our holy archbishop."⁶⁷ It has been stated above, however, that in 431 he certainly occupied the same rank.

⁵⁸ As H. Gelzer (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 12[1886], p. 573, n. 1) remarks, this may have been the usual form of invitation which disregarded the fact that the Egyptian diocese had less than ten provinces, and that the ancient Egyptian church had no metropolitans.

⁵⁹ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 24, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, pp. 68.1-69.8; in Syriac: "Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom J. 449," ed. J. Flemming, *Abh. K. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl.*, N.F. 15, 1 (Berlin, 1917), pp. 2.1-4.7.

⁶⁰ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 47, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 71.1-17; cf. act. I, 109; *ibid.*, p. 85.10-12.

⁶¹ *Conc. Chalc. act.* II, 94, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 28.29-30 [224.29-30].

⁶² τὴν ἀθθεντιαν καὶ τὰ πρωτεία.

⁶³ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 52, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 74.9-28; in Syriac: "Akten" . . . p. 4.9-30 and in Timothy Aelurus, *Brit. Mus. cod. syr.* 729 = Add. 12156 (561/2 A. D.), fol. 53v; the date in line 3: in the month Ḥezirān under the consulship of Protogenes.

⁶⁴ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 52, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 74.29-30. E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II (Paris, Bruxelles, Amsterdam, 1949), p. 214 sq., n. 1, shows that the era of Jerusalem began in 449, "à partir du jour où l'évêque Juvenal de Jérusalem fut proclamé patriarche."

⁶⁵ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 53, *loc. cit.*, p. 75.1-4 (words of Dioscorus); I, 92, *loc. cit.*, p. 84.4 (ἡ ἀθθεντία τῶν πραττομένων was given them by the Emperor); I, 188, *loc. cit.*, p. 96.30 (ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ δικάζειν).

⁶⁶ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 62, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 76.21, 24.

⁶⁷ "Decretum sanctissimi archiepiscopi nostri Iuvenalis et reliqui sancti concilii," *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 884, 73, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars I, p. 185.1; in the Greek text these words are omitted: ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 185.3.

On June 13, Pope Leo sent his famous dogmatic letter or *ρόμος* to Flavian.⁶⁸ The same date is indicated in two letters to Julian of Cos,⁶⁹ but the second, forwarded together with epist. 38 (to Flavian) by Deacon Basilius, is in fact of July 23.⁷⁰ In *Codex Monacensis 14540 (olim Ratisbonensis)* the address of the thirty-fifth letter runs as follows: "Leo epis̄c. Iuvenali epis̄c. hierosoli";⁷¹ but it is quite impossible that this letter was addressed to Juvenal. It would, however, be interesting to know whether the wrong indication of the addressee is the result of an intentional falsification made for the purpose of giving the impression that two months before the Robber-Council Leo had received from Juvenal a letter to which he refers in his answer as follows: "scripta tuae dilectionis accepimus quae multum nobis catholici sensus fervore placuerunt."⁷² It should be noted in this connection that *Codex Ratisbonensis* gives a selection of the letters which were sent to the Orient and were connected with the Easter controversy that had arisen in Constantinople and in Palestine.⁷³

IV. THE "ROBBER-COUNCIL" OF EPHESUS (AUGUST 8-22, 449)

We know altogether the names of about 150 bishops¹ who attended the so-called "Latrocinium" of Ephesus. Dioscorus and Juvenal were accompanied by twenty-three Egyptian and twenty-one Palestinian bishops; the names of the latter are Leontius of Ascalon, Marinianus of Gaza, Photinus of Lydda, Anastasius of Areopolis, Paul of Anthedon, Theodosius of Amathûs, Paul of Maïuma, Zosimus of Minois, Baruchius of Sozusa, Heracilius of Azotus, John of Tiberias, Musonius of Zōora, Dionysius of Sycamazōn, Caiumas of Phaeno, Constanti(n)us of Sebaste(a), Zebennus of Pella, Alypius of Bacatha, Polychronius of Antipatris, Pancratius of Livias, Auxolaus of the tributary Saracenes, Annianus of Capitoliās.²

⁶⁸ Leo, *Epist.* 28 [JK, 423] = *Coll. Novar. de re Eutychnis*, 5, ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars I (1932), pp. 24.15-33.2. Cf. *Gestor. Chalc. versio a Rustico edita*, act. II [III], 20, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars II, p. 14.27-30 [273.27-30]. On the mss. see *ibid.*, praefat., pp. xi-xii, on the Greek version ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, praef., pp. xiv-xvi. The letter was translated into Greek after the pope had sent it again on July 16, 450, plus a short florilegium, to Patriarch Anatolius (Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. xi-xii. F. Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica* [Rome, 1938], p. 95).

⁶⁹ Leo, *Epist.* 34, 35 = *Collect. Grimani.*, 13, 5, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 16.16-17.7, 6.8-8.27.

⁷⁰ Cf. *loc. cit.*, p. 6.12, 18.7.

⁷¹ Cf. *loc. cit.*, p. 6.10 adnot. The beginning of the letter is printed after *Cod. Monac.* 14540 by E. H. Blakeney, *The Tome of Pope Leo the Great* (London, 1923), p. 46.

⁷² Leo, *Epist.* 35, *loc. cit.*, p. 6.12-13.

⁷³ E. Schwartz, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, praef., p. xxviii. Cf. however P. Peeters, *Anal. Boll.*, 50 (1932), p. 171 sq.

¹ Cf. E. Honigmann, *Byzantion*, XVI (Boston, 1944), pp. 34-37.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36, nos. 69-76, 78-83, 85-90, 122.

In the first session, on August 8, Juvenal voted first among 113 bishops for the rehabilitation of Eutyches. He gave the keynote by declaring him "extremely orthodox" (*ὀρθοδοξότατον*).³ Agreeing with Dioscorus, he declared the deposition of Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum⁴ and signed the resolutions relative to the matter.⁵ The minutes of the session on August 22 are known only by a Syriac translation of the Greek original.⁶ In the list of those present at this session Juvenal again occupies the second place.⁷ In the beginning, the deposition of Ibas (Hībā) of Edessa was discussed. Among the documents read in this connection there was one entitled "third relation [*ἀναφορά*] of Fl. Chaereas" (Comes and judge of Osrhoëne), in which there is quoted a copy of the acts (*ὑπομνήματα*) of a discussion which took place at Edessa shortly after April 12, 449. One of the participants in this discussion, Comes Theodosius, occasionally asks that letters be written to the archbishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to "Juvenal, the bishop of Jerusalem" and Eustathius and Photius, the bishops of Tyre and Berytus.⁸ This shows that Comes Theodosius considered Juvenal to be a bishop, not an archbishop; but this personal view of an official in Edessa cannot invalidate the conclusion which we have deduced from the Emperor's letter quoted above.

Immediately after Dioscorus, Juvenal pronounced the deposition of Ibas;⁹ fourteen other bishops expressly affirmed their agreement, while the rest of them approved the condemnation of the Edessene bishop by acclamation.

It seems that the subsequent discussion about the deposition of bishop Daniel of Carrhae was directed by Juvenal in the presence of Dioscorus,¹⁰ whose leadership is again more obvious in the transactions about the deposition of Metropolitan Irenaeus of Tyre¹¹ and of Bishop Aquilinus of Byblus.¹² Juvenal apparently acted as president alone in the trial of Sophronius of Constantina (Tellā)¹³ and took part in that of Theodoretus of Cyrrhus.¹⁴

In the transactions dealing with the accusations against Domnus of

³ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 884, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 182.11-15.

⁴ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 966, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 192.3-10.

⁵ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 1067, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 194.40.

⁶ "Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom J. 449," ed. J. Flemming, *Abh. Kgl. Ges. Wiss. Götting., phil.-hist. Kl.*, N.F. 15, 1 (Berlin, 1917).

⁷ *Akten*, p. 6.19 [7.25].

⁸ *Akten*, p. 46.37 [47.47].

⁹ *Akten*, p. 60.20-26 [61.28-36].

¹⁰ *Akten*, p. 68.13 [69.16], 70.1 [71.1].

¹¹ *Akten*, p. 74.12 [75.15].

¹² *Akten*, p. 78.4-9 [79.5-12].

¹³ *Akten*, p. 80.6 [81.8], 84.11 [85.16]. Cf. E. Honigmann, "A trial for sorcery on Aug. 22, A.D. 449," *Isis*, 35 (1944), pp. 281-284.

¹⁴ *Akten*, p. 84.18 [85.26], 108.33 [109.48].

Antioch the libels (*λίβελλοι*) of the priest and monk Marcellus of Hemesa are particularly interesting, because he enumerates in detail all the "Nestorian" offenses committed by Domnus in Phoenicia.¹⁵ As we shall see, Juvenal just then aspired again to the possession of Arabia and the two Phoenician provinces. At the end of these libels Marcellus mentions "our holy father and bishop Jubenalius" in connection with Bishop Timothy of Arcae, whom he had wanted to consecrate bishop of Psalton.¹⁶ Though Marcellus calls his bishop, Uranius of Hemesa, on this occasion "a man of corrupted conduct who was often and by many people accused of effeminacy, and who had taken possession of the see of Hemesa against the canons, aided by the Jews, gentiles, and buffoons (*μίμοι*)," ¹⁷ I am inclined to identify him with the priest (and later Archimandrite) Marcellus of Hemesa, who, on October 25, 453, discovered near this city the head of S. John the Baptist and conveyed this relic with the assistance of the same Bishop Uranius to his bishopric, which thereafter became a metropolis.¹⁸ After 451 Marcellus may have found this occasion perfectly fit for a reconciliation with his bishop.

After the council the Emperor, "seduced by Chrysaphius," promulgated an edict (which, according to the Syriac translation, was addressed to Dioscorus), demanding that he send circular letters (*ἐγκύκλια*) about the decisions of the second synod of Ephesus to all bishops, "those of Constantinople, of Jerusalem,¹⁹ and the other metropolitans." They and all suffragan bishops should send them back with their signatures.²⁰ At this time the Emperor also wrote to Juvenal, but only the beginning of his letter is preserved.²¹

Dioscorus and Juvenal came off as victors in the struggle fought out at Ephesus. Cyril of Scythopolis claims that the Saracene bishop Auxolaus, Peter's successor, "died in disgrace" in the eyes of Euthymius because he

¹⁵ *Akten*, pp. 122.29–126.7 [123.39–127.10].

¹⁶ *Akten*, p. 126.2–3 [127.3]. Cf. above, pp. 229 and 231.

¹⁷ *Akten*, p. 124.9–12 [125.12–16].

¹⁸ Cf. the very incomplete edition of the Greek text by Migne, PL, 67, col. 420–430 D, and the more complete translation by Dionysius Exiguus, *ibid.*, col. 417–432; *Menologium anon. byzant.*, ed. B. Latyšev, fasc. I (St. Petersburg, 1911), pp. 126–131, fasc. II (1912), p. 403 sq.; Zacharias Scholasticus, *Vita Severi*, ed. M. A. Kugener, PO, II, p. 92; Marcellinus Comes, ed. Th. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, II, p. 84; *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 591.12, Bonn; *Acta Sanct. Iun.*, IV, p. 724 sq., *Novemb., propyl.*, col. 485.29, 487.10; E. Honigmann, *Byz. Ztschr.*, 25 (1925), p. 85; Ensslin, RE, 14 (1930), col. 1495 sq., s.v. Marcellus, no. 49; P. Peeters, *Anal. Boll.*, 47 (1929), p. 54.

¹⁹ *Akten*, p. 152.29 [153.43].

²⁰ *Akten*, pp. 150.20–154.5 [151.23–155.7]; Latin transl. by Rusticus, *Gesta Chalc.*, III [II] 106, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars II (1936), pp. 88.14 [346.14]–89.24 [347.24], in which the passage about the bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem does not appear.

²¹ *Akten*, pp. 154.6–14 [155.8–18].

had sided with Dioscorus at Ephesus,²² but, as E. Schwartz justly remarks,²³ this report was written later from the standpoint of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, which rejected the previous assembly called by Pope Leo "the Robber-Synod."²⁴ It is amusing to see that Auxolaus's successor, John, and Bishop Stephen of Iamnia, having signed two years later the orthodox definition of Chalcedon, were afraid that Euthymius would again be angry at their conduct;²⁵ they apparently supposed that his doctrinal views were not consistent.

In fact there existed probably very few contemporaries who were able immediately to recognize that Eutyche's restoration meant a doctrinal aberration, as it was termed two years later. Dioscorus himself, apart from his autocratic behavior, only executed the will of the Emperor and Chrysaphius. In a remark which is characteristic of the views still prevailing in 451, when the opposite faction had won the day, Anatolius of Constantinople stressed that Dioscorus was deposed not for dogmatic reasons but because of his refusal to communicate with Pope Leo and because of his absence from the council in spite of three citations.²⁶ It is no wonder that this remark was often quoted later by the Monophysitic opponents of the council. True, in the assembly of 449 a feeble opposition was already perceptible,²⁷ but most of the bishops present probably trusted in the orthodox faith of the Archbishop of Alexandria, who, at the same place as his famous predecessor Cyril eighteen years before, defended the Nicæan creed against a new menace of some more or less disguised "Nestorians." By some members the synod was considered to be the third and last of the three ecumenical councils "which bore witness to the Holy Trinity,"²⁸ and in the libel presented to this synod Eutyche likewise stressed the fact that he considered the synods of 325 and 431 as authoritative.²⁹ For the council of Constantinople

²² Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthym.*, 27, p. 41.12, ed. Schwartz: *Αὐξολάου ἐν ἀγανακτήσει ἀποθανόντος ὡς Διοσκόρω ἐν Ἐφέσῳ συναϊέσαντος.*

²³ Schwartz, *Kyryllos von Skythop.*, p. 361; he continues: "da er [Auxolaus] zwischen 449 und 451 starb, erledigt sich die vorwitzige Frage, ob und welche Wirkungen diese Ungnade gehabt habe, von selbst."

²⁴ Leo, *Epist.* 95 [JK, 475] of July 20, 451 = *Collect. Grimanica*, 51, ACO, t. II, vol. IV (1932), p. 51.4: "in illo Epheseno non iudicio sed latrocinio." Following him, all Greek church historians call it the "Robber-Synod" (cf., e.g., Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthym.*, 27, p. 41.16: *ληστρικὴ; Vita Sabae*, 56, p. 149.13-14; *ληστρικωτάτη σύνοδος*).

²⁵ Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthymii*, 27, p. 41.15, ed. Schwartz.

²⁶ *Conc. Chalc. act.* V, 14, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 124.17-19 [320.17-19]. Copied, e.g., by Michael Syrus, *Chron.*, II, p. 55 = IV, p. 199, ed. Chabot.

²⁷ Cf. in the Syriac acts of the second session, p. 122.22 [123.29], the acclamation: "Those who are silent are heretics" (*αἰρεσιῶται*), or p. 104.10-11 [105.18-19]: "the [majority of the] holy synod said [with an obvious threat to some of those present]: . . . if objection is made to Theodoret's deposition, it becomes possible that even Nestorius will be supported!"

²⁸ Words of the priest Pelagius, *Akten*, p. 84.26-27 [85.36].

²⁹ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 157, 185, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars, I, pp. 90.24-25, 95.7, 14, 21-22.

in 381 was intentionally ignored by this assembly,³⁰ which again attacked the archbishop of the capital. So far as I know, in 449 the synod of 381 is mentioned only in a letter written in September 448 by Domnus of Antioch to Flavian, and read in the session of August 22.³¹ In his letter to Domnus, read on the same day, Dioscorus mentions only "the two great and unique synods of Nicaea and Ephesus,"³² and the Emperor likewise speaks only of these two assemblies.³³

It is therefore quite safe to assume that Juvenal's leading role at the side of Dioscorus highly impressed the Palestinians. Two years later, after the Council of Chalcedon, their attitude proved that the one-sided and mistaken conception of Cyrillian theology, which we now call "Monophysitism," had almost entirely conquered the country. At this time Juvenal far surpassed the archbishops of the other prominent sees in seniority. In 449 he had been bishop for at least twenty-seven years, while Dioscorus had occupied the throne of Saint Mark for only five years; the archbishops of Constantinople and Antioch had just been deposed and replaced by willing partisans of Dioscorus. Leo the Great had then occupied the Holy See for only nine years. Moreover, Juvenal's complete victory over the archbishop of Antioch was very promising for his ambition; he could again insist upon his old claims with a view to enlarging his own jurisdiction at the expense of the Oriental diocese. And in fact his dreams were soon fulfilled, although, it is true, for only a very short space of time.

V. FROM 449 TO 451

After his deposition, Domnus of Antioch returned to the lavra of Saint Euthymius.¹ His successor Maximus was consecrated by Anatolius of Constantinople.² If F. Diekamp³ is right in supposing that Anatolius was ap-

³⁰ Cf. Theodorus Lector, frg. 18, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, p. 12: "Dioscorus and his synod seem never to mention the 150 fathers gathered at Constantinople, because they hated it for having thrown out Apollinarius and having honored the see of Constantinople." Nicephorus Callistus apparently misunderstood this passage, for he says that Dioscorus did not accept the third (*sic*) synod, being an enemy of the divine Cyril (!) and Flavian (HE, XIV, 47, PG, 146, col. 1221 C).

³¹ *Akten*, p. 120.31 [121.44].

³² *Akten*, p. 136.33 [137.46].

³³ Timotheus Aelurus, *Brit. Mus. cod. syr.* 729 = Add. 12156, fol. 59v; German transl. by Schulthess, *Akten*, pp. 161.18, 21, 41; 162.5, 19, 28.

¹ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthym.*, 20, p. 33.25-28; Schwartz, *Kyr. v. Skyth.*, p. 262, s.v. Δόμνος, no. 1, doubts this statement.

² Leo, *Epist.* 104, 106 [JK, 481, 483], both of May 22, 452 = *Coll. Griman.*, 54, 56, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 57.7, 60.6.

³ F. Diekamp, *Analecta patrist.*, p. 55, n. 1, against E. Schwartz (*Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, N.F., Heft 10 [1934], p. 174, n. 3; Heft 13 [1937], p. 45, n. 7; *Byz. Ztschr.*, 34, p. 141), who dates the synod in June 450.

pointed patriarch of Constantinople in April 450, the synod which was held at the occasion of Maximus's consecration must be dated between April and July 28, 450, the day of the death of Theodosius II. It probably was the same *σύνοδος ἐνδημούσα* which, under the presidency of Anatolius, awarded to Metropolitan Eustathius of Berytus the northern part of Phoenicia with the bishoprics of Byblus, Botrys, Tripolis, Orthosias, Arca, and Antarados;⁴ the acts of the synod were sent to Maximus of Antioch, who was then staying in the capital but who had not attended the synod; he added his signature after that of Anatolius.⁵ Possibly it was the same local synod of Constantinople⁶ which, executing the will of Emperor Theodosius, finally assigned to Juvenal the three provinces which he always had desired, Phoenicia I and II and Arabia.⁷

By this acquisition the territory subject to Juvenal was almost doubled, reaching north to the 35th degree of latitude, including bishoprics situated as far as Antarados (Ṭartūs), Salamias (Selemīye) and Palmyra (Tudmur).

Maximus of Antioch, consecrated shortly before by Anatolius, the former priest of Alexandria, was not in a position to offer the vigorous Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem for at least twenty-eight years, any efficient resistance, in spite of the fact that Maximus also, apparently, had obtained from the Emperor or other high officials certain decrees protecting his old privileges.⁸ Photius of Tyre, consecrated on September 9, 448,⁹ cautiously added to the signature, by which under threat of deposition he was urged to acknowledge the dismemberment of Phoenicia I, that he "forcedly signed."¹⁰ He even performed an ordination in the lost territory with the result that he was notified from Constantinople of his excommunication, which lasted 122

⁴ *Conc. Chalc.*, 19, 18, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 106.5-6 [465.5-6]. According to E. Schwartz (*Abh. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 32, 2 [1925] p. 3) the imperial decree (*Cod. Iustin.*, 11, 22) confirmed this resolution, while I suppose that this decree preceded the Robber-Synod; see above, p. 218, n. 49.

⁵ *Conc. Chalc. act.* 19, 20, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 106.12-14 [465.12-14].

⁶ V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople* (Kadiköy, 1932), I, fasc. I, p. 51, no. 114, whose chronology is probably inexact; E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., philos.-philol. hist. Kl.*, 32, 2 (1925), p. 6.

⁷ Minutes of the session on October 23, 451 (the Greek original is lost): *Collect. Vatic.*, 6, 5, ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars II (1936), p. 21.8-11 [113.8-11]: "Beatissimus papa . . . Leo privilegia Antiochena ecclesiae . . . reformari secundum veterum patrum statuta constituit ideoque et nos Fenicem primam et secundam simulque Arabiam quas nuper amiserat [viz. Maximus episc. Antiochiae], revocari ad ius pristinum sancta synodo consentiente decrevimus."

⁸ See below, p. 244. Cf. Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, p. 204: "Il paroist qu'il [Juvenal] obtint des rescripts imperiaux en sa faveur . . . et que l'Evesque d'Antioche en obtint aussi de contraires."

⁹ *Akten*, p. 122.11 [123.14-15].

¹⁰ *Conc. Chalc. act.* 19, 7, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 104.29 [463.29]: κελουσθεὶς ὑπέγραψα.

days (probably from July to October 450).¹¹ Nevertheless, he again consecrated two bishops whom Eustathius deposed, making them priests.¹² Juvenal and Eustathius obviously assisted each other in their common struggle against the patriarch of Antioch.¹³

Juvenal's triumph did not last long. On July 28,¹⁴ Emperor Theodosius II died as a result of a fall from a horse. On August 24 or 25, Marcian, chosen by Pulcheria as her consort, ascended the throne.¹⁵

Before March 17, 450, Pulcheria had written to Pope Leo a letter displaying her disapproval of the "heretical error" committed at Ephesus.¹⁶ After his ascension to the throne Marcian announced to the Pope his intention to assemble a new synod under Leo's presidency in order "to do away with all impious error."¹⁷ Soon after, the chamberlain Chrysaphius, the main instigator of the "Robber-Synod," was executed by order of Pulcheria.¹⁸ Eutyches was exiled to Doliche in Northern Syria¹⁹ and, by order of the Emperor as well as by request of the *σύνδος ἐνδημοῦσα* and of the whole population of Constantinople, Anatolius solemnly brought Flavian's body back to the capital.²⁰

¹¹ *Conc. Chal. act.* 19, 24, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 106.28-30 [465.28-30]; V. Grumel, *Regestes*, I, 1, p. 51, no. 115. He probably was rehabilitated some time before November 22, when Pulcheria wrote to the Pope that the Emperor had ordered the recall of the exiled bishops: *Epistularum Collectio M (Cod. Venet. 555)*, *epist.* 9, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 10.1-4; Latin transl.: *Epistularum ante gesta collectio*, 29, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars I, p. 19.18-22. Cf. Theodor. Lect., frg. 28, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, p. 13.

¹² *Conc. Chal. act.* 19, 24, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 106.31 [465.31]. They probably were Heraclitus or Heraclides of Arca and Peter of Byblus, to replace whom Eustathius consecrated Antiochus of Arca and Rufinus of Byblus. Cf. E. Honigmann, *Byzantion*, XVI, p. 65 sq.

¹³ E. Schwartz, "Über die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalkedon, Nicaea and Konstantinopel," *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, N.F., 13 (1937), p. 45.

¹⁴ Theodorus Lector, I, 1; II, 64; PG, 86, 1, col. 165 A, 213 B = frg. 23, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (p. 12, where the date is omitted). Accordingly Theophanes, *Chron.*, p. 103.8, ed. de Boor must be corrected Ἰουλίῳ κ(η)΄.

¹⁵ Marcellinus Comes, *Chron. minora*, II, p. 83, ed. Mommsen; *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 590.9, Bonn.

¹⁶ Cf. Leo's answer to her of this date: *epist.* 60 [JK 448] = *Coll. Griman.*, 28, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 29.1-20.

¹⁷ *Epistularum ante gesta collect.*, 27, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars I, p. 17.17-28; Greek trans.: *Collectio M*, 10, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 10.5-18.

¹⁸ John Malalas, p. 368.5-8, ed. Bonn; Theodor. Lect., frg. 23, Papadopoulos-Kerameus (p. 12) = frg. I, 1, PG, 86, 1, col. 165 A; Niceph. Callist., HE, 14, 49, PG, 146, col. 1232 D, who is probably wrong in dating his banishment "to a certain island" and his death in the lifetime of Theodosius II, in whose reign similarly he puts the burial of Flavian's body after its return to the capital (HE, 14, 49, PG, 146, col. 1233 A), probably in order to vindicate the Emperor's final orthodoxy.

¹⁹ Theodorus Lector, frg. 26, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, p. 13.

²⁰ Paris, *Bibl. Nat. cod. graec.* 1379, fol. 6r, ed. E. Schwartz, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, praefatio, p. XLV; Leo, *Epist.* 79 [JK, 459] = *Coll. Griman.*, 35, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 38.2 (written April 13, 451); Theodor. Lector, frg. 27, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, p. 13.

On October (tešrī) 21, 450, Anatolius signed the dogmatic letter of Leo to Flavian together with a *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* attended by two bishops and two priests sent by the Pope; ²¹ thereafter the Tome of Leo was sent “everywhere” for signatures.²² It is not likely that at this occasion Juvenal refused to sign it, though it is true that, according to John of Bēth Rufinā,²³ “Juvenal had rejected the Tome of Leo before his departure for Chalcedon, had ridiculed the ungodliness which it contained, and testified before all clergymen and monks that the doctrine expressed in it was Jewish and worthy of Simon Magus, and that those who consented to it deserved to be excommunicated.”

All these events certainly were very alarming for Juvenal. But soon his situation became even worse. On April 13, 451, Pope Leo wrote to Anatolius of Constantinople that it would be very unjust to continue mentioning the names of Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Eustathius at the divine service; ²⁴ in another letter to Anatolius written on June 9, Leo says that in the synod unworthy of this name Dioscorus had shown his malevolence and Juvenal his inexperience.²⁵ That the latter expression was not intended to palliate Juvenal’s guilt becomes obvious by the fact that in his Tome and elsewhere Leo calls Eutyches himself inexperienced,²⁶ that is, in the Holy Scriptures. Since the pope was considered by Emperor Marcian the guardian of the true faith, Juvenal could not look forward with much confidence to the great council which was planned. The only choice left to him in view of the completely changed situation, was either proudly to accompany Dioscorus to exile or to abandon him by complying with the new masters of the world.

VI. THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON (451)

On October 8, 451, about 520 bishops met in the church of Saint Euphemia at Chalcedon. Juvenal with nineteen Palestinian bishops was sitting on the right side, together with Dioscorus and the bishops of Egypt

²¹ Syriac fragments in *Cod. Vatic. Musei Borgiani*, 82, fol. 100v–101v, ed. P. Mouterde, *Mélanges Univ. S. Joseph*, 15 (Beyrouth, 1930), p. 43 [46]; V. Grumel, *Regestes*, t. I, fasc. I, p. 51 sq., no. 116.

²² *Conc. Chalc. act.* 19, 23, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 106.26 [465.26]: τοῖς ἀπανταχοῦ μητροπολίταις; V. Grumel, *Regestes*, t. I, fasc. I, p. 52, no. 117.

²³ John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, p. 52 [53], ed. R. Raabe.

²⁴ Leo, *Epist.* 80 [JK, 460] = *Coll. Griman.*, 37, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 40.3–9. The removal of a bishop’s name from the diptychs was synonymous with anathematizing him or breaking communion with him.

²⁵ Leo, *Epist.* 85 [JK, 465] = *Coll. Griman.*, 43, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 44.32: “in qua malivolentiam suam Dioscorus, imperitiam autem Iuvenalis ostendit.”

²⁶ Tomus Leonis: ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars I, p. 24.20–21: “multum imprudens et nimis imperitus”; *Epist.* 29 [JK, 424] = *Coll. Griman.*, 7, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 9.21, 24: “imperite, imperito seni”; *Epist.* 33 [JK, 427] = *Coll. Grim.*, 12, *ibid.*, p. 16.6: “imperitia eius.”

and Illyricum.¹ According to the list preserved in the *Corpus canonum* the following bishops came from the three Palestinian provinces:²

Palaestina I: Juvenal of Jerusalem, Glycon of Caesarea represented by Zosimus of Menoïs, Leontius of Ascalon, Photinus of Diospolis (Lydda), Paulus of Anthedon, Heraclius of Azotus, Pancratius of Livias, Polychronius of Antipatris, Stephen of Iamnia.

Palaestina II: Severianus of Scythopolis (Baišan),³ Annianus of Capitolias, Zebinus (Zebennus) of Pella, Ioannes of Tiberias, Ioannes of Gadara.

Palaestina III: Beryllus of Aïla, Aretas of Elusa, Musonius of Zōora (Sēgōr), Marcianus of Idiota (Diota, Gerara), Netiras and Marianus of Gaza.⁴

In addition, there were twenty-six bishops from the two Phoenician provinces and Arabia. Eustathius of Berytus and the two Phoenician bishops whom he had consecrated — Antiochus of Arca and Rufinus of Byblus — were sitting among the Palestinians, at least according to the list of the sixth session.⁵

Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, one of the few personages whom Emperor Theodosius II had appointed president of the council of Ephesus in 449, from the very beginning of the Chalcedonian council sat on the left side together with his Pontic bishops as well as those of the Asianic, Thracian, and Oriental dioceses.⁶ He flatly declared that he did not know why his name had been put into the Imperial decree, and that he could produce witnesses of his vain efforts to prevent the unjust proceedings of the former council.⁷ Thus Dioscorus and Juvenal remained the two chief culprits; Theodore of Claudiopolis in Isauria, in his accusation of the leaders of the "Robber-Synod," always mentions Dioscorus and Juvenal together.⁸ When the minutes of this council were recited, beginning with the list of those

¹ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 4, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 65.8–14.

² Syriac translation, ed. F. Schulthess, *Abh. Kgl. Gesellsch. Wiss. Göttingen*, N.F. 10, 2 (1908), pp. 135–136, no. 122–140; Latin translation: "ex collectione Dionysiana aucta," ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars II (1936), pp. 69.30 [161.30]–70.15 [162.15], nos. 115–133. In the Latin text the bishops of Pella and Tiberias are omitted, in the Syriac text the two bishops of Gaza figure under one number. In the list of the sixth session (October 25), the metropolitans of Scythopolis and Petra and Marianus of Gaza are omitted (*Conc. Chalc. act.* 6, 9, nos. 6, 66–69, 71–73, 75–83, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, pp. 141.29 [337.29], 143.33–36, 38–40; 144.1–9).

³ Severianus of Scythopolis and Marianus of Gaza do not occur in any other list of the council.

⁴ Gaza is wrongly attributed to Palaestina III instead of Pal. I.

⁵ Cf. my article in *Byzantion*, XVI, pp. 65–67 and p. 70 sq., where I showed that John, bishop of the Saracens, possibly came from Palestine also and not from Osrhoëne.

⁶ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 4, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 65.1–8.

⁷ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 65, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 76.3–5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, act. I, 62, ACO, loc. cit., p. 76.6–7, 21, 24.

present, the Oriental bishops cried: "Why did they degrade the bishop of Constantinople to the fifth place?"⁹ And when Bishop Pascasinus of Lilybaeum, one of the Pope's delegates, remarked: "We [now] have Anatolius in the first place," the bishop of Cyzicus ironically replied: "Because you know the canons."¹⁰

In the following discussions Dioscorus tried to show that all the accusations produced against him concerned all the other leaders of the former synod as well, while Juvenal, Thalassius, and the others protested that they had played only a secondary role. When the question arose as to how certain expressions of Saint Cyril should be interpreted, Eustathius of Berytus slightly corrected his former assertions and even declared that he was in full agreement with the late Flavian. Asked why he then had condemned him, he answered: "I let myself be deceived (*ἐσφάλην*)."¹¹ Thus another of the leaders of the synod of 449 abandoned Dioscorus.

Thereupon the confession of faith which Flavian had made at Constantinople in November 448 was recited, and the assembly was asked whether according to this confession Flavian had been orthodox. Thalassius of Caesarea and Eustathius of Berytus answered without hesitation in the affirmative, while Dioscorus asked first to continue reading Flavian's utterances, "for in the following he is found to contradict himself and to speak of two natures after the union." Approving this suggestion, Juvenal said: "Moreover the holy Bishop Flavian spoke words which agree with those of the late Saint Cyril, but we ask to read what follows, that the meaning may become more clear." His Palestinian suffragans echoed his words. At this moment Juvenal together with his Palestinian bishops rose up and went over to the left side,¹² followed also by all the bishops of Illyricum and even by four Egyptian bishops. His secession was welcomed by enthusiastic acclamations of the assembly. Dioscorus was now entirely forsaken by his former allies; even of his Egyptian bishops, according to a remark by Basilius of Seleucia, only six were left.¹³ However, in the evening the imperial commissioners and senators pronounced that, Flavian and Eusebius having been unjustly deposed, the leaders of the former synod, Dioscorus, Juvenal,

⁹ Juvenal figured in the third place, after Dioscorus and Julius, the Pope's representative.

¹⁰ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 73, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 78.3-4. He alluded to the third of the canons of the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381, which remained little known and were not recognized in the West. Cf. T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), p. 304, n. 7.

¹¹ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 261, 267, 269, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, pp. 112.10-28, 113.11-20, 23.

¹² *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 282-284, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 115.20-26.

¹³ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 853, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 179.36.

Thalassius, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basilius of Seleucia should be deprived of their episcopal dignity.¹⁴

The six accused bishops were absent from the second and third sessions on October 10 and 13, which dealt with Dioscorus's deposition. Dioscorus, refusing to appear before the assembly, required that the other five leaders should also be summoned,¹⁵ but since this session was concerned only with his case, this request was refused. He finally was deposed *in absentia*.

In the fourth session of October 17 the whole assembly was invited to swear by the Gospels whether or not the creed of Nicaea and Constantinople was in agreement with the Tome of Leo. They unanimously affirmed this; the bishops of Illyricum and of Palestine¹⁶ added that they had first taken offense at certain passages in the Tome, but that the papal legates had given a satisfactory explanation of them.

After an intermission of a few hours the council received the answer of the Emperor, who had been asked how the cases of Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Basilius, and Eustathius should be handled.¹⁷ Marcian left it to the bishops to decide whether they should be readmitted. Thereupon, the assembly at once permitted them to enter. Cheered by all the bishops, they again took their places.¹⁸ Since a great number of the bishops had taken part in the "Robber-Synod" two years before, they preferred the deposition of Dioscorus alone, because of his stubbornness and acts of violence, to a general condemnation of the former synod, which would have implied a moral reproof against the majority of them, even if only the protagonists were deposed.

Juvenal was not only readmitted to the council, but, from the fifth session on, he again occupied the honorable place between the bishops of Antioch and Thessalonica.¹⁹ It certainly is quite irrelevant that in the list of the fifth session Anatolius of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch are called archbishops, but Juvenal and all the others only bishops.²⁰ For the minutes of the council show little consistency in the application of these titles; in the lists of those present at the sixth, ninth, and other sessions,

¹⁴ *Conc. Chalc. act.* I, 1068, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, p. 195.10-24.

¹⁵ *Conc. Chalc. act.* II, 36, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 13.40 [209.40].

¹⁶ *Conc. Chalc. act.* IV, 9, 99-114, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 103.3-30 [299.3-30]. Ananias of Capitolias read a written declaration of the Palestinian bishops, who are all mentioned by name; but Severianus of Scythopolis and the two bishops of Gaza are omitted.

¹⁷ *Conc. Chalc. act.* IV, 14, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 109.27-31 [305.27-31].

¹⁸ *Conc. Chalc. act.* IV, 15-18, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, pp. 109.34 [305.34]-110.5 [306.5].

¹⁹ Cf. E. Schwartz, "Bischofslisten . . .," *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, N.F. Heft 13 (1937), p. 19; E. Honigmann, *Byzantion*, XVI, p. 50.

²⁰ *Conc. Chalc. act.* V, 1, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 121.18 sqq. [317.18 sqq.].

Anatolius alone is called archbishop, and even Maximus of Antioch is numbered among the rest of the bishops. As E. Schwartz has shown, all the lists, with the exception of those of the second session, are merely repetitions of one "standard" or "basic" list.²¹

On October 20, after the transactions concerning Carosus and Dorotheus, the complaints produced by Photius of Tyre against Eustathius of Berytus were discussed. It was decided that Photius alone should be allowed to consecrate bishops in the entire province of Phoenicia I, while Eustathius should be deprived of his jurisdiction over the northern part of this province.²² But this does not mean that Berytus was degraded to a simple bishopric; ²³ in fact Photius had asked "nothing else" than the recognition of his former jurisdiction and the restoration of his degraded bishops.²⁴ Henceforth, Berytus certainly remained a so-called "autocephalous metropolis," just as at this time Nicaea had the honorable title of metropolis, while all the bishoprics of Bithynia were subordinate to the metropolitan of Nicomedia.²⁵ This general practice was sanctioned by the twelfth canon of the Council of Chalcedon.²⁶

This decision, by which both an imperial decree and a synodical resolution were simply annulled as being "contrary to the canon," could not leave any doubt in Juvenal's mind as to the fact that it would be impossible for him to maintain his domination, acquired shortly before, over both Phoenicias and Arabia. Therefore he decided to give it back voluntarily to Maximus rather than to endanger his rights over the three Palestinian provinces by a stubborn resistance. For it could always be maintained with good reason that Palestine also belonged to the Oriental Diocese and therefore ecclesiastically to the jurisdiction of Antioch.

When on October 22, after long discussions, a committee was chosen for the purpose of drawing up the authoritative formula of the synod's confession of faith, it was composed of the three papal delegates and twenty eastern bishops, among them Juvenal of Jerusalem.²⁷ After a deliberation

²¹ E. Schwartz, "Bischofslisten," p. 1 sqq.

²² *Conc. Chalc.*, "actio XIX," 43, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 108.10-13 [467.10-13].

²³ As C. J. v. Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*, II [2nd. ed., Freiburg, 1875], p. 463, n. 1 and p. 517]), and others suppose.

²⁴ *Conc. Chalc.*, "actio XIX," 34, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 107.17-20 [466.17-20] (*Οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἀξιώ κτλ.*).

²⁵ *Conc. Chalc. act.* XIV, 39, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 62.29 [421.29].

²⁶ *Conc. Chalc. act.* VII, 12, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 160.25-31 [356.25-31]; E. Schwartz, "Bischofslisten," p. 46, rightly states that Eustathius remained a titular metropolitan; cf. also E. Honigmann, *Byzantion*, XVI, p. 65.

²⁷ *Conc. Chalc. act.* V, 29, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 125.31-32 [321.31-32].

held in the oratory (*εὐκλήριον*) of Saint Euphemia they returned to the council and the "Chalcedonian definition (*ὄρος*)" was read.²⁸

On October 23²⁹ the agreement between Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal about Arabia and the Phoenician provinces was treated for the first time. After long discussion they arranged, in the presence of the judges and the whole assembly, that these three provinces should belong to the Antiochene see and only the three Palestinian provinces to that of Jerusalem, and that both interested parties should in the future renounce any further claims. By this agreement all previous decisions issued either by secular or ecclesiastical powers should be null and void. The two bishops reached this arrangement not by a judicial decree, but by "mutual consent" (*communi consensu*). Maximus, following this agreement, settled another matter in dispute by declaring that he was ready to pay an indemnity to his predecessor Domnus, who should renounce all further claims. In the name of the Pope his three legates approved these agreements together with the other bishops.³⁰ Maximus and Juvenal sent a petition to the Emperor asking him to confirm the mutual pact concluded by them.

Following the minutes of the solemn sixth session of October 25, during which, in the presence of the Emperor and Empress, the definition of faith established by the council's commission was approved, the original Greek acts as well as the *Versio Antiqua* add the twenty-seven canons drawn up by the council, heading them as the "seventh session."³¹ None of these canons concerns the unusual situation of the Palestinian church. Both canon 9 and canon 17 mention that a bishop complaining of his metropolitan should appeal either to the "Exarch³² of the Diocese" or to the see of Constantinople; but there is no hint of the question whether the bishop of Jerusalem is assimilated to the hitherto existing exarchs or is still dependent on the Oriental diocese.

²⁸ *Conc. Chalc. act.* V, 31-34, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, pp. 126.12 [322.12]-130.11 [326.11].

²⁹ The exact date (X Kal. Nov.) figures only in *Cod. Novariensis*, cf. *Collect. Vatic.*, 6, 5, ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars II (1936), p. 20.25 [112.25] adnot., while *Cod. Vatic.* 1322 has only Kal. Nov.

³⁰ *Coll. Vatic.*, 6, 5, ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars II, pp. 20.24 [112.24]-21.25 [113.25].

³¹ At the time of the fifth general council the redactor of a codex, written in the monastery of the Acoemeti, placed the canons after the transactions about Athanasius of Perrhe. This changed order appears in the "*Versio antiqua correcta*" and the edition of this version by Rusticus. Moreover Liberatus describes a codex showing this arrangement: *Breviar.* 13, ACO, t. II, vol. V (1936), p. 123.8-10. On the exact place of the canons see the third letter of Pelagius II to the Istrian monks, 105, 109, ACO, t. IV, vol. II, p. 127.14, 25; cf. E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, 32, 2 [1925], p. 18.

³² The reading *ἐπάρχω* instead of *ἐξάρχω* in canon XVII (cf. e.g. Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, II, 2d. ed., p. 520 sq.) has no support in the manuscripts; cf. *Conc. Chalc. act.* VII, 17, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 161.22 [357.22].

During the whole dispute between Antioch and Jerusalem, as far as it is known from the minutes of the council, no mention was ever made of the rights of the metropolitan of Caesarea in Palestine, carefully established by the seventh canon of Nicaea, which was clearly violated by the new agreement.³³ Glycon of Caesarea did not attend the council, but was represented by Bishop Zosimus of Menoïs; it seems that they fully submitted to the will and authority of the Palestinian primate.

On October 26, the agreement between Maximus and Juvenal was again brought up on the request of the Emperor. It seems that the transaction of October 23 was considered invalid, because the consent of the Emperor had not been obtained beforehand. Therefore, the previous "unwritten"³⁴ agreement was simply disregarded, and in the name of the Emperor his commissioners brought the case before the synod as if for the first time.³⁵ The last sentence spoken by Maximus of Antioch runs as follows: "And we ask that by a decree of your Magnificence and of the Holy Synod the agreement be confirmed in writing"; but before these words the compiler of the *Collectio Vaticana* inserted the following restriction: "provided that this be approved by our venerable Father, Leo, archbishop of Greater Rome."³⁶ This passage does not appear either in the Greek original or in the *Versio Antiqua* or in that of Rusticus. As the Ballerini and Schwartz have shown,³⁷ this is obviously an interpolation inserted in a copy of three extracts from the minutes of October 23 and 26 made by Maximus himself which he sent to Pope Leo, who had asked him for more detailed information about his former negotiations with Juvenal.³⁸ We shall return to this point below.

On October 27 the case of Ibas of Edessa, deposed by the "Robber-Synod," was discussed. The papal legates rejected the proposed reading of the minutes of this assembly, which was not acknowledged as a synod by the Pope. While all the other bishops declared Ibas innocent and worthy to be bishop, Juvenal's vote somewhat differed from theirs: "The Holy Scrip-

³³ Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, p. 204. E. Schwartz remarks that the decrees of Theodosius II relative to the matter had first to be annulled, but that this was not in the competence of the synod (*Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss.*, 32, 2 [1925], p. 23; *ibid.*, N.F. Heft 13 [1937] p. 46, n. 1).

³⁴ *Conc. Chalc. act.* VIII, 3, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 5.11-12 [364.11-12]: πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς ἀγράφοις ἐτύπωσαν.

³⁵ *Conc. Chalc. act.* VIII, 1-17, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, pp. 3.1 [362.1]-7.6 [366.6]; *Versio a Rustico edita*, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars III [1937], pp. 3.1 [442.1]-5.16 [444.16]; *Versio antiqua*, *ibid.*, pp. 7.1 [446.1]-10.26 [449.26] — in these versions as "Actio septima," the canons being counted as Actio XV.

³⁶ *Coll. Vatic.*, 3, ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars II, p. 18.21-22 [110.21-22]: "si tamen id venerabili patri nostro archiepiscopo Romae maioris Leoni placuerit."

³⁷ *Opera S. Leonis*, ed. a frat. Ballerinis, II, p. 1230 sq.; E. Schwartz, *Abh. Bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Abt.*, 32, 2 (1925), pp. 5-26.

³⁸ Cf. Leo, *Epist.* 119 [JK, 495] = *Coll. Griman.*, 66, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 74.4-5. Cf. below, pp. 254-255.

ture teaches us to admit the converted; therefore we admit even former heretics. For this reason I also agree with you that pity ["philanthropy"] has been allotted to the venerable bishop Ibas, because he is an old man, with the idea that he shall have the episcopal dignity, since he is [now] orthodox."³⁹ This shows that he considered Ibas to be at least a former Nestorian; but his words also seem to reveal some personal dislike.

The events of the last days (October 29–31) of the council had no connection with the Palestinian question.⁴⁰ The final disagreement between the assembly and the papal delegates about the so-called twenty-eighth canon of the council was only the beginning of a long dispute, continued by letters, concerning the aspirations of the Constantinopolitan see. In one of the letters relative to the matter, Pope Leo wrote on May 22, 452, that Anatolius would not be able to make Constantinople an Apostolic see.⁴¹ It is interesting to compare this remark with Saint Augustine's words, quoted above,⁴² about Jerusalem as the see of Saint James, the brother of the Lord.

VII. THE PALESTINIAN INSURRECTION (451–453)

After the council, Juvenal returned to Palestine. He was probably well satisfied with all he had accomplished at Chalcedon. At the very beginning of the council he had averted the imminent danger of his deposition by a quick and clever *coup de théâtre*, crossing over to the left side of the assembly and thus abandoning the losing team of his former ally Dioscorus. Some days later he had gathered in the fruits of this act: he was not only readmitted to the council, but even played once again a preëminent role as he had done at the two Ephesian councils. The loss of three of his six provinces was the less grievous since he had possessed them for only a very short period.

But he soon realized that his conduct at Chalcedon had unleashed unexpected fury in Palestine. The majority of his flock considered him an apostate who had betrayed his former faith. How far was this reproach justified?

We shall not criticize his *volte-face* from a moral point of view. It is true that, as the second leader of the "Latrocinium," he was much more responsible for its decisions than his fellow bishops; but for the rest he acted in

³⁹ *Conc. Chalc. actio* XI, 164, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 40.18–21 [399.18–21]. Concerning the date of the session see Schwartz, *ibid.*, *praef.*, p. XXII note.

⁴⁰ As I pointed out above, the agreement between Maximus and Juvenal, which some scholars dated October 31 or November 1 (cf. Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, II, 2d. ed., p. 502), really took place on October 23.

⁴¹ Leo, *Epist.* 104 [JK, 481] = *Collect. Griman.*, 54, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 56.19: "quam apostolicam facere non potest sedem."

⁴² See above, p. 216, n. 41.

451 in exactly the same way as all the other leaders of the former synod, all of whom had been pardoned except Dioscorus, who, of course, could not have expected to be absolved anyhow. If we examine Juvenal's decision from a more formal point of view, the accusations made by the Monophysites seem unjust likewise. As I mentioned above, Anatolius of Constantinople, one of the foremost personages attending the council, remarked before the assembly, without provoking any contradiction, that Dioscorus had not been deposed for dogmatic reasons.¹ As to Eutyches, the instigator of the whole dispute, he was not expressly condemned by the council either, for the simple reason that he had already been anathematized on November 22, 448, by the *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* under Flavian, and that both Leo the Great and Anatolius of Constantinople (the latter on Oct. 21, 450) had approved this condemnation. We can even fully disregard the case of Eutyches, for most of the Monophysites rejected his doctrine as did the Chalcedonian orthodox. It is well known that he was condemned by the great Monophysitic leaders, Timothy Aelurus, Severus of Antioch, and, as we shall presently see, by the Palestinian monks as well, immediately after the Council of Chalcedon. It seems, therefore, that the blind partisanship provoked by the opponents of the council resulted from false reports representing it as a great "Nestorian victory" rather than from an exact knowledge of its transactions. The monk Theodosius spread the rumor that the synod, in contradiction to the symbol of the holy fathers, had decreed that two Sons, two Christs, and two Persons be venerated.²

Immediately after his return Juvenal realized how great the excitement in Palestine was. Several monks, among them a certain Theodosius, who had also attended the council, had already arrived before him in Palestine.³ Theodosius probably had been among the crowd of Monophysitic ("Eutychian") monks who had joined Carosus, Dorotheus, and the other archimandrites summoned before the council.⁴ On October 20, these obstinate archimandrites were given time for reflection expiring on November 15, after which they were to be deposed.⁵ The monks who had arrived from abroad and their abbots were probably allowed to return to their provinces

¹ Διὰ πίστιν οὐ καθήρεθη Διώσκορος: *Conc. Chalc. act.*, V, 14, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 124.17-18 [320.17-18].

² Emperor Marcian's letter to Bishop Macarius and the monks of Mount Sinai, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 131.20 [490.20], and to the Palestinian synod, *ibid.*, p. 133.17 [492.17].

³ Zacharias Rhetor, HE, III, 3, ed. Brooks, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 156.24 sq. [107.26 sq.]; Evagrius, HE, II, 5, p. 52.9, ed. Bidez and Parmentier.

⁴ Cf. *Conc. Chalc. act.* IV, 65, 66, 76, 82, 97, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, pp. 115.14, 16 [311.14, 16], 116.3, 41 [312.3, 41], 118.36 [314.36]; act. XVIII, 2, 7, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars. III, pp. 99.32 [458.32], 100.26 [459.26], 101.20 [460.20]. Cf. Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, p. 672.

⁵ *Conc. Chalc. act.* XVIII, 11, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 101.20 [460.20].

after the end of the council. Since Zacharias Rhetor asserts⁶ that Theodosius had “struggled for years for the faith” and “was known for his zealous veracity,” I suppose that he was the same as the “well-known monk” of this name who, according to a remark of the priest and protonotarius John made in the second session of the “Robber-Synod,” had arrived with others at Alexandria a year before (448) and agitated there against Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Domnus of Antioch.⁷

When Juvenal arrived, the monks, including Peter the Iberian, hastened to meet him at Caesarea, but the governor of that city prohibited their entering it.⁸ They invited Juvenal to repudiate the decisions of the synod.⁹ His refusal¹⁰ provoked threats of assassination and such an uproar that he preferred to return at once to the capital to ask the Emperor’s help. In his stead, the hired assassins killed Severianus, metropolitan of Scythopolis, and his attendants.¹¹ The unrest spread over the whole country; houses were burned and many persons were killed by the rebellious monks.¹² Their leaders were Romanus, Marcianus, Theodosius, and others; Theodosius was chosen to succeed Juvenal, who was deposed. The slight resistance with which Theodosius opposed his consecration was perhaps more than the modest gesture usually exhibited at such occasions, for he must have realized that he was playing a very dangerous game. But, having been elected by the fanatical monks, he certainly had no choice, and it seems that within a short period all the Palestinian bishops who defended the Council of Chalcedon were deposed and replaced by Monophysites. The new archbishop Theodosius always appointed bishops whom the inhabitants of the city in

⁶ Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 3, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 157.16–17 [108.6–7]. Cf. also John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, ed. R. Raabe, p. 52.22 [53].

⁷ *Akten*, ed. J. Flemming, p. 130.23 [131.33] sqq.

⁸ John of Bēth Rufinā, *Plerophoriae*, 10, 56, ed. F. Nau, PO, VIII, pp. 24.8 [424.8], 111–113 [511–513].

⁹ Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 3, *loc. cit.*, p. 157.4 sqq. [107.31 sqq.]; John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petr. Ib.*, p. 52[53].

¹⁰ According to Zach. Rhet. (*loc. cit.*, p. 157.7–8 [107.34]), he replied like Pilate: “What I have written I have written.”

¹¹ Letters of Emperor Marcian to the archimandrites of Aelia (ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 125.14–17 [484.14–17]), to the monks of Mount Sinai (*ibid.*, p. 132.1–4 [491.1–4]), and to the Palestinian synod (*ibid.*, p. 133.29–32 [492.29–32]). As a member of the Council of Chalcedon, Severianus is mentioned only by the list of the *Corpus canonum* (Syriac list no. 121; Latin list no. 124; cf. above, p. 241, n. 3). See also Theophanes, *Chron.*, p. 107.14, ed. de Boor, who adds (p. 107.23) that Domnus of Antioch and Juvenal fled to the desert. While this may be true of Domnus who, according to Cyril of Scythopolis, had returned to the *lavra* of S. Euthymius after his deposition in 449 (*Vita Euthym.* 20, p. 33.27–28; Schwartz’s doubts [see above, p. 237, n. 1] are hardly justified), it obviously does not apply to Juvenal, although M. I. Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί πίνακες* (Constantinople, 1890), p. 193, repeats this error without correction.

¹² Marcian, Letter to the archimandrites and monks of Aelia, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 125.2 [484.2].

question had proposed by their *ψήφισμα*,¹³ and thus shared the responsibility for their consecration with the whole population. One of the new bishops was the Iberian prince Nabarnugius, who, at this time, lived under the Christian name Petrus as priest in Maïuma, having left Constantinople long before because he preferred monastic seclusion to high dignities at the imperial court. He was seized by the population and taken to Jerusalem where the "patriarch"¹⁴ Theodosius ordained him bishop of Maïuma in spite of his resistance.¹⁵ Similarly, Theodosius appointed as bishop of Joppe another Theodosius, a convinced Monophysite, who even required that those who rejected "the synod" after having approved it at first, be re-anointed.¹⁶ A third bishop consecrated by Theodosius "in one of the cities which were under him" was Timothy, former archimandrite of the monastery of Hypatius, seven miles from Jerusalem; the name of his bishopric is unknown.¹⁷ If it is true that the bishops Stephen of Iamnia and John of the Saracenes came back from the Council of Chalcedon to their former teacher, Euthymius, delivering him a written creed and definition of the assembly, and that he welcomed them as orthodox,¹⁸ their attitude certainly was a rare exception. We may even suppose that the two bishops went to his *lavra* chiefly in order to find a hiding place there during this time of agitation. As Cyril of Scythopolis himself stresses, Euthymius's *lavra* remained the only place in the whole "Palestinian desert" in which orthodoxy survived.¹⁹ But since Theodosius repeatedly tried to win Euthymius over, the saint finally retired for two years²⁰ to the inner desert called 'Povβâ, followed by his faithful adherents.²¹ They stayed there until Theodosius had been expelled.

¹³ John of Bêth Rufinâ, *Vita Petri Iberi*, ed. R. Raabe, p. 53.8 [54], written "psophisma."

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 55.2 [56.4].

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54 [54-55]; Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 4, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 158.18-20 [108.29-31]; Evagrius, HE, II, 5, p. 52.17-19, ed. Bidez and Parmentier; Zacharias Scholasticus, *Vita Severi*, ed. M.-A. Kugener, PO, II, p. 78.7-8. Peter is sometimes called bishop of Gaza, sometimes of Maïuma or "of Gaza on the sea shore," which means the seaport of Gaza; cf. H. Grégoire and M.-A. Kugener, *Marc le Diacre, Vie de Porphyre* (Paris, 1930), p. 152.

¹⁶ Zach. Rhet., HE, V, 4, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 217.20, 27 [150.30, 151.2]. Severus of Antioch, *Select letters*, ed. Brooks, I, 60; V, 6, 14; IX, 1: pp. 207 [185], 356 [314-315], 392 [349], 472 [418]. Evagrius, HE, III, 6, p. 106.19, ed. Bidez and Parmentier. Theodosius was still alive in 475.

¹⁷ John of Bêth Rufinâ, *De commemoratione quomodo beatus Theodosius episc. Hieros. ad Dominum nostrum migraverit*, ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. XXV (1907), p. 21.10-13 [15.11-13].

¹⁸ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthym.*, 27, p. 41.4-22, ed. Schwartz.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 42.6-9.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 45.5.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 42.9-45.4. Domnus of Antioch was probably included in this group.

Theodosius occupied the see of Jerusalem for twenty months,²² thus at least until the middle of 453. He was supported not only by the overwhelming majority of the population and the monks, but also by the Empress Eudocia, who was then residing at Jerusalem.²³

Even during the council (thus between October 25 and 31?), the Egyptian Monophysites ordered all those who wanted to turn "from all heresies, viz. from those who say two natures and from Nestorians and Phantasiasts or Eutychemians," to pronounce an anathema. A form of this *formula abiurationis* under the name of one Anastasius, priest of Jerusalem,²⁴ is still preserved. This document condemns both Juvenal the renegade and all who accept his teachings.²⁵

In the meantime Juvenal arrived at Constantinople and there complained to the Emperor about the Palestinian insurgents.²⁶ Probably in 452 the rebellious abbots and monks wrote to the Empress asking her to intercede with the Emperor in their behalf. From the Emperor's letter to them we learn that they had alleged that the crimes of which they had been accused had been committed by the citizens of Jerusalem and by some strangers. Besides, they asserted that they too anathematized Eutyches. Moreover, they complained of the great inconveniences which resulted from the presence of soldiers billeted in their monasteries.²⁷

But the Emperor kept resolutely to the decisions of the synod, which he confirmed by four decrees of February 7, March 13, July 6 and 18, 452. The first and second of these made disputes about religious questions punishable; the third annulled the decree issued by Theodosius II after the "Robber-Synod," and the fourth threatened the Eutychemian laity and clergy with severe punishment.²⁸ For several months, however, he hesitated to intervene by force in Palestine, contenting himself at first by writing a letter to the archimandrites and monks in and near Aelia-Jerusalem. He wrote that he knew from reliable reports that they had taken Jerusalem like a city of

²² Theophanes, *Chron.*, p. 107.23-24, ed. de Boor.

²³ Leo, *Epist.* 117 [JK 493] = *Collect. Griman.*, 63, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 69.32 (written on March 21, 453, to Julian of Cos); Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthym.*, 27, 30, pp. 41.24, 47.4.

²⁴ Cf. the priest Anastasius mentioned by Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthym.*, 30, p. 49.3, according to E. Schwartz (p. 258, s.v. 'Αναστ. 4) the same as the σκενοφύλαξ, χωρεπίσκοπος, and later Patriarch Anastasius.

²⁵ *Textes monophysites*, 13, ed. F. Nau, PO, XIII (1919), pp. 237.8 [127.8]-238.6 [128.6]; for the date cf. the words: "j'anathématisé le symbole impie qui est venu du concile impie réuni maintenant à Chalcedoine."

²⁶ *Marciani Imp. Epist. ad archimandritas Aelienses*, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 127.32 [486.32]; *Pulcheriae Aug. Epist. ad archim. et monach.*, *ibid.*, p. 128.9 [487.9]; Evagrius, HE, II, 5, p. 52.1-9, ed. Bidez and Parmentier.

²⁷ *Marciani Epist. ad archim. Aelienses*, *loc. cit.*, p. 125.4, 25 [484.4, 25].

²⁸ *Marciani Constitutiones et edictum*, ACO, *loc. cit.*, pp. 119.1 [478.1]-124.24 [483.24].

enemies instead of peaceably staying in their monasteries, that they had killed a venerable deacon²⁹ and mutilated his body, burned houses, shut the gates and guarded the walls of the city, opened the prisons and allowed criminals to escape, hired a murderer, who, after Juvenal's flight, had killed Severianus and his attendants. By all these misdeeds they had proved that their aim was not the victory of the true faith but the occupation of the hierarchical dignities, which they did not deserve at all since they were eager only to ruin the cities. Though their anathematization of Eutyches was praiseworthy, they had surrendered to Theodosius, the instigator of their illegal acts. For these crimes they could be punished by Christ; but he, the Emperor, would not take any measures against them. He required only that order be restored in Aelia. They had waged war against peace and order, however, by gathering a crowd of robbers and criminals, for which they had deserved the severest punishment. In addition they were too ignorant for doctrinal disputes. Nevertheless, the Emperor explains to them in detail the orthodoxy of the Chalcedonian creed, refutes their argument that the council's definition meant two Sons and two Christs, and points out that the contrary was proved by the fact that the council had condemned Nestorius. The Emperor had not compelled anyone to sign, and had avoided leading people to the truth by terror and violence. But the monks, on the contrary, he shows, had used all manner of cruelty to force others to join them in anathematizing Pope Leo and the Holy Synod. As to their reproaches against the Samaritans, the Emperor promised a strict investigation by Count Dorotheus. He finally admonished them to repent of their error, promising that he would not refuse his clemency to many of them, "especially since the holy Bishop Juvenal has asked us, begging again and again, to send you these writings."³⁰ Informed by several petitions that the soldiers, who had been ordered to guard the city of Aelia, were seriously molesting their monasteries, he promised that Dorotheus would redress their grievances.³¹

Comes Dorotheus had hastily arrived before the gates of Jerusalem after a war waged by him in Moabitis against the Saracens.³² The passage of the Emperor's letter about the closing of the gates of Jerusalem by the rebels

²⁹ His name, Athanasius, is mentioned by Theophanes, *Chron.*, p. 107.19, ed. de Boor, and by Nicephorus Callistus, HE, XV, 9, PG, 147, col. 32 B; their common source is probably Theodorus Lector.

³⁰ Marcianus, *Epist. ad archimandr. Aelienses*, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 127.32-33 [486.32-33]: *πολλαῖς παρακλήσεσι χρησαμένον τοῦ ὀσιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου Ἰουβενάλιον, δι' ὧν ἡμᾶς ἐξεδυσώπησε ταῦτα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὰ θεῖα χαράξαι γράμματα.*

³¹ *Ibid.*, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, pp. 124.25 [483.25]-127.38 [486.38].

³² Nicephorus Callistus, HE, XV, 19, PG, 147, col. 32 B.

seems to confirm the assertion of Nicephorus Callistus³³ that the followers of Theodosius and Eudocia refused to admit Dorotheus into the city unless he would side with them.

At the same time the Empress Pulcheria wrote a similar letter to the monks, referring to that of her husband and also to the demands of Juvenal; she likewise explained the real sense of the Chalcedonian creed and warned them of persisting in their secession, lest their stubbornness cause them to be designated as heretics. Finally, she repeated his promises concerning the Samaritans and the soldiers billeted in their monasteries, and expressed the hope that they would again be united to the orthodox church.³⁴

The exact date of these two imperial letters is not known; but from the mention of Comes Dorotheus,³⁵ as well as from the situation as a whole, it seems probable that they were written in the beginning of 453 rather than late in 452, as E. Schwartz assumed.³⁶ In February 453 the Emperor issued a decree (*forma*), by which all the bishops appointed by Theodosius were expelled under threat of capital punishment in case of resistance, and Theodosius himself was condemned to death.³⁷

Pope Leo showed less sympathy for the fugitive Juvenal than his sovereigns. On November 25, 452, he wrote to Julian of Cos: "Bishop Juvenal, whose misfortune must be deplored, had associated himself too inconsiderately with the blasphemies of the heretics, and as long as he agreed with Eutyches and Dioscorus, he led many of the inexperienced to follow his example, though he corrected himself later by a more sane resolution." He adds that those who "had drunk deeper of the poison of impiety became, from former disciples, his enemies"; he had therefore to suffer from his own former disciples. The Pope hoped, however, that the Palestinians would now follow him, mend their ways, and even, under the influence of the holy places which surrounded them, again become reasonable. As to the intruder who occupied the see of the living bishop, there could be no doubt about his perversity.³⁸ On March 11, 453, in a letter to the same correspondent, he wrote that he had no news about the situation in Palestine, and repeated the hope that the testimonies of the holy places might teach the monks the truth about the Lord's incarnation.³⁹ On March 21 he wrote to Julian that,

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Pulcheriae Aug. Epist. ad archimandr. et. monach. Aelienses*, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, pp. 128.1 [487.1]-129.22 [488.22].

³⁵ Cf. Niceph. Callist., *loc. cit.* Seeck, RE, V, col. 1570 sq., s.v. Dorotheos, no. 11.

³⁶ E. Schwartz, *Kyrrillos von Skythopolis*, p. 363, n. 1.

³⁷ John of Bêth Rufinâ, *Vita Petri Iberi*, ed. R. Raabe, p. 57 [58]; "forma," p. 57.19.

³⁸ Leo, *Epist.* 109 [JK, 486] = *Collect. Ratisbonensis*, 105, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 138.8-16.

³⁹ Leo, *Epist.* 113 [JK, 489] = *Collect. Griman.*, 60, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 66.15-23. Cf. T. Jalland, *The Life of St. Leo*, p. 329.

at the Emperor's secretly transmitted request, he had sent a letter of admonition to Augusta Eudocia and had induced her son (actually her son-in-law, Emperor Valentinian III) to join their efforts.⁴⁰

About this time Maximus of Antioch regretted very much the agreement he had made with Juvenal at Chalcedon, which now was to the advantage of the heretics. He wrote in this vein to the Pope, stressing the inviolability of the old privileges of his see and adding a copy of the letter in which Cyril had expressed his horror at Juvenal's cupidity and had demanded that the latter's illicit claims find no support.⁴¹ Leo answered on June 11, 453, agreeing that no violation of the Nicene canons should be permitted, and stating that he felt such reverence for these canons that he would not permit them to be violated by any innovation. The rights of the sees should be respected without regard to the merits of the occupants. He asked what steps Maximus intended to take in the interest of the Antiochene privileges. Leo expressed himself as convinced that no agreement made at a council could affect the inviolability of these canons, and that it would be easier to alter any conciliar decision whatever than to transgress the canons. For, he says, the ambitious always seek to aggrandize themselves, and at the great assemblies of the bishops especially the greed of the wicked (*improborum*) tries to attain their immoderate aims, as, for instance, at the Council of Ephesus, when Juvenal sought to obtain the supremacy over the province of Palestine and to confirm his insolent attempts by forged writings. The Pope then quoted the same letter of Cyril, adding that an authentic copy of it had also been found in the papal archives. He repeats that any decision, even of a great number of bishops, contrary to the constitutions of the 318 (the Fathers of Nicaea) should be annulled. If his delegates had given their approval to any decision except those concerning the establishment of orthodoxy, they had exceeded their authority. As confirmation of his resoluteness in this respect, the Pope sent Maximus a copy of his letter to Anatolius of Constantinople,⁴² asking that he make it known to all his fellow bishops.⁴³ The same day Leo wrote to Theodoretus of Cyrrhus, referring at the end of this letter to the one he had sent Maximus.⁴⁴

As I pointed out above,⁴⁵ Maximus, in answering Leo's letter, appended the three extracts of the minutes of the Council of Chalcedon which differ

⁴⁰ Leo, *Epist.* 117 [JK, 493] = *Collect. Griman.*, 63, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 69.30-34.

⁴¹ Cf. above, p. 217, n. 45.

⁴² Leo, *Epist.* 106 [JK, 483] = *Collect. Griman.*, 56, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 59.15-62.12.

⁴³ Leo, *Epist.* 119 [JK, 495] = *Collect. Griman.*, 66, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 72.30-75.6. Cf. Jalland, pp. 338-340.

⁴⁴ Leo, *Epist.* 120 [JK, 496] = *Collect. Griman.*, 71, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 78.19-81.30.

⁴⁵ See above, p. 246.

slightly from the original text, notably in the insertion of a sentence restricting Maximus's consent to the proposals of Juvenal by making it contingent upon the approval of Pope Leo, "who desires that everywhere the canons of the holy fathers remain inviolable."⁴⁶

But for several reasons all these discussions between the Pope and Maximus had no consequence. Shortly afterward Juvenal returned to Palestine, reinstated by the military forces of the Emperor, while Maximus himself soon got into trouble. A letter of Pope Leo dated March 11, 455, shows that he had been accused of some serious lapse before the Emperor;⁴⁷ in 456 or 457 "he was expelled because of a fault," as a chronicler puts it.⁴⁸

In spite of being displeased with Juvenal, the Pope was much more concerned over the temporary victory of the heretics in Palestine. On June 15 he again wrote to Empress Eudocia, who was at Jerusalem, asking her to influence the intransigent Palestinian monks by convincing them of the orthodoxy of the Chalcedonian definition.⁴⁹ It is well known that the diplomatic tact of that time always affected to disregard any possibility that a member of the imperial family could accept a wrong doctrine. Leo also wrote to the Palestinians themselves, explaining in detail his doctrinal point of view and defending his dogmatic letter to Flavian, which, either through inexperience or through ill will, had been misinterpreted by their Greek informants. It is no wonder, since in these subtle and difficult questions a disputant (*disputator*) could hardly find suitable expressions in his own language.⁵⁰

As I suggested above, the letters of the Emperor and the Empress to the Palestinian monks were probably written in the spring of 453. Somewhat later, Marcian learned that Theodosius of Jerusalem had fled to Macarius, bishop and archimandrite of the Sinai monastery. The Emperor therefore wrote a letter to Macarius and the monks of that monastery cautioning them against giving refuge to Theodosius, whom he called the forerunner of Antichrist. They should instead hand him over to the administrator of Palestine, who would deliver him to the Stratelates of the East for judg-

⁴⁶ Cf. E. Schwartz, ACO, t. II, vol. II, pars II, praefatio, pp. xiii-xiv, who supposes that the emissaries sent by Maximus to the Pope interrupted their journey at Constantinople, where they asked for the minutes of the council and translated them into Latin, adding the interpolations which figure in *Collectio Vaticana*, 6, 3-5. I see no cogent reason why this translation and interpolation could not have been made at Antioch as well.

⁴⁷ Leo, *Epist.* 141 [JK, 516] = *Collect. Griman.*, 85, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 95. 1-6.

⁴⁸ Nicephorus patriarcha, *χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον* in his *Opuscula historica*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1880), p. 131.18: ὃς καὶ ἐξεβλήθη διὰ πταῖσμα.

⁴⁹ Leo, *Epist.* 123 [JK, 499] = *Collect. Griman.*, 69, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 77.6-33.

⁵⁰ Leo, *Epist.* 124 [JK, 500] = *Collect. Quesneliana*, 113, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 159-163 (undated).

ment.⁵¹ In this letter he also wrote the following: "Juvenal was saved by the Holy Trinity and, as the facts have shown, by his confidence in faith."⁵² In another letter he warned "the synod in Palestine," that is, the orthodox bishops there, against receiving Theodosius, if he should try to go back from Mount Sinai to Palestine.⁵³ In this letter he calls the see of Jerusalem "the throne of the thrice blessed Apostle James."⁵⁴ A similar letter was sent by Pulcheria to Bassa, the hegumene of a nunnery in Aelia.⁵⁵

In the summer of 453, after an absence of twenty months, Juvenal returned to Palestine, escorted by armed forces. He deposed all the bishops appointed by Theodosius.⁵⁶ Comes Dioscorus was entrusted by the Emperor with the task of catching Theodosius, of crushing the revolt, and of punishing the guilty monks and people. Only Peter, the former Iberian prince, was not to be harmed, for the Empress had interceded for him. In Neapolis (Biblical Shekhem, today Nablus), many monks were massacred by the soldiers and by the Samaritans, when they refused to communicate with Juvenal, as the Emperor had ordered.⁵⁷ In spite of the amnesty accorded him by the Empress's intercession, Peter the Iberian also left his bishopric (Maïuma) and emigrated with his Monophysitic fellow bishops to Alexandria.⁵⁸ The abbots Romanus ("the father of the monks") and Timothy of the monastery of Hypatius were arrested and imprisoned at Antioch.⁵⁹ Theodosius of Jerusalem first fled to Egypt;⁶⁰ but when he learned there that dissension had arisen among his followers who were interned at Antioch, since Timothy had embraced the Eutychian heresy, he tried secretly to reach the Syrian capital in order to strengthen the faith of his adherents. According to others, he wanted to see the famous Simeon Stylites, to prevent him from being "seduced by Theodoret and other heretics."⁶¹ It was probably at this time that each party attacked the other by forged writings. There exist Syriac letters of Simeon Stylites ascribing to him Monophysitic

⁵¹ *Marciani Imp. Epist. ad Macarium episc. et monachos in m. Sina*, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, pp. 131.1 [490.1]–132.41 [491.41].

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 132.1–2 [491.1–2].

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 133.1 [492.1]–134.42 [493.42].

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133.27–28 [492.27–28]: *θρόνω τοῦ τρισμακαρίστου ἀποστόλου Ἰακώβου*.

⁵⁵ *Pulcheriae Aug. Epist. ad Bassam*, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, pp. 135.1 [494.1]–136.6 [495.6]. Cf. Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthym.*, 30, p. 49.20, ed. Schwartz.

⁵⁶ Nicephorus Callistus, HE, XV, 19, PG, 147, col. 32 D.

⁵⁷ Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 5, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 159.15–23 [109.17–23]; John Rufus, *Plerophoriae*, 10, PO, VIII, p. 24 (Neapolis).

⁵⁸ Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 7, *loc. cit.*, p. 160.18–26 [110.9–16].

⁵⁹ John of Bēth Rufinā, *De commemoratione quomodo b. Theodos. ep. Hieros. ad Dom. nostr. migraverit*, ed. Brooks, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. XXV, p. 21.7–12 [15.8–12].

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 21.6 [15.7].

⁶¹ John of Bēth Rufinā, *De commemoratione . . .*, *loc. cit.*, p. 22.1–13 [15.20–29].

convictions.⁶² In Alexandria a certain John Rhetor issued forged books full of nonsense under the names of Theodosius of Jerusalem and Peter the Iberian, both of whom indignantly cursed him and his writings.⁶³ When Theodosius arrived near the gates of Antioch, he was recognized by a companion of the Chorepiscopus Gaianus, who knew him as a former inmate of the monastery Bēth Mār Bizī.⁶⁴ He was arrested and by order of the Emperor transported to Constantinople, where he was interned in the monastery of Dius in a room full of unslaked lime. When Emperor Leo succeeded Marcian (457), he was released, but he died a few days later at Sycae.⁶⁵

VIII. FROM 454 TO 458

After his return to Palestine, where he was reinstated by military force, Juvenal's position was very precarious in the midst of a hostile population. Though the numerous Monophysitic stories about his shame and repentance are evidently pious inventions,¹ they are true in so far as they reflect the hatred which the majority of the Palestinian population felt for the spiritual leader forced upon them by the supreme power. Indeed orthodox writers report similar facts. The monks of Jerusalem and of the desert continued to refuse him communion.² Of the two archimandrites, Helpidius and Geron-tius, who, as messengers of Theodosius of Jerusalem, had tried to win over Euthymius, the former, Passarion's successor, later changed sides.³ Geron-tius, however, persisted in open opposition,⁴ but remained for forty-five years (440-484) archimandrite of the monasteries of Melania the Younger,⁵ of whose biography he was apparently the author.⁶ He was asked by the

⁶² "The Letters of Simeon the Stylite," ed. Ch. C. Torrey, *Journ. Amer. Orient. Soc.*, XX (1899), pp. 253-276; German transl. by H. Hilgenfeld, TU, 32, 4 (1908), pp. 188-191.

⁶³ Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 10, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, pp. 163.9-164.19 [112.5-113.4]. John Rhetor is also mentioned in a treatise against the followers of Julian of Halicarnas-sus, *Brit. Mus. cod. syr.* 857 = Add. 12,155, fol. 125v; cf. Brooks in his translation of Zach. Rhet., pp. 113-114, n. 1. According to this text (fol. 124v) John later also misused the name of Timothy (Aelurus) of Alexandria.

⁶⁴ John of Bēth Rufinā, *De commemoratione . . .*, *loc. cit.*, p. 22.22 [16.3]. Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 9, p. 162.5 [111.11], however, says that he was captured near Sidon.

⁶⁵ John of Bēth Rufinā, *loc. cit.*, p. 24.6 [16.33].

¹ E.g. Zach. Rhet., III, 8, *loc. cit.*, pp. 161.1-19 [110.17-111.4], and many passages in the *Plerophoriae* by John Rufus, PO, VIII, cf. *Indices*, p. 186 [586] and p. 201 [601] *s.v.* Juvenal. Cf. below, chapter IX, pp. 262-266.

² Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Theodosii*, p. 236.14-19; *Vita Theognii*, p. 241.15-17 (454-5), ed. E. Schwartz.

³ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 28, 30, pp. 44.4, 49.7-10.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 28, 30, pp. 44.6-8, 49.8-11. Cf. above, p. 228.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 45, p. 67.15.

⁶ Tillemont, *Mém.*, XIV, pp. 251-252; O. Bardenhewer, *Gesch. d. altkirchl. Lit.*, IV, p. 158.

rulers and by many distinguished persons “to promise just to speak with the apostate Juvenal, even if he did not communicate with him, but he refused, saying: ‘God forbid that I should see the face of the traitor Judas.’”⁷ Archdeacon Stephen of Jerusalem left the clergy of the Holy City and finished his life as a pilgrim.⁸

Even Empress Eudocia, whose alliance with the Monophysites had considerably strengthened the position of Theodosius of Jerusalem, could not be won over to the orthodox cause until 456. She received letters not only from the Pope and the Emperors of the Eastern and the Western Empire,⁹ but also from her brother Valerius¹⁰ and from Olybrius, the son-in-law of her daughter Eudoxia, all of whom urged her to separate from communion with the “Eutychians” and to embrace the catholic faith once more.¹¹ It seems that, like many others, she took special offense at the return of Juvenal, though she had formerly favored him, as we can infer from the fact that among her numerous charitable institutions was his episcopal residence, which was built and kept up at her expense.¹² It was the disasters of 455 — the assassination of her son-in-law, Emperor Valentinian, and the abduction of her daughter and granddaughters to Africa by Genserich — that made her accessible to the entreaties of the orthodox. In her indecision she consulted by letter the famous Simeon Stylites, who recommended Euthymius as her confessor. The latter declared that her misfortune was the divine punishment for her connection with the wicked Theodosius, and counseled her to communicate with Juvenal instead of the followers of Dioscorus. She took this advice, and her example made a great number of monks and laymen return to the catholic community.¹³ Her change did not come before 456.¹⁴ Her generosity was now bestowed again on the orthodox church.¹⁵

Shortly after his return, Juvenal gathered the Palestinian bishops and sent a synodical letter through them “to the priests, archimandrites, and monks of the province of Palestine who were subordinated to him in his diocese.” This heading¹⁶ strangely speaks of only one “province of Palestine,”

⁷ John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, ed. R. Raabe, p. 32 [36].

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 133.1-5 [122].

⁹ See above, p. 254, n. 40; p. 255, n. 49.

¹⁰ Valerius is also mentioned by John Malalas, p. 353.16, ed. Bonn.

¹¹ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 30, p. 47.5-14.

¹² Nicephorus Callistus, HE, XIV, 50, PG, 146, col. 1240 B (ἐπισκοπεῖον).

¹³ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 30, pp. 47.5-49.7.

¹⁴ Nicephorus Callistus, *ibid.*, 1240 D: Μετὰ δὲ τὸ τὴν σύνοδον παραδέξασθαι καὶ ἄλλα τέσσαρα ἐπεβίω ἔτη. ἔπειτα ἐτελεύτα. Tillemont, *Mém.*, XV, pp. 929-930, Eudocia died on October 20, 460 (Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 35, p. 54.10, ed. Schwartz).

¹⁵ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 35, pp. 53.5-54.10.

¹⁶ Rescriptum synodicarum litterarum Iuvenalis sc̄issimi epi Hierosolymorum ad reverentissimos pr̄sbos et archimandritas et reliquos monachos Palaestinae provinciae sub eius diocese constitutos.

while in the subscription all three provinces are mentioned. The words “sub eius diocese constitutos” could hardly be interpreted as an attestation of a newly created “dioecesis” comprehending the three Palestinian provinces after their separation from the Dioecesis Orientis; they probably mean nothing more than “being under his administration.”

In this short letter, which is preserved only in a Latin translation,¹⁷ it is stressed that the Council of Chalcedon strictly followed the Creed of Nicaea, that those who denied this fact were calumniating the holy fathers and the whole world. But God might join to his church even those who went astray, since he does not want the death of the sinner, but his conversion and life.

Of the signatures only three are preserved, those of Juvenal, Irenaeus of Caesarea, who of course, occupied the second place, and Paul of Paralus,¹⁸ whose signature is followed by the words: “and after them other bishops of the three Palaestinae signed.”¹⁹

It is not likely, however, that such apologetic proclamations convinced a great number of his Monophysitic opponents of the rightness of his dogmatic views; the great majority of his flock certainly remained hostile to him. Even nature seemed to accuse him, for during the five years of Abbot Romanus’s exile (453–457), Palestine continually suffered from a horrible drought and famine.²⁰ Juvenal, alarmed by the discontent of the Palestinian population, tried to appease the Monophysites by asking Emperor Marcian and Empress Eudocia to grant amnesty to Romanus, whereupon not only Romanus, but even all the “saints” staying in exile were permitted to return to Palestine.²¹

While it is only natural that the Monophysites should have detested the archbishop whose return had destroyed all their hopes, even the orthodox Chalcedonians showed little sympathy for the former assistant of Dioscorus. Pope Leo, who after the “Latrocinium” had ordered Juvenal’s name to be

¹⁷ *Collectio Sangermanensis*, 1, 4, ACO, t. II, vol. V, p. 9.1–29.

¹⁸ Ed. Schwartz, “Prosopographia . . .,” ACO, t. II, vol. VI, p. 99, s.v. Parali (2) says: “latet, ni fallor, (Azoti) Parali, cf. Hierocl. p. 718, 5. Georg. Cyr., 1020.” But the harbor town of Azotus was never a bishopric. Paralus is a translation of Maïuma (in 518 bishops of Μαῖουμᾶ Γάζης and M. Ἀσκάλωνος are attested), meaning the harbor of Gaza. Evidently Paul is the same person as the bishop of Maïuma of this name who attended the “Robber-Synod” (see above, p. 233, n. 1; therefore, in Schwartz’s *Prosopogr.*, p. 55, Παῦλος no. 11 is = no. 14). He was the son of Juvenal’s brother; see John of Bêth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, ed. R. Raabe, p. 51.1–2 [52.2]; Peter the Iberian was his rival bishop.

¹⁹ et consequenter alii trium Palaestinarum episcopi subscriperunt.

²⁰ John of Bêth Rufinā, *De commemoratione quomodo beatus Theodosius episc. Hierosolymorum ad Dominum nostrum migraverit*, CSCO, Scr. Syri, ser. III, t. XXV, p. 25.2, 24 [17.18, 35].

²¹ John of Bêth Rufinā, *ibid.*, pp. 25.26–26.9 [17.36–18.7].

removed from the diptychs, must have canceled this measure after the Council of Chalcedon. He rejoiced, of course, at the announcement that “the Palestinian monks had been converted by the Emperor.” In a letter to Marcian of January 9, 454, he thanks him for his successful efforts to restore unity in Palestine, as a result of which “it was finally possible for my fellow bishop Juvenal to return to the see of his priesthood, no longer opposed, but desired by his flock.”²² It would seem that the Emperor had sent to the Pope a very optimistic description of the Palestinian situation. In another letter to the Emperor of May 29, 454, he again mentions that his addressee’s merit had “called back the obscured hearts of the Palestinians to the light of truth.”²³ On September 4 of the same year, he wrote to Juvenal in answer to a letter delivered to him by the priest Andrew and the deacon Peter. Juvenal had referred in his letter to Leo’s Tome, probably declaring the conformity of his own doctrinal views with those expressed in it. He also seems to have mentioned his seniority. In his answer the Pope does not cease to reproach Juvenal for his former attitude, in spite of the joy he feels at the latter’s return to his bishopric. He again and again repeats that Juvenal had to attribute his troubles to his own fault, that the condemnation of Flavian and the admission of Eutyches had been nothing less than the negation of the human nature in Christ. He is glad that “at the time of indulgence” Juvenal had shown more compliance than pertinacity, and that finally he could appear as a defender of the true faith. No priest should be ignorant about what he preaches; yet the errors of a misled Christian staying in Jerusalem are much less excusable than those of anyone else, since he can learn the truth of the Gospel not only from books, but also from the very testimonies of the holy places. The Pope dwells on this theme in minute detail, speaking of Bethlehem, of the Holy Sepulcher, and of the Mount of Olives. In subsequent passages he admonishes Juvenal to convert those who still remain heterodox. Three of the nine chief manuscripts add the following sentence at the end: “I received with veneration a small fragment of the Lord’s Cross²⁴ together with the benediction²⁵ of your Charity.”²⁶

The last writing of the Pope to Juvenal is a circular letter, almost iden-

²² Leo, *Epist.* 126 [JK, 502] = *Collect. Griman.*, 72, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 81.31–82.13.

²³ Leo, *Epist.* 136 [JK, 510] = *Collect. Griman.*, 81, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 91.2–3.

²⁴ According to John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, p. 39.7–9 [41], Peter, a young hostage at the court of Constantinople, was able to obtain a particle of the Holy Cross “from the clergymen (κληρικοί) who used to come from Jerusalem to honor the Emperor with benedictions.”

²⁵ On these “benedictions” (εὐλογίαι), cf. the fragment of the “*Historia Euthymiaca*” published in PG, 96, col. 747, adnot. 58, and used by Nicephorus Callistus, HE, XIV, 47, PG, 146, col. 1221 D (cf. below, p. 270, n. 20).

²⁶ Leo, *Epist.* 139 [JK, 514] = *Collect. Griman.*, 82, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 91.25–93.26.

tical in wording, sent to him on September 1, 457, as well as to Basilius of Antioch, Euxitheus of Thessalonica, Peter (of Corinth), and Lucas (of Dyrrachium) concerning the alarming news of the crime committed by the Eutyrians in Alexandria (namely, the assassination of Archbishop Proterius). He admonishes them all resolutely to struggle for the general acknowledgment of the definition of the Council of Chalcedon, asking that his letter be transmitted to all their fellow-bishops.²⁷ In the same year Emperor Leo, Marcian's successor, sent Juvenal a copy of his Encyclical,²⁸ directed to all metropolitans of the Empire and to some other personages, by which he asked to be informed of their opinions about the aspirations of Timothy Aelurus and about the question whether the confessions of Nicaea and Chalcedon were in complete agreement. At the very beginning the Emperor refers to the "allocutions made by the Emperors Marcian and Pulcheria as well as by the holy bishop Juvenal" to the monks who stirred up the population of Jerusalem.²⁹ This is the last preserved document which was directed to Juvenal; he probably answered the Emperor by a synodical letter composed by him together with the suffragan bishops of the three Palestinian provinces; but his answer, like many others, is missing in the only two existing manuscripts of the Latin translation of the Encyclical, which Epiphanius Scholasticus had made at Cassiodorus's request.

According to Cyril of Scythopolis,³⁰ Juvenal died after an episcopate of forty-four years in the eighty-third year of Euthymius. Both indications must be wrong: as we remarked above, Juvenal cannot have been bishop for forty-four years, and, besides, the eighty-third year of Euthymius corresponds to August 459–August 460. From the same author's *Vita Sabae* we learn, however, that as early as July 458 Juvenal's successor, Anastasius, was bishop of Jerusalem.³¹ Juvenal probably died in the beginning of that month; the Greek church indicates July 2 as the day of his death.³²

²⁷ Leo, *Epist.* 149, 150 [JK, 526, 525] = *Collect. Griman.*, 90, 91, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, pp. 97.31–98.25.

²⁸ Leo Imp., *Encyclia, Codex Sangermanensis*, 1, 6, ACO, t. II, vol. V, pp. 9.30–11.4. Several other documents, probably all the pieces collected in *Cod. Sangerm.*, 1–9, *loc. cit.*, pp. 3.1–22.21, were annexed to the Emperor's circular letter. The addressees are enumerated, *ibid.*, 11, pp. 22.32–24.27; Juvenal's name occurs there (p. 22.35) after those of the Pope and the bishops of Constantinople and Antioch.

²⁹ Leo Imp., *Encyclia, loc. cit.*, p. 9.36.

³⁰ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, 33, pp. 51.22–52.2, ed. E. Schwartz.

³¹ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, 12, p. 95.4–5: Euthymius died in the fifteenth year of Anastasius of Jerusalem (Jan. 20, 473); *ibid.*, 15, p. 98.11: Anastasius died after nineteen (in fact, twenty) years of his episcopate (that is, in July 478).

³² N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale*, II (Innsbruck, 1897), p. 48. Cf. also F. Doelger, *Byz. Ztsch.*, 40 (1940), p. 483.

IX. JUVENAL IN THE LATER MONOPHYSITIC LITERATURE

The furor provoked among the Monophysites by Juvenal's "apostasy" left many marks in their literature. We can observe there a gradually increasing animosity against him, changing from slightly retouched historical reports into grossly exaggerated stories.

The Life of Peter the Iberian, written by John of Bēth Rufinā,¹ is still almost free of those exaggerations, though Juvenal is already considered as "the traitor Judas."² Mentioning the expulsion of the Monophysitic bishops in 453, the author only speaks of the Emperor's order³ without any accusation against Juvenal, while in his history of the death of Theodosius of Jerusalem⁴ he reports that Abbot Romanus was arrested "as the result of the persecution and plots of Juvenal the apostate."⁵ On the occasion of Peter's ordination as priest at Maiūma in 445, he mentions that even during Peter's stay at Jerusalem Juvenal had several times tried to ordain him, but had not been able to do so, "because God prevented it" by sending an angel to Peter who commanded him to flee.⁶

The *Church History* of Zacharias Rhetor or Scholasticus seldom indulges in fabulous tales; there are only two cases where, in connection with Juvenal, the author seems to have repeated legendary stories in good faith. At the beginning of the Council of Chalcedon, he says, Juvenal struggled by the side of Dioscorus for the faith. But he yielded when the government had recourse to constraint (ἀνάγκη), flattery, and bribery of which the Emperor personally made use on the occasion of a banquet given to the bishops. Juvenal, to whom the Emperor promised the three provinces of Palestine, abandoned Dioscorus, went over to the opposite party, and signed the

¹ *Petrus der Iberer, ein Charakterbild z. Kirchen-u. Sittengesch. d. 5. Jhdts.*, . . . von R. Raabe (Leipzig, 1895). E. Schwartz has identified the author as John Rufus (or of Bēth Rufinā) of Antioch, who wrote the *Plerophoriae*; cf. "Johannes Rufus, ein monophysitischer Schriftsteller," *Sitz.-Ber. Heidelberg. Akad.*, 1912, Abh. 16, p. 8 sqq.; for the name Ἰωάννης ὁ κατὰ Πουφίνον, see P. Maas, *Byz. Ztschr.* 22 (1913), p. 249. The chronological indications of Io. Phokylides, *Νέα Σιών*, 10 (1910), pp. 614-624; 11 (1911), pp. 81-92, quoted by F. Nau, PO, VIII, p. 203 [603], Index, s.v. Pierre l'Ibère, are nearly all wrong. It is surprising that neither A. Baumstark, *Gesch. d. syr. Liter.* (Bonn, 1922), p. 184, nor O. Bardenhewer, *Gesch. d. altkirchl. Lit.*, IV (Freiburg, 1924), pp. 315-316, mentioned the penetrating investigations of Schwartz.

² John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, p. 52.3 [53], ed. R. Raabe.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 57.12 [58].

⁴ *De commemoratione quomodo beatus Theodosius episc. Hierosolymorum ad Dominum nostrum migraverit*, ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. XXV (Paris, 1907), written also by John of Bēth Rufinā, as E. Schwartz has shown (*Sitz. Ber. Heidelberg. Akad.*, 1912, Abh. 16, p. 11).

⁵ *De commemoratione* . . . , loc. cit., p. 21.8 [15.9].

⁶ John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, p. 50.18 sq. [51].

council's definition with his bishops.⁷ We know, however, that even at the first session of the council he had complied with the Emperor's wishes. Therefore, the whole story of the banquet, which allegedly took place between Juvenal's previous struggle in behalf of Monophysitism and his subsequent compliance, is obviously an invention.

Another story told by Zacharias Rhetor is typical of the literary revenge taken by the Monophysites as a compensation for their inability to translate their feelings into action. After Juvenal's return (in 453) a monk called Salomon, pretending to ask for his benediction, poured a basketful of dust on the head of the archbishop, saying: "Be ashamed, liar and persecutor." Juvenal, tormented by remorse, did not even allow his attendants to punish the monk.⁸

The *Plerophoriae*, written by John of Bēth Rufinā between 512 and 518, show how quickly legend had penetrated Monophysitic historiography, if we can classify as history this collection of incoherent tales about visions, predictions, and prodigies written to show that "the impious Council of Chalcedon" was nothing but the vengeance taken by the Nestorians for their former condemnation at Ephesus. It is true that some of the events of the years 452–453 are related only with a slight alteration of the real facts;⁹ but usually Juvenal is shown as the miserable victim of his own perfidy and ungodliness. In 444 the monk Pelagius of Edessa is said to have prophesied the whole history of the "treason of Chalcedon."¹⁰ The author, walking once with one of the notables of Jerusalem from Shilōhā (Shiloah) through the vale (of Cedron) to the opposite heights, saw a great monastery that was completely abandoned. Upon questioning his companion, he learned that this had been the monastery where Juvenal had lived in peace before his episcopate; at the time of the Council of Chalcedon the building was suddenly deserted.¹¹ Abbot Peter (the Iberian) told the author most of the following stories. When Peter was still an ascetic in Jerusalem, Juvenal wished to ordain him priest, but Peter was warned by an angelic voice commanding him to flee.¹² During one of his visits at the time of Lent, when Juvenal used to inspect the monasteries near Jerusalem, he wanted to see a certain famous ascetic. But when he arrived at the cell with a crowd of

⁷ Zach. Rhet., HE, III, 3, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 156.13–23 [107.17–25].

⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 8, *loc. cit.*, p. 161.1–20 [110.17–111.4].

⁹ E.g., the ultimatum of the monks, the appointment of Theodosius, *Plerophoriae*, 25, 57, PO, VIII, pp. 61–62, 111–113.

¹⁰ John of Bēth Rufinā, *Plerophoriae*, 3, 4, PO, VIII, pp. 13–16.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 16, *loc. cit.*, p. 33.

¹² John of Bēth Rufinā, *Vita Petri Iberi*, p. 50.16–24 [51], ed. R. Raabe = *Plerophoriae*, 42, PO, VIII, p. 93. This passage confirms E. Schwartz's opinion that the two works are by the same hand; cf. P. Maas, *Byz. Ztschr.*, 22 (1913), p. 248.

clergymen and townsfolk, the old man shut the door crying: "Go far from me, Antichrist, I do not permit the Antichrist to enter my cell, the traitor Judas will not enter here." These words made a great impression on Juvenal's attendants as well as on the whole city. The archbishop tried in vain to calm their anxiety by asserting that the hermit was out of his mind.¹³ In another story, Peter reported on a vision the scene of which was the church of the Piscina Probatica (προβατική κολυμβήθρα). Christ appeared there to a young lector; he was in great anger at the negligent performance of the divine service, and cried: "Woe to Juvenal, he has made my house a den of thieves and filled it with debauchees, adulterers, and impure people!" In great anxiety the lector told his vision to everyone; but Juvenal, fearing that the circulation of this story would hurt his reputation, made him disappear.¹⁴ On another occasion, some time before the Council of Chalcedon, Peter, apparently foreseeing Juvenal's future apostasy, had refused to enter the church in his company or to receive the Eucharist from his hand, and, in revulsion of feeling over the transgressions of Juvenal and his followers, had, under divine inspiration, uttered words of reproof.¹⁵ Another venerable priest, Paul of the village of Ganthā, fifteen miles north of Jerusalem, was favored by the Empress Eudocia to whom that village belonged. When he left for the Council of Chalcedon, Juvenal, knowing that the Empress held this priest in great esteem, went to see him. He asked the priest to pray for him, "that he should not be covered with shame in his old age." After his departure the priest had a vision showing him Juvenal black as pitch, "like a man who stokes a furnace," and lamenting over his sins and disgrace. After the council he understood the meaning of his vision.¹⁶ A priest from Rome, Boniface, an ardent opponent of the council, had the following vision. A dead man was placed on a bed before the Holy Sepulcher. Suddenly rising from the bed, he gave Boniface a book; the book, splendidly adorned outwardly, was filled with dirt. "This showed that Nestorius, after his death, would relive in Juvenal, who would be the heir of his vain-glory."¹⁷ Juvenal's clergy were of course as infamous as he himself. An impudent deacon had intercourse with a woman after his day of service at the Holy Sepulcher and the Holy Martyrium. As usual he went to bed at the holy place of Golgotha, but a voice said: "O, with what filth has Juvenal filled my house! Turn this corrupted being out of doors!" The next morning the deacon was found in his bed on the place before the Martyrium and all

¹³ John of Bēth Rufinā, *Plerophoriae*, 17 ed. F. Nau, PO, VIII, pp. 33-34.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 18, pp. 35-37.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 18-19, pp. 37-39.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 20, pp. 39-43.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 40, p. 91.

the people laughed at him. Juvenal, covered with shame, forbade him to continue celebrating the holy service.¹⁸ According to the priest Aniā (Aeneas?) of Jerusalem, it was after the Council of Ephesus (431) that Juvenal was ready for treachery, but at this time he was still afraid of the venerable Cyril because of the latter's ardent zeal and frankness.¹⁹ The pious sister of the blessed priest and archdeacon Stephen, hesitating at the "time of apostasy" to pray with the oppressors and especially with Juvenal the apostate, was comforted by a vision of Saint Stephen.²⁰

The *Plerophoriae* were probably the source of the legendary biography of Dioscorus of Alexandria, written after 518, allegedly by his own Deacon Theopistus.²¹ In regard to Juvenal, the author, like Zacharias Rhetor, is chiefly concerned with the role he played as a member of the councils. Beginning with the time of the death of Theodosius II, the author says: "In the party of the orthodox they then counted the enemy of God, Juvenal of Jerusalem, who at that time helped Cyril to expel Nestorius, while here [at Chalcedon], in his madness, he attacked the church and orthodoxy and destroyed what he previously had built with Cyril."²² When Dioscorus arrived on the Bosphorus, the Emperor sent Juvenal to salute him.²³ When the one hundred bishops, who were gathered in Constantinople, learned that Juvenal was present also, they said: "This one is also a well-educated man who does not deviate from the orthodox faith of the Fathers."²⁴ Juvenal and Basil of Seleucia came to Dioscorus, but when Deacon Theopistus, admiring their brilliant sacerdotal clothes, said: "How beautiful these bishops are! They certainly will fight to the death for the orthodox faith," Dioscorus replied: "Believe me, my son, all those whom you see will not endure a single blow for the faith of the Messiah. I say unto you, my son, of all of them none will remain faithful to orthodoxy, except those who were in our boat" — namely, the Egyptian bishops.²⁵ The banquet mentioned by Zacharias Rhetor is replaced by a great reception given to the bishops of

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 41, p. 92.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 58, p. 114.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 79, pp. 135–136.

²¹ F. Nau, "Histoire de Dioscore, écrite par son disciple Théopiste," *Journal Asiatique*, X^e série, I, (1903), pp. 1–108, 241–310 (text, pp. 21–108, transl., pp. 241–308). On the date and slight historical value of this work, cf. E. Honigmann, *Byzantion*, XVI (1944), p. 68, n. 133, which must be corrected at one point. For in the vision I discuss, it is not Severus who speaks to Dioscorus, but Saint Ignatius, appearing as a child, who addresses Severus, and says: "Suffer for God as I do." But this does not invalidate my conclusion that Pseudo-Theopistus wrote after Severus's deposition, i.e., after 518 ("Histoire de Dioscore," 19, p. 101 in fine [305]).

²² "Histoire de Dioscore," I, p. 22.4–8 [242].

²³ *Ibid.*, 7, p. 43.12 [261.5].

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 7, p. 43 in fine — 44.1 [261].

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 7, p. 44.1–12 [261].

both parties by Marcian; "the Nestorians deceived the Emperor by impure machinations."²⁶ On his way to exile, Dioscorus dictated to Theopistus a letter addressed to Juvenal in which he exhorted him to beware of "the deluge of Nestorius" and "the letter of the impious Leo."²⁷ Theopistus himself brought the letter to Juvenal, who, having read it, wept bitterly, saying: "It is a vehement and burning grief to abandon my city and to go into exile." Theopistus replied: "Is not your soul more precious than the whole world? Will not God guide well your flock without you? Where are the words which Nabernugius [i.e., Peter the Iberian] addressed to you?"²⁸ At Gangra, the place of his exile, Dioscorus received a letter from Peter the Iberian, full of indignation about the impious Juvenal.²⁹ When a messenger arrived bringing the bad news about the council, Dioscorus asked him: "Has Juvenal signed?" The man answered: "Who is that? Is he that old man from the Holy City of Jerusalem?" And when he received an affirmative answer, the messenger added: "In truth, his white clothes will be thrown into outer darkness, for it was on his account that all were lost and evil was committed."³⁰

X. JUVENAL'S LEGENDARY ROLE IN THE CHALCEDONIAN LITERATURE

The new and severe persecutions at the time of Emperor Justin I probably made the Monophysites somewhat forget their former calamities. The actual danger, the fate of their leaders — Severus, Philoxenus, and others — became burning questions, and made them lose all interest in a historical personage who had died sixty years earlier.

On the other hand, the orthodox writers were certainly acquainted with the propaganda literature in which their opponents had maligned the memory of the founder of the "patriarchate" of Jerusalem. They were all the more inclined to consider him as an outstanding champion of orthodoxy, willingly forgetting his former conduct at the "Latrocinium," with which Pope Leo had reproached him long after the Council of Chalcedon.

Unfortunately the work of Theodorus Lector, the authoritative orthodox historian describing the events of the second half of the sixth century, is almost entirely lost. It is certain that Theophanes and Nicephorus Callistus used his ecclesiastical history to a great extent, but it is usually very difficult to recognize these excerpts in their works. In the extant fragments of his

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 7-8, pp. 44.13-50 ult. [262-267].

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 11, p. 58.1-pu. [274].

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 11, pp. 58 ult.-59.6 [274-275].

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 11, pp. 62.11-63 ult. [277-278].

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 13, p. 75.5-11 [285-286].

work, which are mostly very short, Juvenal is not mentioned; but there can be no doubt that Theodorus wrote fully concerning the events of at least the later part of his episcopate.¹

Cyril of Scythopolis, who wrote his biographies of the Palestinian saints after February 21, 554,² mentions Juvenal several times in his *Life of Euthymius* and once in that of Saint Sabas,³ but rather incidentally and without any personal prejudice for or against him. The sober objectivity of his work contrasts strikingly with the vehement partiality of Monophysitic authors like John of Bēth Rufinā.

Besides the *Life of Euthymius* by Cyril of Scythopolis, there exist two fragments of another "Euthymian history" (Εὐθυμιακὴ ἱστορία), which is otherwise entirely unknown. In one of these two fragments Juvenal plays an important role. The text in question is inserted as a quotation from Book III, chapter 40, of the Euthymian history into a homily of John of Damascus,⁴ where it is an obvious interpolation. The same story, though somewhat differently worded, is repeated by Nicephorus Callistus⁵ and also figures in certain other treatises.⁶

The literal quotation in the homily of John of Damascus begins as follows: "It has been told above how Pulcheria of holy memory built in Constantinople many churches for Christ. One of these churches is that which was constructed in the Blachernae at the beginning of the reign of Marcian of divine memory. Having built there a church of Saint Mary and splendidly adorned it, these sovereigns inquired about the holy body of Her who had conceived God. They sent for Juvenal, archbishop of Jerusalem, and the bishops from Palestine who were then staying in the imperial city because of the Council of Chalcedon, which took place at that time, and they said to them: 'We are told that there is at Jerusalem the first and venerable church of the Holy Virgin Mary at the place called Gethsemane, where Her Life-bringing body was buried in a coffin (σορός). Now we want

¹ For the various collections of his fragments and their editions, cf. H. G. Opitz, RE, V, A (1934), col. 1869–1881, s.v. Theodorus, 48 (Anagnostes).

² Cyril of Scythop., *Vita Euthymii*, 60, p. 83.21, 28 sq.; cf. E. Schwartz, *Kyr. v. Skyth.*, pp. 413–414.

³ Cf. E. Schwartz's edition, Index, p. 267, s.v. Ἰουβενάλιος. At Juvenal's time the feast of S. Mary was first celebrated in Jerusalem; cf. D. B. Capelle, "La fête de la vierge à Jerusalem au V^e siècle," *Le Muséon*, t. LVI (1943), p. 21–22, 32–33.

⁴ Ioannes Damasc., *Homilia* 9, 18 (in dormitionem Deiparae), PG, 96, col. 748 A–752 A.

⁵ Niceph. Callist., HE, XV, 14, PG, 147, col. 44 C–45 C.

⁶ In Symeon Metaphrastes, *Oratio de S. Maria*, 43, PG, 115, col. 560 A–C (Latin translation), in Greek: *Cod. Paris. graec.*, 1548 (s. XIII), fol. 129v–130r; an interpolation at the end of the *Liber de dormitione Mariae*, e.g. in *Cod. Paris. graec.*, 1215 (saec. XI), fol. 127v, and *Cod. Paris. graec.*, 947 (1523 A.D.), fol. 174r. Cf. M. Bonnet, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 23 (1888), pp. 231–232, 235, n. 3, 236, n. 2. See also *Menologiū anonymi byzantini saec. X quae supersunt*, ed. Latyšev, II (St. Petersburg, 1912), pp. 281.30 sq., 376.4 sq.

to bring this relic here as a "palladium" (*φυλακτήριον*) for this imperial city.' In his reply Juvenal affirms that in the Holy Scripture there is no mention of the death of the blessed Mary, but "from an old and quite true tradition" we learn that at the moment of her death all the holy apostles, who were engaged in converting the nations of the world, immediately gathered in Jerusalem, having been carried through the air. He then describes in detail the angelic vision which appeared to them while the body of the Holy Virgin was being buried at Gethsemane. But after three days, when they opened the Sepulcher at the request of one of the apostles (Thomas), who arrived late, they found it empty. They explained this mystery by the assumption that the Lord had honored her incorruptible body by taking it away to (heaven). Timothy, one of the apostles and first bishop of Ephesus, and Dionysius the Areopagite were present, as Dionysius himself confirms in his letter to Timothy about the blessed Hierotheus, who then was with them also. In this connection Juvenal quotes verbatim a long passage from Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite⁷ about this famous scene, describing how the bishops (i.e., apostles) and many brethren came together "to behold the body which gave the principle of life";⁸ the "God-brother"⁹ James, and Peter, the head of the apostles, were also present. After listening to his long speech and lengthy quotation, the Emperors asked the Archbishop Juvenal to send them, safely sealed, the holy coffin with the clothes of the blessed Virgin in it. When they received these relics they deposited them in the temple of the Virgin in Blachernae.

We cannot enter here into an exhaustive discussion of these texts, which have already called forth an immense literature. As to the much disputed writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, I shall only state that, in my opinion, their author possibly was Peter the Iberian, an assumption which I shall try to substantiate in another article. In any case it seems obvious that these writings were composed during the second half of the fifth century. After their sudden appearance at the beginning of the sixth century, they became almost immediately known to the whole Monophysitic and orthodox reading public of the Byzantine Empire. Some doubts about their authenticity were still expressed in 532 by the orthodox Archbishop Hypatius of Ephesus, but these soon gave way to a general admiration, and both the orthodox and the Monophysites tried to explain them as authentic writings of the early Christian period, which were in conformity with their own doctrinal views.

⁷ Ps.-Dionysius Areopagita, *De divinis nominibus*, 3, 2, PG, 3, col. 681 CD; 684 A.

⁸ ἐπὶ τὴν θεάν τοῦ ζωαρχικοῦ σώματος.

⁹ ἀδελφόθεος, one of the strange words introduced into Greek by Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite.

The so-called "Euthymian history," with Juvenal's quotation of the famous passage of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite concerning the death of the Holy Virgin, can hardly have been published before the middle of the sixth century. Some scholars are inclined to ascribe this work to Cyril of Scythopolis on account of its title, suggesting that there may have existed another edition of his biographies, which, after the first and most important of them, was entitled *Εὐθυμιακὴ ἱστορία*.¹⁰ But it is improbable that Cyril, a very sober writer, who, in his extant works seldom speaks of visions and never mentions the writings ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, could have been the author of this passage, written in a pompous style, quite different from that of the Scythopolitan. On the other hand, M. Jugie has tried to show¹¹ that the "Euthymian history" was composed during the ninth century. The homily of John of Damascus cannot be used for dating it, since the quotation is obviously interpolated and the date of this interpolation is uncertain. Jugie found the same story in *Cod. Paris. graec. 1470*, written in 890; on fol. 198r and 199r the copyist of this manuscript added the following remarks: "Of what history is he speaking?"¹² and "Who is the missing apostle?"¹³ Jugie concluded from these words that at this time — that is, about 890 — the "Euthymian history" was not yet very old, and that the passage about the death of the Holy Virgin had been introduced shortly before into the text of John of Damascus.

In my opinion this inference is not cogent. Even if we admit that Jugie is right as to the time at which the interpolation was inserted into John's homily, this does not furnish any proof concerning the date of the "Euthymian history" itself, for it is quite possible that a story, buried in the fortieth chapter of the third book of a historical work, remained for a long time unnoticed by the writers of homilies and theological treatises on the same subject. I agree with Jugie (p. 390) in holding that the report upon Juvenal cannot be historical, and that this apocryphal story was probably not published before the end of the sixth century. But Jugie's comparison of the sensation caused by the invention of Saint Stephen's relics in 415 with the feeble impression left by that of the coffin of Saint Mary somewhat misses the point, for the story of Juvenal, devised to explain why there are no relics of the Virgin's body, cannot be compared with a real invention of

¹⁰ P. Lambecius, *Commentar. de Bibl. Caesar. Vindobon.*, VIII, pp. 172 sq., 306 (ed. Kollar, pp. 363 sq., 653). M. Bonnet, "Schriften von der Himmelfahrt Mariae," *Ztschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.*, 23 (Leipzig, 1880), p. 235, who suggests that the story of Juvenal appeared there as the report of one of the Fathers or on the occasion of the invention of a relic.

¹¹ M. Jugie, "Le Récit de l'Histoire euthymiaque sur la mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge," *Echos d'Orient*, 25 (1926), pp. 385-392.

¹² Ποίαν ἱστορίαν φησίν;

¹³ Ποῖος ὁ ἀπολειφθεὶς ἀπόστολος;

famous relics. Even such real inventions were sometimes forgotten shortly after, as for instance that of the head of Saint John Baptist, discovered first by Emperor Theodosius I in 391¹⁴ and again in 453.¹⁵ Besides, it is certainly quite arbitrary to assume (Jugie, p. 391) that Theodorus Lector did not know the Juvenal story, for of his whole work we have only a small number of fragments.¹⁶ Moreover, one of these fragments merely mentions that the churches in Blachernae, in the Chalcopratia, and those of the Hodegoi and of the Martyr Laurentius were built by order of Pulcheria.¹⁷ It is true that another modern scholar has doubted the exactness of this statement by Theodorus Lector, because Procopius,¹⁸ speaking of the construction of the church of Blachernae by Justinian, does not mention the earlier church at this place.¹⁹ But I cannot agree with an attempt to reject a fact related by one author for the reason that it is not confirmed by another who wrote about thirty years later. Though the story about Juvenal can hardly have figured in the work of Theodorus Lector, it seems rather likely that the fragment of the "Euthymian history" is based upon historical facts reported by him. The other short fragment of this work is quoted, without any indication of book or chapter, in Nicon's *Pandectes*,²⁰ written toward the end of the eleventh century.²¹ It concerns the origin of the strained relations between the eunuch Chrysaphius and Flavian of Constantinople before the "Latrocinium," and it shows a decided tendency to exculpate Theodosius II and Pulcheria on this occasion.²²

The contents of these two fragments hardly enable us to establish the time of the composition of the "Historia Euthymiaca" in a more precise way. We can only assert that it was certainly written between 518 and 890, and probably in Constantinople. The interest of the author in a glorification of Juvenal²³ seems rather to point to the earlier part of this period, namely, the time before Palestine was conquered by the Arabs.

¹⁴ Sozomenus, HE, VII, 21, PG, 67, col. 1481 B sq.

¹⁵ Cf. above, p. 235, n. 18.

¹⁶ There are even fewer than are usually quoted, since the fragments 38-59 of Book II (PG, 86, 1, col. 205 A-212 B) are in fact excerpts from the work of John Diacrinomenus.

¹⁷ Theodorus Lector, HE, frg., I, 5, PG, 86, 1, col. 168 C.

¹⁸ Procopius, *De aedificiis*, I, 3, 3; *Works*, vol. VII, ed. H. B. Dewing and G. Downey (Loeb Classical Library), p. 38.

¹⁹ E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults* (Tübingen, 1904), p. 473, n. 10.

²⁰ Nicon, *Pandectes*, chapter 35. The fragment was published by P. Lambecius, *Comment. de Bibl. Caesar. Vindob.*, V, cod. 251, and by M. Le Quien in his edition of John of Damascus (reprinted in PG, 96, col. 747-748, n. 58). Nicephorus Callistus (HE, XIV, 47, PG, 146, col. 1221 D) repeats it without quoting the "Historia Euthymiaca."

²¹ Cf. V. Grumel, *Échos d'Orient*, 32 (1933), p. 289.

²² Cf. the words τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀκάκῳ ὄντι and Πουλχερίας ταῦτα μὴ εἰδύσας.

²³ More objective orthodox writers merely remark that Juvenal and others were present at Chalcedon, though they had attended and approved the second council of Ephesus. Cf. Leontius, *De sectis*, actio VI, 5, PG, 86, 1, col. 1237 C; Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia dogmatica*, tit. XVI, PG, 130, col. 1084 D.

APPENDIX I

THE CREATION OF THE PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM

In modern works Juvenal is often called the first “patriarch” of Jerusalem. How far is this expression justified?

At the time of the Second Ecumenical Council (381), the five great territories into which the Eastern Empire was divided according to civil administration, namely, the dioceses of Egypt, Oriens, Asia (Proconsularis), Pontus, and Thracia, were at the same time the chief ecclesiastical units, each of which comprised several provinces.¹ Theodoret says² that, in conformity with the Fathers of Nicaea, those of Constantinople “distinguished [by the second canon] the dioceses.” Socrates, however, says³ that the members of the Council “set up patriarchs”; by this expression he means the bishops to whom the Emperor had given extraordinary authority to watch over the general maintenance of orthodoxy.⁴ Elsewhere he calls Nestorius of Constantinople Patriarch.⁵

We can disregard here the use of the term in the Western Empire, where, in the fifth and sixth centuries, Chelidonius of Vesontio (died *c.* 451), Nicetius of Lugdunum (died 573), and others are called patriarchs.⁶ Cyril calls the Pope ἀρχιεπίσκοπον πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης πατέρα τε καὶ πατριάρχην Κελεστῖνον τὸν τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως Ῥώμης.⁷ Theodosius II applied the term as a title of honor to Pope Leo.⁸ The letter sent to Pope Leo on December 18, 451, by Valentinian and Marcian is addressed in the Latin original: “Sancto patri merito venerabili Leoni episcopo,”⁹ while the Greek translation runs: τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ ἀληθῶς σεπτῷ πατριάρχῃ ἐπισκόπῳ Λέοντι.¹⁰

¹ Concil. CP. (381), Canon II.

² Theodoret, *Epist. 86 ad Flavianum*, PG, 83, col. 1280 C. τὰς διοικήσεις διέκριναν.

³ Socrates, HE, V, 8, PG, 67, col. 577 C: καὶ πατριάρχας κατέστησαν.

⁴ Socrates, *ibid.*, col. 580 A: τῆς δὲ Ποντικῆς διοικήσεως Ἑλλάδιος . . ., Γρηγόριος . . ., καὶ Ὅτρηϊος . . . τὴν πατριαρχίαν ἐκλήρωσατο.

⁵ Socrates, HE, VII, 31, PG, 67, col. 808 A.

⁶ *Vita S. Romani abbatis Iurensis in Burgundia*, AASS, 28 Febr., III, p. 742; Gregor. Tur., *Hist. Franc.*, V, 21, PL, 71, col. 341 A, cum n.b.

⁷ Cyrillus, *Homil.*, 11, PG, 77, col. 1040 B.

⁸ Theodos. II, *Epist. ad Valentinian.* III and *Epist. ad Gallam Placid.* (inter Leonis epist., 62, 63) = *Epistular. Coll.* M, Ep. 5, 6, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars I, pp. 7.8, 27–28. (εὐλαβέστατος πατριάρχης); Latin: *Epistular. ante gesta coll.*, 22, 23, ACO, t. II, vol. III, pars I, pp. 15.32, 16.16 (reverentissimus patriarcha). Cf. E. Caspar, *Geschichte d. Papsttums* I (Tübingen, 1930), p. 499, n. 5; T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), p. 287, n. 124, 125.

⁹ *Epist. 114 ex collect. q. d. ecclesiae Thessalonicensis*, ACO, t. II, vol. IV, p. 167.2 (inter Leon. ep. 100).

¹⁰ *Collectio epistularum B*, epist. 16, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 55.4 [251.4]. Cf. also *Conc. Chalc. act.* II, 47, 51, 64; VI, 9, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 15.21 [211.21], 17.11 [213.11], 23.7 [219.7], 141.18, 25 [337.18, 25].

But the head of each diocese was not yet officially called "patriarch"; his title even as late as the middle of the fifth century being "exarch" (ἑξαρχος, Latin *primas*).¹¹ While at the time of the council of Serdica (342 or 343) ἑξαρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας was still identical with ἐπίσκοπος τῆς μητροπόλεως¹² (of a province), "exarch" corresponded later exactly to the dignity which the second canon of Constantinople (381) calls τοὺς ὑπὲρ διοικήσιν ἐπισκόπους. Thus it included the "patriarchs" of a later period; for example, in 444 Domnus I of Antioch is called ἑξαρχος τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως.¹³ Yet even at Chalcedon the new usage occurs: in the third session the magistrates and senators suggest that "patriarchs of each diocese" should discuss the dogmatic questions together with one or two bishops of every diocese before the synod.¹⁴

It is true that even long before the Council of Chalcedon the term "patriarch" (apart from Biblical quotations) occasionally occurred. It was, however, not yet the clearly determined title of an ecclesiastical dignity, but an expression used in very different ways. The highest hierarchical degree of the Montanists was that of patriarch.¹⁵ A deacon, Glycerius of Venesa, ordained by Saint Basil, usurped "the name and apparel of a patriarch."¹⁶ Saint Gregory of Nazianzus speaks of "the elder bishops, or more exactly, the patriarchs."¹⁷

In the last session of the Council of Chalcedon the privileges of the see of Constantinople were definitively established by a decree.¹⁸ It was decided that the throne of Constantinople should have the right of consecrating the metropolitans of the Thracian, Asianic, and Pontic dioceses. By this decree, which sanctioned a practice already often exercised, a new ecclesiastical dignity was created which ranked above three of the exarchs, previously the highest dignitaries of the Eastern Church. The new dignity re-

¹¹ *Conc. Chalc.* can. 9, 17, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, pp. 160.12 [356.12], 161.22 [357.22].

¹² *Conc. Serdicens.* can. 6 (only in the wording of the Greek version).

¹³ *Conc. Chalc. act.* XV, 135, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 79.32-33 [438.32-33]. Ibas of Edessa also calls the archbishop of Antioch ὁ ἑξαρχός μου (*Gesta Beryti* [Feb. 449?], *Conc. Chalc. act.* XI, 120, 122, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, p. 30.34, 37 [389.34, 37]; Latin version, t. II, vol. III, pars III, p. 38. 3, 7 [477.3, 7]: "primatem meum, cum meo principe").

¹⁴ *Conc. Chalc. act.* III, 6, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars II, p. 78.26 [274.26]: οἱ δοσιώτατοι πατριάρχαι διοικήσεως ἐκάστης.

¹⁵ S. Hieronym., *Epist.* 41, 3, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL, 54, p. 313.17; H. Grégoire, "Hiérarchie de la secte montaniste," *Byzantion*, II (1925), p. 333; "Un Patriarche phrygien?", *ibid.*, VIII (1933), pp. 69-76.

¹⁶ S. Basil., *Epist.* 169, PG, 32, col. 641 D = vol. II, p. 438, ed. R. J. Deferrari.

¹⁷ S. Gregor. Nazianz., *Orat.* 42, 23, PG, 36, col. 485 B: πρεσβυτέρων ἐπισκόπων, οἰκειότερον δὲ πατριαρχῶν εἰπεῖν.

¹⁸ The wrongly so-called twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon (cf. above, p. 247), *Conc. Chalc. act.* XVII, 8, ACO, t. II, vol. I, pars III, pp. 88.28 [447.28]-89.17 [448.17].

quired a new title which was not bound to the administration of a single diocese. But in the Greek Church the importance of a see was determined less by the extension and composition of the territory subject to it than by the question whether the occupant of this see was independent or not. Apparently the term "patriarch," after 451, meant no more than an exarch who was independent (autocephalous) and not subject to a higher authority, as were those of the dioceses of Thracica, Asiana, and Pontica. The distinctive mark of this independence was the right of consecrating the metropolitans of the diocese in question. I infer this from the following facts.

In 475, when by his Encyclical the usurper Basiliscus tried to abolish the "innovations" of the Council of Chalcedon, the reinstated Monophysitic archbishop of Alexandria, Timothy Aelurus, went to Ephesus, where a great synod met. On this occasion Timothy yielded to Archbishop Paul of Ephesus the privilege of consecrating the metropolitans belonging to the Asianic Diocese.¹⁹ According to Evagrius, who quotes Zacharias Rhetor, a contemporary of the events, "he also restored the patriarchal right to the city of the Ephesians which the Chalcedonian synod had taken away."²⁰ But two years later, when Emperor Zeno ruled again, Paul of Ephesus was deposed. The bishops of the province of Asia then (477) sent a letter to Acacius of Constantinople which began as follows: Ἀκακίῳ τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ ὀσιωτάτῳ πατριάρχῃ τῆς κατὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν Κωνσταντινούπολιν νέαν Ῥώμην ἀγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας.²¹ These are the first known attestations of the official use of the title in the sense of "independent exarch."

It is more difficult to ascertain the exact date on which the archbishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were first officially called "patriarchs." There was some doubt as to whether this title could be applied to the archbishop of Thessalonica, who indeed occupied a position similar to that of the Eastern patriarchs. In 515, forty orthodox bishops of Illyricum and

¹⁹ Cf. E. Schwartz, "Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacian. Schisma," *Abh. Bayer. Akad., phil.-hist. Abt.*, N.F. Heft 10 (1934), p. 186.

²⁰ Evagrius, HE, III, 6, p. 106.12-14, ed. Bidez-Parmentier: Ἀποδίδωσι δὲ τῇ Ἐφεσίων καὶ τὸ πατριαρχικὸν δίκαιον, ὅπερ αὐτὴν ἀφείλεν ἢ ἐν Καλχηδόνι σύνοδος. Cf. Zacharias Rhetor, HE, V, 4, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 216.20-23 [150.6-8: "et iura sedis eius quae concilium Chalcedonis ei eripuit, et throno urbis regiae adsentatione dedit ei canonicè restituit"]. E. Schwartz (*Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss.*, XXXII, 6 [1927], p. 134) quite improperly says: "Timotheos . . . gab . . . dem dortigen Bischof . . . die von Konstantinopel unabhängige metropolitane Oberhoheit über die Provinz Asien"; it was the patriarchal jurisdiction over the Asianic Diocese which comprised eleven provinces, one of which was Asia.

²¹ Zach. Rhet. ap. Evagr., HE, III, 9, p. 108.23-25. The abridged Syriac translation of Zachary's church history mentions these λίβελλοι, but does not quote their text (CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. V, p. 219.20 [152.9]). If the metropolitan of Tyre was acclaimed "patriarch Epiphanius" (Coll. Sabbait. 5, 32, ACO, t. III, p. 85.18, 86.1), in 518 (not 536, as scholars often affirm), this probably means that, as brother of Flavian of Antioch (Zach. Schol., *Vita Severi*, PO, II, p. 114), he was expected to replace Severus of Antioch.

Hellas separated from the archbishop of Thessalonica because he had communicated with Timothy of Constantinople.²² On this occasion Theophanes calls the archbishop of Thessalonica very improperly “their own metropolitan,”²³ adding: “The historian Theodorus thoughtlessly calls the bishop of Thessalonica ‘patriarch,’ not knowing himself why he does so.”²⁴ It seems, however, that the orthodox author Theodorus Lector had not actually called the bishop of Thessalonica patriarch, but had on the contrary reproved his own source, probably John Diacrinomenus, for doing so.²⁵

The year 546 can be considered as an incontestable terminus before which the title “patriarch” had officially replaced “exarch,” apart from the three exarchs dependent on the see of Constantinople. In this year the 123rd novel of Justinian was promulgated, in which the word *ἐξαρχος* of the ninth and seventeenth Chalcedonian canons is always replaced by *πατριάρχης* (*τῆς διοικήσεως*).²⁶ As early as his letter to the monks of Alexandria (usually quoted *Contra Monophysitas*), written in 542–543, Justinian calls the Pope (Julius) “patriarch,” and Zoilus of Alexandria “archbishop and patriarch.”²⁷ In 535 the bishop of Constantinople is officially called “archbishop and patriarch” or only “patriarch.”²⁸

It is obvious that historians like Cyril of Scythopolis, writing during the reign of Justinian, use the term “patriarch,” familiar to them, even in speaking of past time.²⁹ According to the usage of the sixth century, it was quite correct to call Juvenal a “patriarch,” for the territory subject to his jurisdic-

²² According to E. Schwartz (*Publ. Samm. z. acac. Schisma*, p. 253, n. 1), this report is “exaggerated and inexact,” but he does not document this assertion.

²³ Theophan., *Chron.*, p. 162.22, ed. de Boor.

²⁴ Theodorus Lector, PG, 86, 1, col. 217 C = Theophan., p. 162.24–25: τὸν δὲ Θεσσαλονίκης ἐπίσκοπον Θεόδωρον ὁ ἱστορικὸς πατριάρχην ὀνομάζει ἀλόγως, μὴ εἰδὼς τὸ διατί.

²⁵ Cf. the frgm. of Theod. Lect., ed. by E. Miller, *Rev. arch.*, N.S. 26 (Paris, 1873), p. 399: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι πατριάρχην ὀνομάζει τὸν Θεσσαλονίκης ἐπίσκοπον ὁ ἱστορῶν, οὐκ οἶδα διατί. See Miller’s observation (*ibid.*, p. 280) that the addition “I do not know why” has meaning only if applied to Theodorus speaking of his source.

²⁶ Justinian, Nov. 123, 22 (of May, 546), ed. R. Schoell and W. Kroll (5th ed., Berlin, 1928), pp. 611.16, 25–26, 31; 612.2.

²⁷ Justinian, *Ad monachos Alexandr.*, 86, 169, ed. E. Schwartz, “Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians,” *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, N.F. Heft 18 (1939), pp. 21.11, 36.31–32.

²⁸ Justinian, Nov. 3, 2, p. 22.15, 39, 42, ed. Schoell and Kroll; Nov. 7, praef. 1, p. 49.24, 51.32. Cf. Coll. Sabbait. 5, 119, ACO, t. III, p. 176.31. On the use of the title in other documents of the sixth century, which is beyond the limits of this article, see the careful study of H. Gelzer, “Der Streit über den Titel des ökumenischen Patriarchen,” *Jahrbücher f. protestant. Theol.*, 13 (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 549–584; P. Collinet, *Histoire de l’Ecole de Droit de Beyrouth* (1925), pp. 167–172, on *οἰκουμενικός*; H. Grégoire, *Byzantion*, VII (1933), p. 570 sq.; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, p. 16, 747 sq.; E. Stein, *Catholic Histor. Review*, 21 (1935–6), p. 135; the same, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II (1949), p. 37, n. 3.

²⁹ Even Cyril of Scythopolis is still rather inconsistent in the use of this and other titles with regard to Juvenal (cf. above, p. 218, n. 51) and his successors.

tion, though only a part of the Dioecesis Orientis, was composed of three provinces, and Juvenal had certainly acquired the right of consecrating the metropolitans of their capitals.³⁰ But since, as we have seen, the new term became official only between 451 and about 475, it is quite possible that Juvenal was never officially called "patriarch" during his lifetime.³¹

APPENDIX II

INSCRIPTION OF THECLA, ABBESS OF THE MONASTERY
OF JUVENAL (EIGHTH CENTURY)

The inscription was found above the entrance of one of the tombs hewn in the rock in the Valley of Hinnom, now Wādī er-Rabābeh, south of Jerusalem.

Θήκη δι|αφέρ(ουσα) | Θέκλα | Θεσα(λονικίσση?) | ἡγουμ(ένη) | μονα-
στηρ(ίου) | Ἰουβενα(λίου) | τοῦ Γε(ω)ρ | γίου +

4 completed by Abel; others read Σεβα(στη) or σεσα . . .

6-8 Formerly read μοναστηρ|ίου Βενά|του, which was supposed to be the Arabic *benāt* "Daughters" (de Saulcy) or *βεγάτου* = Latin *beati* (Germer-Durand)! The reading Ἰουβενα(λίου) was restored by Kaufmann.

8-9 According to Thomsen's suggestion, τοῦ Γε(ω)ργίου means either "of the Georgian (Iberian)," or "of St. George," both of which seem impossible. A "monastery of Juvenal," that is, the convent in which he was monk or abbot before his episcopate, is mentioned in the *Plerophoriae* of John of Bēth Rufinā (cf. above, p. 263, n. 11). But it was probably different from that "of Juvenal, son of (?) Georgius."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

E. D. Clarke, *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa* (London, 1810), II, 4, p. 345. J. M. A. Scholz, *Reise in die Gegend Zwischen Alexandrien und Parä-tonium, die libysche Wüste, Siwa, Egypten, Palästina und Syrien in den J. 1820 und 1821* (Leipzig and Sorau, 1822), p. 180. J. Berggren, *Resor i Europa och Østerlaenderne*, II (Stockholm, 1828), p. 532. W. Krafft, *Die Topographie Jerusalems* (Bonn, 1846), p. 197 and Pt. I, no. 2. J. Kennedy-Bailie, *Fasciculus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, III (London, 1849), p. 136, no. cccxlii d. F. de Saulcy, *Voyage autour de la Mer Morte*, II (Paris, 1853), p. 322. T. Tobler, *Zwei Bücher Topographie von Jerusalem und seinen Umgebungen*, II (Berlin, 1854), p. 238 sq., no. 5. A. Böckh, E. Curtius, and A. Kirchhoff, *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, IV (1856-1859), no. 9139. M. de

³⁰ J. Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine de 527 à 847* (3rd ed., Paris, 1923), p. 52, says that even at the end of the sixth century a hagiographer scorned Jerusalem so much that he spoke of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, but did not mention Jerusalem (Eustratius presb., *Vita Eutychii patr.* CP, 29, 30, PG, 86, 2 col. 2308 C-2309 C). In fact this author mentions the four patriarchs who came at the same time — viz. in 553 — to Constantinople!

³¹ About 500 the Monophysite John of Bēth Rufinā calls Juvenal's rival Theodosius "patriarch" (above, p. 250, n. 14).

Vogüé, *Le Temple de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1864–5), append., p. 134 and pl. xxxvii, 5. Ph. Le Bas and W. H. Waddington, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*, III (Paris, 1870), *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, no. 1902. Ch. Warren and C. R. Conder, *The Survey of Western Palestine; Jerusalem* (Palestine Exploration Fund [=PEF] 1884, new ed., 1889), p. 418 (cf. 425, no. 14). A. S. Murray, PEF, *Quarterly Statements* [=QS], 22 (1890), p. 70. J. Germer-Durand, *Revue biblique*, I (1892), p. 564, no. 6. R. A. S. Macalister, PEF, QS, 32 (1900), pp. 237–241, no. 15; *A Century of Excavation in Palestine* (London, 1925), p. 254. C. M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch der altchristl. Epigraphik* (Freiburg, 1917), p. 290, fig. 188. P. Thomsen, *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* [=ZDPV], 44 (1921), pp. 58–59, no. 116; 64 (1941), p. 218–219. A. Alt, ZDPV, 47 (1924), pp. 94–95, no. 4. F. M. Abel, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, VII, 2 (1927), col. 2363. H. Leclercq, *ibid.*, XIII (1937), col. 835. J. J. E. Hondius, *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, VIII (Leiden, 1937), pp. 29–30, no. 199.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF JUVENAL'S TIME

EMPERORS

Theodosius II	408	— 450, July 28
Marcian	450, Aug. 24	— 457, Jan. 27
Leo I	457, Febr. 7	— 474

POPES

Coelestinus I	422, Sept. 10 (?)	— 432, July 26 (?)
Sixtus (Xystus) III	432, July 31	— 440, Aug. 18
Leo I	440, Aug.	— 461, Nov. 10

ARCHBISHOPS OF CONSTANTINOPLE

Atticus	406, March	— 425, Oct. 10
Sisinnius I	426, Feb. 28	— 427, Dec. 24
Nestorius	428, Apr. 10	— 431, June 22
Maximianus	431, Oct. 25	— 434, Apr. 12
Proclus	434	— 447
Flavian	447	— 449, Aug. 8
Anatolius	450, Apr. (?), 449, Nov. (?)	— 458, Aug. 3

ARCHBISHOPS OF ALEXANDRIA

Cyril	412, Oct. 18	— 444, June 27
Dioscorus	444	— 451, Oct. 13
Proterius	452, Nov.	— 457, March 28 (?)
Timothy Aelurus	457, March 8 (?)	— 460, 475–477, Aug. 31

ARCHBISHOPS OF ANTIOCH

Theodotus	420 or 421	— 429
Ioannes I	429	— 441 or 442
Domnus II	442	— 449, Aug. 22
Maximus I	450	— 455
Basilius I	456	— 458

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ANCIENT SOURCES

ABBREVIATIONS

AASS	Acta Sanctorum
ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, ed. Eduardus Schwartz
Coll., Collect.	Collectio
CP	Constantinople
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
EO	Échos d'Orient
HE	Historia ecclesiastica
JK	Ph. Jaffé, <i>Regesta pontificum Romanorum</i> , 2nd ed. by . . . F. Kaltenbrunner.
<i>Mém.</i>	see Tillemont
N.F.	Neue Folge
PG	J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca</i>

- PL J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina*
 PO R. Graffin and F. Nau, *Patrologia Orientalis*
 RE A. F. v. Pauly, *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*,
 new edition by G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Witte, and K. Mittelhaus
 Tillemont, *Mém.* *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*,
 par Le Nain de Tillemont
 TU *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*,
 hrsg. v. O. v. Gebhardt und A. v. Harnack

NOTE: A period separates the line number from the page number. Numbers in square brackets refer to the translation of the Syriac text; but in ACO and PO they indicate the double pagination used in these works.

SOURCES

- ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VIII = *Indices* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1930), Index III, pp. 19–20, and Index V, p. 35, *s.v.* Ἰουβενάλιος (Council of Ephesus in 431).
 Mariano Card. Rampolla del Tindaro, *S. Melania giuniore, senatrice romana . . .* (Rome, 1905), pp. 39–40, 83.1–2, 85.5. Cf. A. d'Alès, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 25 (1906), p. 401 sqq.
 Cyril of Alexandria, *Letters*, PG, 77; ed. E. Schwartz: Epist. 16 = *Coll. Vatic.*, 15, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars I, pp. 96.27–98.3; Epist. 32 = *Coll. Athen.*, 90, ACO, t. I, vol. I, pars VII, p. 137.11–33; Epist. 56 = *Codex Vatic. gr.*, 1431, 38, *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., philos.-philol. u. hist. Kl.*, 32, 6 (1927), p. 17.11–24.
 Socrates, HE, VII, 34, 2, PG, 67, col. 813 C, 816 A.
 Johannes Flemming, “Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449, syrisch mit Georg Hoffmanns deutscher Übersetzung u. s. Anm. hrsg.,” *Abh. kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl.*, N.F. Bd. 15 (Berlin, 1917), pp. 1–188. The Index p. 184, *s.v.* Iubenalios is not quite complete.
 Ed. Schwartz, “Prosopographia et topographia actorum Chalcedonensium et Encycloporum, Indices,” (Berlin-Leipzig, 1938), ACO, t. II, vol. VI, p. 33, *s.v.* Ἰουβενάλιος; cf. also p. 28, *s.v.* Θεοδοσίος (2); p. 72, *s.v.* Ἀθανάσιος (2) διάκονος τῆς ἁγίας Ἀναστάσεως; p. 82, *s.v.* Αἰλία; p. 91, *s.v.* Ἱεροσολύμων; p. 109, *s.v.* Παλαιστίνη $\bar{\alpha}$, $\bar{\beta}$, $\bar{\gamma}$, (councils of 449 and 451 and events until 458).
 Leonis papae Epistolae, PL, 54, mostly ed. by Schwartz, ACO, t. II, vol. IV (1932). Cf. also Trevor Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), Index, p. 536, *s.v.* Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem [there was no Juvenal of Heraclea; p. 336, n. 65 read Quintilius (Κύντιλλος) of Heraclea].
 Zacharias Rhetor (Scholasticus), HE, ed. E. W. Brooks, II, 2, 3, 4; III, 1, 3, 5, 8; IV, 12, CSCO, *Scriptores Syri*, series III, t. V.
 [John of Bêth Rufinâ], *Petrus der Iberer . . .*, hrsg. u. übers. v. Richard Raabe (Leipzig, 1895).
 [John of Bêth Rufinâ], “De commemoratione quomodo beatus Theodosius episcopus Hierosolymorum ad Dominum nostrum migraverit,” ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO, *Scr. Syri*, ser. III, t. XXV (1907), pp. 19–27 [13–19]; “Iuvenalis apostata” mentioned p. 21.8 [15.9].
 John Rufus (or: of Bêth Rufinâ), “Plerophoriae,” ed. F. Nau, PO, VIII, 1 (Paris, 1912). Cf. *Indices*, p. 186 and 201.

Cyril of Scythopolis, ed. Eduard Schwartz, TU, 49, 2 (Leipzig, 1939), Index, p. 267, s.v. Ἰουβενάλιος; cf. also p. 265, s.v. Θεοδόσιος (5), p. 258, s.v. Ἀναστάσιος (4), pp. 284–285, s.v. Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Evagrius, HE, I, 10, II, 4, 5, 18, III, 5, 6, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier (London, 1898).

Theophanes, *Chronographia*, rec. C. de Boor, vol. I (Leipzig, 1883); cf. vol. II (1885), Indices, p. 624, s.v. Ἰουβενάλιος.

Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, HE, II, 23, XIV, 30, XV, 4, 8, 9, 14, 28, PG, 145–147.

Juvenal mentioned in the *Εὐθυμιακὴ ἱστορία*: John of Damascus, *Homilia*, 9, 18, PG, 96, col. 748 A – 752 A (cf. Niceph. Callist., HE, XV, 14, PG, 147, col. 44 C–45 C).

Authors by whom Juvenal is only occasionally mentioned (e.g. Zonaras, *Epitome historiarum*, XIII, 22, 29; 24, 23; t. III, pp. 103.13, 115.15, ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst) are omitted in the bibliography.