

Abstracts

THOMAS GRAUMANN, Die Verschriftlichung synodaler Entscheidungen: Beobachtungen von den Synoden des östlichen Reichsteils

The production of a written record of conciliar decisions often involves a process that starts from the stenographic recording of oral discussions and is finalised by the approval of an agreed text; yet this procedure and consecutive progression from oral expression to written text is by no means universal. The present paper examines several examples, principally from councils in the Greek-speaking eastern parts of the Roman Empire, that reveal a more complex entanglement of orality and writing both in the decision-making of councils and in formalising their judgements. The examination brings into focus the work of drafting commissions and individuals, in preparing texts foundational for subsequent discussions. It identifies occasions where decisions on doctrine or discipline are written up seemingly without discussion—and certainly without recording it. Conversely, other instances show that verdicts can be presented as oral when, in reality, they are doubtless merely the reading out of written statements prepared in advance. The resultant complex interweaving of orality and writing, and the observation of repeated changes between textual aggregates along the way of the preparation of conciliar records, highlights the great importance of writing and document-use often outweighing ‘live’ interaction. It requires constant scholarly attention to the working practices of secretaries and notaries by which the intentions of their editorial supervisors are inscribed onto the presentation of ‘speaking’ and ‘writing’ in councils.

CHRISTIAN BARTHEL, Monastic Authority on Trial: The Synod of Latopolis

This contribution offers a close reading of the events of the so-called Synod of Latopolis, where members of the Pachomian monastic congregation and Upper Egyptian clergy met to debate the issue of clairvoyance. By exploring the different and, at times, contrasting modes of perception of this local church council, it also contributes to the reception of the institutional synod as a suitable forum for conciliation and conflict resolution in the hagiographical literature of the late fourth century.

VOLKER MENZE, Das Konzil als Instrument imperialer Politik: die Reorganisation der Konziliengeschichte und der Kirchenordnung durch Chalkedon

The Council of Chalcedon in 451 is regarded as the fourth ecumenical council in Western Church History, and scholars often consider it a council that rectified the un-

canonical deeds of the so-called “robber-council” of 449. However, between 449 and 451, the second Council of Ephesus in 449 was accepted as the third ecumenical council, and it is safe to assume that church history would be narrated differently if emperor Theodosius II (408–450) had not unexpectedly died in the summer of 450. It was only his successor Marcian (450–457) who summoned the Council of Chalcedon in 451 that ingeniously “rediscovered” an ecumenical council of 381 that gave the city of Constantinople the second place after Rome in the ranking of the episcopal sees. At the same time, Chalcedon deposed Dioscorus and nullified the council of 449, leading to the permanent downgrading of Alexandria in favor of Constantinople. Marcian, together with Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople re-wrote church history and introduced an ecclesiastical structure that fitted the Later Roman as well as the Byzantine Empire to come.

PHILIP MICHAEL FORNESS, Representing Lay Involvement in the Christological Controversies: The *Acclamations of the People* and the Synod of Constantinople (518)

What role did lay people play in debates over Christology in late antiquity? According to one allegedly eyewitness report, a group of laity gathered in the Great Church in Constantinople at the beginning of Justin I’s reign on July 15th, 518, to demand that the patriarch affirm the teachings of the Council of Chalcedon and denounce its detractors. A liturgy in honor of Chalcedon was celebrated on July 16th, and the Synod of Constantinople took place on July 20th. This highly stylized text, the *Acclamations of the People*, emphasizes the role of the laity in the decision-making process of this synod and thus in the changes to imperial policy regarding Christology. This article examines the transmission of this text and the reception of its report in collections of texts from three separate moments: (1) in Constantinople before and just after the Synod of Constantinople in 518; (2) at regional synods held in 518 and 519; and (3) in the *Acts of the Synod of Constantinople in 536*. These collections exhibit how the organizers of collections sought to shape the reading of this text and its content. They reveal a gradually decreasing importance assigned to the role of the laity in the events that led to the Synod of Constantinople in 518. This study thus lays necessary groundwork for evaluating the involvement of laity in the theological controversies of late antiquity.

MARIA CONSTANTINOIU, Synodal decision-making based on archived material. The case of the *Endemousa Synod of Constantinople 536*

The Endemousa Synod of 536 was convoked at Justinian’s order in Constantinople for the purpose of examining the case of the already deposed patriarch of Constantinople Anthimus. Upon the announcement of the verdict against Anthimus in the end of

the fourth session, requests for the Synod's ratification of the earlier condemnations of Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea were raised by the assembly. The Synod meets again to grant the demands by conducting a trial in absentia by proxy of documents. The paper discusses how the Acts of the fifth session of the Endemousa are constructed upon the presentation and insertion into the record of the proceedings of both contemporary texts and dossiers of documents stemming from the time after Justin's ascension to the throne. It also demonstrates how the editorial process shaped the form of the Acts.

HARTMUT LEPPIN, *Zwischen Bekennerstolz und Konsensfindung: Konzile und Konzilstheorie in der Geschichtsschreibung des ausgehenden sechsten Jahrhunderts*

This contribution discusses four works that were composed during the first decades after the council and the Council of Chalcedon: The Chronicle of Ps.-Zachariah of Mytilene, the History of the Holy Fathers by Barḥadbshabba, and the Church Histories written by Evagrius Scholasticus and John of Ephesus. While they differ in language (Greek or Syriac) and confessional outlook (Chalcedonianism or Miaphysitism), they all concern councils, which were often highly contested between various Christian groups. Scholars usually read the narratives in order to reconstruct the historical events, but the narratives also provide an excellent opportunity for a multi-perspective analysis of councils and the underlying ideological concepts.

There are some basic commonalities: All the authors taken into consideration criticise the use of violence during synods and regard the Council of Nicaea 325 as canonical and exemplary. Most authors are convinced that henceforth a pious emperor is able and entitled to hold a successful council. Barḥadbshabba, however, claims that Constantine consigned all the power to the bishops. They all accept the Council of Constantinople 381 but focus their attention on the council of 431, which is contentious. Evagrius starts his work from this council, which he believes was successful, while Barḥadbshabba condemns it completely. The series of synods from 448 to 451 is highly contested since the Council of Chalcedon, ended in 451, was offensive to certain groups. These groups developed into miaphysitic churches. But not even Evagrius, although being close to the Chalcedonians, was completely happy about it. Justinian's council of 553 in Constantinople is less contentious, but does not enjoy much respect.

All non-Chalcedonian groups highlight the importance of holy men who fight courageously (but not necessarily with success) for true belief. Evagrius, however, underlines that seeking the truth is an on-going task of councils. Thus, all authors accept the council although they know that councils are disruptive. But a successful council was almost impossible at this time because most groups attached more importance on true confession than on consensus.

HEINZ OHME, Konziliare Entscheidungsfindung und das Problem der Rezeption: Das Concilium Quinisextum (691/2)

The question of how and why the most extensive work of canon law of the first millennium CE was pronounced by the so-called Concilium Quinisextum (691/2) is closely linked to political and ecclesiastical crises of the seventh century. Some consideration must be given as well to the fact that the synod was received very differently in the Latin West than in the Greek East. It is from this perspective that the records of the Quinisextum, consisting merely of 102 canons, a list of episcopal subscriptions, and a *logos proshonetikos*, should be interpreted. In doing so, it stands to reason that an official commission not including any representatives of the Roman Church prepared and completed the canonical work before the synod began. Synod proceedings were limited to a single session in which, following the emperor's commencement address, the canons were read aloud and decided without further discussion through affirmative signatures of the attendant bishops. As this synod was convened to confirm the controversial Sixth Ecumenical Council (680/1) and to provide a cononical extension to it. Its conclusion was in peril when Roman legates and distinguished cathedrae within the Roman jurisdiction, who had been represented at the Sixth Council and whose endorsement had been anticipated, did not attend. This led to the decision to conclude the synod as an "ecumenical" one nevertheless by the emperor placing his signature before the bishops while the endorsement of the Roman Church was to be sought *ex post facto*. To this end, a total of three initiatives were necessary including violent action. A compromise was not reached until the year 711; the agreement was sealed during a papal visit to Constantinople.

CAROLA FÖLLER, Die Irrelevanz der Eroberung. Bischöfliche Teilnehmer von italischen Konzilien ca. 480–780

How was the structure of the Italian church influenced by the political transformations and wars during the first centuries after the end of the Western Roman polity (5th-8th centuries) that took place at the Apennin Peninsula? The article focusses on the Italian bishops of this period by analysing the preserved attendance lists and subscription lists of the Italian councils. Although the reasons why an individual bishop participated in a council can only rarely be reconstructed, and the lists at times do not allow to identify the bishops and their sees unambiguously, it is nonetheless possible to recognize significant spatial patterns in a long-term perspective. The analysis shows that contemporary political and ecclesiastical configurations are only minor factors for the question which bishops attended the councils of that period. Instead, the geographical position of the bishoprics within an area that can be described as the core of the Roman Republic since the 3rd century BCE, has proven to be decisive. One of the reasons for this is most probably the

well established system of Roman roads which was obviously still working in post-Roman Italy.

**FLORIAN HARTMANN, Auf dem Weg zur bischöflichen Dominanz?
Entscheidungsfindung und leitende Akteure auf den Konzilien von Frankfurt 794
bis Paris 829**

The Council of Frankfurt in 794 was a demonstration of Charlemagne's undisputable primacy as *rex* and *sacerdos* over papacy. Charlemagne not only dominated the discussions of the council, he also determined essentially the council's decisions. However, already under his son Louis the Pious, the leading influence of the Frankish rulers on councils declined. Although the Emperor convened a synod in Paris in 829, the synod was held without the Emperor's presence and presented its own results to the ruler, including the demand to enforce the decisions of the council. This illustrates the grave transition that had taken place in under 40 years: The emperor who had occupied a leadership role in the council of Frankfurt in 794 acted merely as a heeler in the Synod of Paris in 829. The following contribution aims at explaining this deep change in the Emperor's role in councils and at embedding this development in the historical context.

**TIM GEELHAAR, Das christliche Volk in den lateinischen Konzilstexten.
Konzeptionalisierungen und Reichweite einer Figur des großen Ganzen**

What happened to the idea of the Christian people, the *populus christianus*, after the reign of Charlemagne? What do different texts related to the Carolingian councils tell us about the role of this religious-political figure that represented the idea of the one empire uniting many different peoples? And what else do these texts tell us about the role of these councils concerning the Christian people during the ninth century? To answer these questions, this paper analyzes the use of the expression *populus christianus* mainly in the conciliar acts to understand the underlying semantics and its historical background. In this way, the paper seeks to contribute both to the history of political ideas and to the history of ecclesiastical councils.

**ANDREAS WECKWERTH, Der Entstehungsprozess synodaler Kanones im Kontext
westlicher Synoden**

In this paper, the formation process of the Western disciplinary canons of late antiquity is examined. Starting from the synodal discussions of the bishops, their genesis is described from the textualization of the results of the deliberations to their publication and archiving. Since relevant references pertaining to this question are rela-

tively scarce in the sources, it is necessary to put them together like a mosaic in order to obtain an overview.

JOHN HALDON, Monastic politics and vested interests in the inter-iconoclastic years. Myths and realities

It used to be generally assumed that there was a solid and obdurate monastic opposition to imperial iconoclasm during the eighth century. But until the period of the Council of Nicaea in 787 there is in fact no reliable evidence to support this contention. Nor is there solid evidence for monastic opposition to the synod of 754, or to the policies of Constantine V in general, before the events of 765/766, when the monk Stephen was killed and a number of higher-ranking military personnel were executed for plotting against the emperor. Even then, such opposition was highly localised, apparently quite limited, and represented no general opposition. Support for and hostility to imperial religious policy depended chiefly on closeness to the court and the emperors themselves, and thus on the degree of dependency upon the emperors and their court. Until now, it has generally been assumed that individuals or groups opposed or publicly objected to iconoclasm as a question of conscience—iconoclastic ideas posed a fundamental challenge to their understanding of orthodox belief. But were other motives also involved? This short contribution will consider this question in the light of the activities and views of a number of key players in the events of the last decades of the eighth century.

KIRILL A. MAKSIMOVIČ, Die Synode von 843 als Wendepunkt in der Bekämpfung von Häresien in Byzanz: Der Fall des “Synodikons der Orthodoxie”

In 843, the Council of the Church of Constantinople under Patriarch Methodios I (843–847) solemnly condemned the iconoclastic heresy and proclaimed a renewal of the entire Church through the restoration of the cult of icons. The synod must have issued a very interesting ecclesiastical document, the so-called “Synodikon of Orthodoxy”, written beyond any doubt by Methodios himself. This document has a complex nature; it combines features of diverse genres such as homiletics, church chronicles, liturgical books and theological treatises. The present article addresses some controversial questions concerning the provenience, literary character, and social functions of the Synodikon. It argues that the Synodikon demonstrates features of a legal text alongside the genres mentioned above. Although it is preserved only in a version that underwent multiple revisions and the reconstruction of its primitive form remains highly hypothetical, we can assume a relatively complex structure already in the original version of the Synodikon. From that time, it was constantly enlarged over the centuries through additions of “eternal memories” for champions of orthodoxy along with anathemas for heretics. By the end of the Byzantine era, it had

become a very voluminous text which no longer had a direct reference to the restoration of icons. The regular solemn proclamation of this text at the annual Feast of Orthodoxy on the first Sunday of Lent marked a turning point in the suppression of heresies in Byzantium. Namely, through the proclamation of the Synodikon of Orthodoxy the anti-heretical propaganda in Byzantium from 843 on assumed a total (empire-wide), regular, and solemn character never seen before. Other communities, the Georgians and Slavs, then adopted the Synodikon as means of “informational warfare” against heretics, so that this text has enjoyed almost the longest period of continuous use out of the entire corpus of Byzantine literature.

**PANAGIOTIS A. AGAPITOS, Vom Dokument zum literarischen Werk:
Philologisch-literarisches zur neuen Ausgabe der Akten des Nicaenum II von Erich Lamberz**

The paper briefly presents the innovative editorial method by which Erich Lamberz prepared the critical edition of the Greek text of the acts of the 7th Oecumenical Council (Nicaea, 787) and its translation into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in 873. The edition was published in three volumes between 2008 and 2012, but the work on the text and its complex manuscript tradition began in 1990. The Greek and Latin text have taken on a completely fresh appearance, while they are accompanied by well-organized apparatuses that have been judiciously composed so as not to simply offer a mass of unreadable and textually useless material. Moreover, the editor succeeded through his palaeographical and codicological expertise, as well as his philological and historical approach to reconstruct convincingly the process of reworking that lies behind the manuscript witnesses. He showed that the text underwent a series of specific changes (additions, omissions, adaptations) over a period of more than one hundred years (from the original document of 787 to its final revision around 900). This process of reworking is reflected in this edition which presents the text of ca. 880, along with all other material pertaining to this process as separate entities. Finally, the new edition allows scholars to realize for the first time that this complex “three-dimensional” product is a text that underwent a literarization with the effort to produce for various ecclesiastical and political aims a unified work that should take its place in a new history of Byzantine literature.

WOLFRAM BRANDES, Die neue Edition der Akten des Nicaenum II und einige historische Probleme

There are many texts (or fragments) in the new edition of the Nicaenum II by Erich Lamberz of special importance for the history (and pre-history) of the so-called iconoclastic struggle. Previously, these important sources could be used by scholars only in older editions—especially the *editio Romana* from 1612 (and reprints, until

Mansi). Until now, all interpretations (historical, patristic etc.) were dependent on these outdated editions. Lamberz's monumental new, three-volume edition offers, for example, the definitive text of the famous (but faked) letters of Pope Gregory II to Germanos, the patriarch of Constantinople, the so-called *Narratio* by John of Jerusalem, two letters by Nilos of Ancyra, the *Horos* of the iconoclastic synod of 754, and many more. Extremely important is the new edition and analysis of the famous letter from Pope Hadrian I to Empress Irene and her son Constantine (VI), who was suspected of manipulations by the Greeks, which Lamberz proves false. Also important is Lamberz's argument that the eighth session (as numbered in previous editions and in modern research) is a forgery and should be eliminated. This article concludes with an evaluation of the information in the acts concerning the history of the city of Nicaea.

ERICH LAMBERZ, Die neue Edition der Akten des Nicaenum II: Reflexionen des Editors

The contribution presents some reflections on problems and questions whose solution or more detailed treatment was difficult within the framework of the new edition. Thus, it may become clear that the edition should not be the end but rather the starting point of further studying the Acts. The following topics are addressed:

1. The materials presented in the edition may provide an impetus for further research into the texts and documents cited in the Acts with regard to their original version and their possible transformation or interpolation prior to their inclusion in the Acts. As an example, the alleged letter of Basil of Caesarea to the Emperor Julian (epist. 360) is subjected here to a more detailed analysis.

2. An in-depth examination of the later Greek and Latin tradition of the Acts in the 15th–17th centuries will hardly reveal important new variants that would require changes to the text of the new edition. However, it may lead to better insights into the further dissemination of the Acts, especially during the Councils of Ferrara / Florence and Trento, and it may not only contribute to the history of the reception of the Council, but also to the history of libraries and scholars.

3. A thorough documentation and evaluation of the rich manuscript tradition of the Greek canonical collections, into which a certain number of texts of the Acts have been incorporated, was impossible in preparing the edition of the large bulk of the Acts of the Council. Therefore, a representative selection of manuscripts was made and their relationship to each other and to the direct transmission of the Acts was examined. The task of further research would be to deepen the results by comparing them with the results of research on other texts transmitted in the canonical collections.

4. Although a direct criticism of the iconoclastic emperors is avoided in the Acts, it hardly seems doubtful that they reflect an effort of the Church to regain competence in matters of faith and to strengthen the position of the Patriarch of Constan-

tinople vis-à-vis the emperors. A clear indication of this is to be found in a section of the *Refutatio* of the Horos of Hiereia (p. 780,14–16 and 23–28). Further research would still have to examine this point more systematically, always taking into account the different stages of the transmission of the Acts.

5. The Acts of the Council provide numerous important documents on the beginning and course of the iconoclastic controversy up to 787. In recent decades, these documents have been subjected to in-depth criticism and their relevance has been questioned. Likewise, the thesis was put forward that numerous interpolations have been made in the texts of the Acts in the 9th century, a thesis, which has to be rejected for the reasons given in the introductions to the new edition. Therefore, the question must be, whether the “Quellenkritik” of the last decades has overstepped in some cases its target and whether its results need to be modified.

