

Martijn J.H. Hodselmans

S-4230779

Master Thesis Eternal Rome 2018-2019

## Gregory, John, and the overlooked Patriarch Amos

A new consideration of the dispute on the ecumenical title

## Table of contents

Introduction .....	2
Status Quaestionis .....	2
Thesis outline .....	6
Chapter 1, The Ecumenical Councils and the Pentarchy.....	8
Principle of accommodation.....	8
Principle of apostolicity.....	8
Church Councils .....	9
Conclusion.....	15
Chapter 2, The Pentarchy in the Codex Justinian.....	16
Historical Context.....	16
Justinian and the Church .....	17
The laws .....	18
Conclusion.....	21
Chapter 3 , Jerusalem between 451 and 604 CE .....	22
Pilgrims of Jerusalem .....	23
Monks of Jerusalem.....	24
Synods of Jerusalem.....	26
Conclusion.....	28
Chapter 4, The letters of Pope Gregory the Great .....	29
The ecumenical title before Gregory the Great .....	30
First series of letters on the ecumenical title: 595 CE .....	30
Second series of letters: 596-7 CE.....	33
Letters to Jerusalem.....	35
Conclusion.....	37
Conclusion.....	38
Appendix 1: Byzantine Emperors and Patriarchs of the Pentarchy.....	41
Bibliography .....	45
Primary sources .....	45
Literature .....	45

## Introduction

In the year 595 CE pope Gregory I the Great (540-604) wrote a series of letters to the Byzantine emperor Maurice (539-602) and the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch in protest of the use of the title ‘ecumenical patriarch’ by John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople (in office 582-595).<sup>1</sup> Gregory was not the first to object the use of the title, his predecessor Pope Pelagius II (520-590) had also protested the title in vain. Gregory argued that if one of the five patriarchs claims to be ecumenical, or as Gregory understood it, universal bishop, that would diminish the episcopal authority of the other patriarchs. The patriarchs of Constantinople had been using that title for the better part of the sixth century, starting as early as 518 CE. The usage of this title was later codified by Emperor Justinian (482-565) in 535.

## Status Quaestionis

There is a large amount of literature on Pope Gregory, written from a wide number of perspectives. Although the dispute over the ecumenical title is well known to most experts on Gregory, the literature on this specific subtopic is, especially in comparison, rather limited. There are no monographs on this subject, and monographs on the subject of Gregory the Great, Byzantine theology, the papacy or ecclesiastical history only mention this dispute in passing. There are, however, a small number of articles written on this subject. Over the next couple of paragraphs, we will discuss what has been written on the subject of the dispute over the ecumenical title. The academic debate on this topic mostly concerns itself with Gregory’s interpretation of the title as well as his motivation for starting this dispute. In general, four different interpretations are given as to the meaning of the claim ‘ecumenical patriarch’ by John the Faster.<sup>2</sup> The following overview of the debate will, therefore, be done according to the different schools of thought.

The first interpretation sees the use of the title as a way of expressing universal Christian jurisdiction, regardless of the boundaries of the Empire. This is mostly due to problems that arise in translating the Greek word ‘Οικουμενικό’. In Latin, this was often translated as *universalis* which could lead to the belief that the adjective ‘imperial’ was

---

<sup>1</sup> For easy reference, a list has been added in the appendix with all the Byzantine emperors and the patriarchs of the pentarchy. See page 41.

<sup>2</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great and the sixth-century dispute over the ecumenical title’, 616.

implied.<sup>3</sup> In this way, they would be comparable to ecumenical councils, which applied to all Christians, not just those within the empire. This interpretation, however, is outdated in the sense that modern historiography considers this position as too extreme and historically inaccurate. The decisive argument against this interpretation is the fact that the Patriarchs of Constantinople themselves also used this title to honour others and throughout the fifth century, a multitude of patriarchs from various places were honoured with this title making it non-exclusive. The Patriarchs of Constantinople would not refer to others as ‘ecumenical patriarch’ if this implied universal jurisdiction.

The second interpretation states that the ecumenical title means the adherence of the patriarchs to the Catholic doctrine common to the East and West since the Council of Chalcedon (451 CE), thus essentially expressing unity within the Christian world. This interpretation is the one argued by André Tuilier in his article *Le sens de l’adjectif ‘oecumenique’*.<sup>4</sup> Tuilier argues this by pointing to the time when the title emerged, which, according to him, was just after the Acacian Schism (484-519). This Schism, in which Rome and Constantinople had excommunicated each other for a period of 35 years, ended around the time the ecumenical title emerged.<sup>5</sup> This interpretation of the title seems to be based on thin evidence and is contradicted by the fact that the title had been used as early as the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE to honour Pope Leo (400-461).<sup>6</sup>

The third interpretation is that the term implied supreme jurisdiction in one’s own Patriarchate.<sup>7</sup> This view was first stated by Francis Dvornik in his often cited work *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*.<sup>8</sup> Dvornik argues, based on Emperor Justinian’s use of the title in his Codex and his simultaneous agreement to Roman primacy, that the title was merely an expression of the patriarch’s power within his own territory. There was no intention of usurping jurisdiction over the Church and therefore the title should be regarded as ceremonial according to Dvornik.<sup>9</sup>

Jeffrey Richards came to the same conclusion, that the title implied nothing more than supreme authority within his own patriarchate and not over the universal church.<sup>10</sup> He argues that there was no sign in Gregory’s time that the See of Constantinople desired to overthrow

---

<sup>3</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great and the sixth-century dispute over the ecumenical title’, 616.

<sup>4</sup> André Tuilier, ‘Le sens de l’adjectif «oecuménique» dans la tradition patristique et dans la tradition byzantine’, *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 86:3 (1964), 260-271, here 269.

<sup>5</sup> Tuilier, ‘Le sens de l’adjectif «oecuménique»’, 269.

<sup>6</sup> Francis Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York, 1966), 79.

<sup>7</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 79.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, 78.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, 79-80.

<sup>10</sup> Jeffrey Richards, *Consul of God, The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London, 1980), 218-221.

Roman primacy or diminish their jurisdiction.<sup>11</sup> He illustrates this by pointing to the numerous instances in which Eastern Patriarchs readily use Petrine terminology to honour the popes. The primacy that they conceded to, was one of honour, not of jurisdiction.<sup>12</sup>

The fourth interpretation sees the use of the title as a combination of ecclesiastical and political privilege throughout the empire.<sup>13</sup> According to John Meyendorff, the ‘ecumenical patriarch’ title blended the patriarch’s ecclesiastical and political privilege throughout the empire.<sup>14</sup> This would explain why Emperor Maurice supported John’s usage of the title: it added imperial cachet.<sup>15</sup> A similar argument is made around ten years later by Henry Chadwick. According to Chadwick, the title expressed no claim to universal jurisdiction but rather a measure of imperial stature relying on Constantinople’s political position.<sup>16</sup> According to Demacopoulos, this interpretation would explain the emperor’s support for John of Constantinople in this matter, but he notes that this does not clarify why John would insist on the title in a purely ecclesiastical dispute, nor Gregory’s ecclesiastical objections to it.<sup>17</sup>

The fifth interpretation regards the ecumenical title, as used specifically by John, as an assertion of authority. Robert Markus, in reference to Gregory’s ascetic character, points to this interpretation.<sup>18</sup> According to Markus, Gregory’s main grievance was the bishops anti-Christian pride as expressed by the title, a characteristic Gregory loathed.<sup>19</sup> This view is also held by Demacopoulos, who interprets the dispute as part of a sixth-century trend among patriarchs of Constantinople to assert greater authority in the church, and Gregory’s response as a justified effort to save traditional Roman privileges as well as the positions of the patriarchs in general.<sup>20</sup> This interpretation is specific to the way the title was used by John since the title is, according to Demacopoulos, vague enough to be used with different meanings in other contexts.<sup>21</sup> This interpretation contrasts the first in the sense that the title is not seen as an expression of universal jurisdiction but rather as a way of boasting about their supreme position within the Eastern Church.

---

<sup>11</sup> Jeffrey Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages (Routledge Revivals): 476-752* (London 1979), 10.

<sup>12</sup> Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 11.

<sup>13</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great and the sixth-century dispute over the ecumenical title’, 617.

<sup>14</sup> John Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions* (Crestwood, 1989), 305.

<sup>15</sup> Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 304-305.

<sup>16</sup> Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society: from Galilee to Gregory the Great* (New York, 2001), 669-670.

<sup>17</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 617.

<sup>18</sup> Robert A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge, 1997), 92-93.

<sup>19</sup> Markus, *Gregory and his World*, 93.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*, 619.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*.

Walter Ullmann's (1910-1983) view on the matter at hand is best characterised as belonging to the above described fifth tradition, although his arguments have been criticized for a number of reasons. Ullmann argues that Gregory's conduct implies a perceived threat coming from the Patriarchs of Constantinople and that the title was an expression of a claim to primacy based on the civic status of Constantinople as the empire's capital.<sup>22</sup> Ullmann further argues that Gregory was actively building new relations in the west and that Gregory started the dispute because his mission of Christianising England was about to begin.<sup>23</sup> Ullmann's position in this debate has widely been criticized, for instance by Markus and Demacopoulos. Both agree that the title had no intention of claiming primacy for Constantinople in contrast to Ullmann as do most modern historians. Markus argues that there is no evidence to prove Ullmann's thesis that there is a link between Gregory's plans for Christianising England and the start of the dispute on the ecumenical title.<sup>24</sup> Based on the above, Demacopoulos refers to Ullmann as an example of a biased scholar with a roman view and an apologist.<sup>25</sup>

Based upon the debate described above, a few notes have to be made. The debate seems to be divided between those that argue that Gregory was mistaken and that any offence taken by him was the result of miscommunication or misinformation. This group includes Tuilier, Dvornik, Meyendorff and Richards. The other side argues that Gregory was rightfully reacting to protect Rome's primacy against Constantinople's ambition. This group includes Markus, Demacopoulos and Ullmann. The second conclusion drawn from the literature is the fact that the position of the Patriarch of Jerusalem in this dispute is never questioned or considered by the historians and theologians assembled above. Gregory writes to him once, but not on this subject.<sup>26</sup> Even if Jerusalem's patriarchy was merely ceremonial and its patriarch the least important or powerful of the five patriarchs, surely his position on the matter would still have mattered? Why did Gregory not reach out to Amos (in office 594-601) in the hope of finding an ally? This is the gap in the academic debate that this research aspires to fill, for the sake of deepening our understanding of the subject and to break the deadlock that currently exists in the academic debate.

---

<sup>22</sup> Walter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy* (New York, 2003), 35-37.

<sup>23</sup> Ullmann, *History of the Papacy*, 37.

<sup>24</sup> Robert A Markus, 'Gregory the Great's Europe', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 31 (1981), 21-36, here 24-26.

<sup>25</sup> Demacopoulos, 'Gregory the Great', 601.

<sup>26</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 8.6*. in

## Thesis outline

The main research question will be as follows: How was the relationship between Gregory I the Great and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem from the fourth to the sixth century and why was Patriarch Amos not involved in the dispute over the ecumenical title?

In order to answer this question, a few steps will have to be taken. Information about Patriarch Amos and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the fifth and sixth century is scarce or irrelevant so this thesis will have to take a broad scope in order to understand the wider context of the situation. This study of ecclesiastical history will focus on the development of both the Pentarchy as an institution, and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in various stages that preceded Gregory's dispute on the title.

In the first chapter, we will consider the development of Church administration in the Roman/Byzantine empire in the third and fourth century and the ramifications this had for the Sees of Rome and Jerusalem.<sup>27</sup> Specifically, this study will examine the distribution of ecclesiastical power and its development in the first four ecumenical councils, the last of which took place in 451 CE. The focus here will be twofold: we will look closely into the canons relevant to Jerusalem, as well as the general idea of hierarchy which evolves in these councils; most notably Roman primacy.

The second chapter will look at the next milestone in the history of ecclesiastical administration: the codification of church legislation in the Codex Justinianus. The *Codex* and the *Novellae* contain a number of laws regarding the administration of the Church, including the Pentarchy and the position of Rome and Jerusalem. This will be the focus when we discuss the relevant laws.

The third chapter will take a closer look at the situation in Palestine regarding the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the period following the last ecumenical council, the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE, until the end of Pope Gregory's reign in 604 CE. Specifically the position of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and the monastic community in the context of a heretical incursion and the (potential) consequences this had for later. We will also discuss different aspects of Jerusalem's power and influence as well as its see's special relation with the emperors in the fifth and sixth century. This chapter will focus on the special status of Jerusalem and its relationship with the monks of Palestine and the emperors. Together with

---

<sup>27</sup> The Pentarchy is the form of Church administration in which the Church was governed by the bishops of the five most important sees in collaboration with the Byzantine emperor. For more information, see Ferdinand D., *Die Pentarchie-theorie; Ein Modell der Kirchenleitung von dem Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main, 1993).

the previously described chapters, this will form the background of the events that finally culminated in the dispute on the ecumenical title.

The fourth and final chapter will re-evaluate the available source material left to us by Pope Gregory the Great in an effort to understand his motivation behind some of his letters. This chapter will delve into Pope Gregory's letters, and it will focus on two groups of letters: letters he sent regarding the ecumenical dispute and letters he sent to Jerusalem but on a different topic. The objective here is to understand why Patriarch Amos did not receive a letter from Pope Gregory.

The primary sources used in this research are of a variety of mostly Christian ecclesiastical origin. Over the next chapters this research will analyse, using discourse analysis, the canons of several Ecumenical Councils, the Codex Justinianus, Cyril of Scythopolis' *The Lives of the Monks of Palestine* and the letters of Pope Gregory the Great. In this way, each chapter focusses on a different primary source, as well as accompanying literature. Together, these sources provide a wealth of information regarding the development of the ecclesiastical administration from the fourth to the sixth century, the Pentarchy and the relationship between the emperor and the patriarchs as stated by Emperor Justinian, the monastic and ecclesiastical situation in fifth and sixth century Palestine and Pope Gregory's relationship with the Eastern patriarchs and the Byzantine Emperor. It is important to note that this research uses modern English translations of these primary sources and not the original Greek or Latin versions; my gratitude goes out to the translators of these texts.

The following research is of a historical nature, but since it seeks to analyse ecclesiastical history, a fair amount of theological ideas and concepts will be discussed. Relevant names, concepts or events will be explained where necessary, either in the text itself or in the footnotes.



## Chapter 1, The Ecumenical Councils and the Pentarchy

In Justinian's *Novellae* the pentarchy was codified, but before that, it was shaped by evolving tradition and several Church Councils. This chapter, we will analyse the formation of Church authority and hierarchy in the first ecumenical councils. It revolves mostly around two concepts, namely the principles of accommodation and apostolicity, and the canons of the councils of Nicaea, Constantinople and Chalcedon in 325, 381 and 451 CE respectively.<sup>28</sup>

### Principle of accommodation

The primacy of the Roman See had several origins. Eamon Duffy states these in *Saints and Sinners* that there were three reasons for this. The most mundane reason is the fact that the Roman church was wealthy and felt a sense of responsibility towards other Christian communities.<sup>29</sup> The second reason, and according to Duffy the most important one, was that Rome 'preserved the witness' of not one but two apostles, Peter and Paul.<sup>30</sup> Thirdly, the church of Rome was located in the capital and thus in the hub of the Empire.<sup>31</sup> Francis Dvornik called this the principle of accommodation: a city's secular status determined its ecclesiastical status.<sup>32</sup> According to Dvornik, the Church had from its beginnings always conformed to the political divisions of the Roman Empire.<sup>33</sup> Dvornik states that this can be traced back to the Apostles who started preaching in the great cities of the Empire where large Jewish communities could be found. Large cities were the centre of the political, social and economic life of the provinces of the Roman Empire, and over time, their bishops came to be considered more important in the hierarchy within the province.<sup>34</sup> According to the same logic, Rome came to be considered more important in terms of ecclesiastical hierarchy than all other bishoprics.

### Principle of apostolicity

The justification for the superiority of the papacy based on the political position of Rome came under pressure when the Roman Empire moved its capital first to Mediolanum in 395

---

<sup>28</sup> Nicaea was an ancient city in the (relative) vicinity of Constantinople. Ephesus was an ancient city located near the Ionic coast and Chalcedon was located on the eastern coast of the Bosphorus opposite Constantinople, part of modern-day Istanbul.

<sup>29</sup> Eamon Duffy, *Saints and Sinners; a history of the popes* (London, 2014), 17.

<sup>30</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 16.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, 16-17.

<sup>32</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 28-29.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibidem*, 29.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem*, 30.

CE, then Ravenna in 402, and finally to Constantinople in 476.<sup>35</sup> It was from the fourth century onwards that the papacy slowly developed and emphasized the theory of Rome's Petrine origin.<sup>36</sup> The Church father Tertullian (160-220 CE) was the first to describe how, based on Matthew 16.18-19, Peter was the foundation of the Church, possessed the Keys to the Kingdom of Heaven and had the power to bind and to loose.<sup>37</sup> This power was then in turn passed on to his successors who were, therefore, more equal than others in ecclesiastical matters. Dvornik states that this theory was more widespread in the West, where Rome was the only city that could boast apostolic origin. In the East, there were several cities that had comparable claims such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and Ephesus.<sup>38</sup> The transfer of the capital from Rome to Constantinople could have contributed to the development of the Petrine claim, for, as Dvornik explains it, there was less need to justify Rome's primacy when it was still the capital.<sup>39</sup>

## **Church Councils**

Before the pentarchy was codified by Justinian, several general Church Councils had gathered, in part, in order to define a structure of Church authority 'that would not simply rest on the personal charisma of individuals'.<sup>40</sup> The next section will discuss the relevant canons of the general Church councils and their consequences for the relations between the patriarchs.

The Council of Nicaea was assembled by emperor Constantine (272-337) in the summer of the year 325 and it was the first General or Ecumenical Church Council which over time would come to be recognized as having binding authority in matters of the faith.<sup>41</sup> The main reason for this council was to settle the Arian controversy which it did by formulating the Nicene Creed.<sup>42</sup> According to this creed, Jesus was 'of the same essence' as the Father and therefore had a divine nature.<sup>43</sup> This council received little interest from the Roman See; Pope Sylvester (285-335) did not attend but sent two priests as representatives in

---

<sup>35</sup> Richards, *Consul of God*, 60.

<sup>36</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 40-41. Richards, *Consul of God*, 60-61.

<sup>37</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 42.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, 44.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, 42.

<sup>40</sup> Brian E. Daley, "Position and Patronage in the Early Church: the original meaning of 'Primacy of Honour'", *Journal of Theological Studies* 44:2 (1993), 529-553, here 553.

<sup>41</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 29.

<sup>42</sup> William Bright, *The Canons of the Four General Councils of Nicaea, Ephesus, Constantinople and Chalcedon* (Oxford, 1892), lii.

<sup>43</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 29.

his stead.<sup>44</sup> They were the first to sign the Conciliar decrees as a matter of honour, before all the other bishops, immediately after the president of the Council.<sup>45</sup>

The seventh canon of the Council of Nicaea is important for this study because, for the first time, the See of Jerusalem, at that time still called Aelia Capitolina, was elevated. After being destroyed by the Romans in 70 CE Jerusalem, was rebuilt by Emperor Hadrian (76-138) in the year 130 CE and he renamed the city Aelia Capitolina; a combination of his gentile name Aelius and Capitolina which meant that the city was dedicated to the god Jupiter Capitolinus.<sup>46</sup> Under Emperor Constantine, the city's Christian nature was emphasized and the city was adorned with a number of great churches, some of the first basilicas. The canon decrees the following:

“Since custom and ancient tradition have prevailed that the Bishop of Aelia [i.e., Jerusalem] should be honoured, let him, saving its due dignity to the Metropolis, have the next place of honour.”<sup>47</sup>

The metropolis in question here is Caesarea Martina.<sup>48</sup> This canon thus seeks to elevate the status of the See of Jerusalem whilst simultaneously stating that Jerusalem remains dependent on Caesarea and that this city remains the metropolis of southern Palestine. Consequently, the power to ordain bishops would remain the right of the bishop of Caesarea. The ‘next place of honour’ in this case means that the See of Jerusalem would take an honorary precedence immediately after the Patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch.<sup>49</sup>

The second general council, the Council of Constantinople, was called by Emperor Theodosius (364-395) in 381. It was purely an eastern council and therefore Pope Damasus I (305-384) did not attend this council nor did he send any legates; the bishops who were present were all part of the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan areas of influence.<sup>50</sup> This council made several major and lasting decisions, one of which was the slight adaption of the Nicene Creed which is still used in Catholic and Anglican churches every Sunday to this day.<sup>51</sup> The Council of Constantinople issued several canons regarding the balance of power

---

<sup>44</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 29.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*, 30.

<sup>46</sup> F. Peters, *Jerusalem: The Holy City in the Eyes of Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton, 1985), 129.

<sup>47</sup> Translation taken from: David M. Gwynn, *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire: a Sourcebook* (London, 2015), 106.

<sup>48</sup> Daley, ‘Position and Patronage’, 535.

<sup>49</sup> Gwynn, *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire*, 100.

<sup>50</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 34. Daley, ‘Position and Patronage’, 537.

<sup>51</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 34.

within the Church that was illustrative of a growing rift between Rome and the Eastern Churches.

First of all, this council decreed the following in canon two: “The bishops are not to go beyond their dioceses to churches lying outside of their bounds, nor bring confusion on the churches; .... And let not bishops go beyond their dioceses for ordination or any other ecclesiastical ministrations, unless they be invited.”<sup>52</sup> This canon continues the Nicene legislation of canons four and six but expressed in a clearer manner.<sup>53</sup> Most importantly this canon conforms the ecclesiastical boundaries to the imperial boundaries and limits the bishops’ authority to their own territory, preventing influential bishops from interfering in the elections of vacant bishoprics in other provinces or dioceses.

The third canon of the Council of Constantinople was also unacceptable for Rome. This canon proclaimed that “The bishop of Constantinople shall have the primacy of honour after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is new Rome.”<sup>54</sup> Following the idea of the principle of accommodation, the new capital, or New Rome, deserved in the minds of Emperor Theodosius and the eastern bishops a higher ecclesiastical status which this canon established. The basis for this elevation in honour and/or power came from its position in the political divisions of the Empire, which the church was keen to follow in those centuries. Important to note is that Constantinople only claimed the second place, after (Old) Rome; a clear sign that the easterners still revered the old capital, or perhaps saw some grounds to its claim on the apostles Peter and Paul.

Whether the Council of Constantinople was against Roman claims on authority or not is a matter of debate among historians. Dvornik argues that even though the Council was purely eastern and not ecumenical, the canons were known in the West but that there was no protest or rejection of the decrees until almost a century later.<sup>55</sup> According to Dvornik, the second and third canons were aimed at reducing the influence of the See of Alexandria which had supported its own candidates for bishoprics in both Antioch and Constantinople.<sup>56</sup> Dvornik argues that because the council was only for eastern bishops, it was only meant to straighten out affairs in the Church of the East and that in the minds of these bishops the canons did not infringe upon the rights of Rome because Rome remained the first see in the

---

<sup>52</sup> Translation taken from: Gwynn, *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire*, 107.

<sup>53</sup> Daley, ‘Position and Patronage’, 537.

<sup>54</sup> Translation taken from: Gwynn, *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire*, 107.

<sup>55</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 44-45.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibidem*.

ecclesiastical hierarchy.<sup>57</sup> Whether the Roman bishops actually had this right, whether they used it and how the eastern bishops saw this, is also a matter of debate.<sup>58</sup> Other historians, among which Duffy and to a lesser extent Brian Daley argue that the acts of the Council of Constantinople were in fact (also) aimed at Rome. According to Duffy, the third canon was unacceptable to Rome for two reasons, even though it still explicitly stated that Rome had the first rank of honour. It was seen as a capitulation to the imperial claim to control over the Church to elevate Constantinople, a city merely 50 years old with no apostolic origin, above the other Sees of the East.<sup>59</sup> Second, this also implied that Rome's only claim to primacy was the fact that it used to be the empire's capital, instead of its double apostolic origin.<sup>60</sup> For these reasons, Pope Damasus and his successors could not endorse the Council of Constantinople and in the following year, 382 CE, Damasus held a Synod in Rome for the Western bishops where they proclaimed that Rome held the first rank because of its dual apostolic heritage; Alexandria was second because it had been founded from Rome by Saint Mark on the orders of Peter, Antioch was third in rank because it had also been founded by Peter before he departed for Rome.<sup>61</sup>

The fourth general Church Council, the Council of Chalcedon was held in 451 CE and it was convoked by Emperor Marcian (392-457). The main goal of this council was to undo the errors of a previous council, namely the 'Robber' Council of Ephesus of 449 and because of this, nearly all the bishops of the Christian world were present.<sup>62</sup> Much like the previously discussed general council, this Council was also the battleground between the various churches of the East. The Council of Chalcedon greatly increased the powers of the See of Constantinople and is generally seen as a defeat of the ambitions of the See of Alexandria.<sup>63</sup>

Canons nine and seventeen of the Council of Chalcedon are relevant here because they increased the supra-provincial jurisdiction of the See of Constantinople.<sup>64</sup> The relevant passage of the ninth canon is as follows:

“If anyone infringes this, he is to be subject to the canonical penalties. If a cleric has a suit against his own, or another, bishop, he is to plead his cause before the council of

---

<sup>57</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 45.

<sup>58</sup> For this debate, see for instance: J.J. Taylor, 'Eastern Appeals to Rome in the Early Church: a little known witness' *The Downside Review* 89:295 (1979), 142-146. Geoffrey D. Dunn, 'The Church of Rome as a court of Appeal in the early fifth century: the evidence of Innocent I and the Illyrian Churches' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 64:4 (2013), 679-699.

<sup>59</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 34-35.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibidem*, 35.

<sup>62</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 24.

<sup>63</sup> Daley, 'Position and Patronage', 539.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibidem*, 540.

the province. If a bishop or cleric is in dispute with the metropolitan of the same province, he is to have recourse to the exarch of the diocese or to the see of imperial Constantinople and plead his case there.”<sup>65</sup>

The section most relevant to us of the seventeenth canon is as follows:

“If anyone is wronged by his own metropolitan, he is to plead his case before the exarch of the diocese or the see of Constantinople, as has been said above. If any city has been founded by imperial authority or is in future so founded, the arrangement of the ecclesiastical dioceses is to follow the civic and public regulations.”<sup>66</sup>

This meant that when someone had a canonical complaint against the metropolitan of his province, that person was able to go to the exarch, or metropolitan, of the corresponding diocese or to ‘the throne of Constantinople’.

The most famous, or infamous, canon of the Council of Chalcedon was the 28<sup>th</sup> canon. The relevant passages of the 28<sup>th</sup> canon are as follows:

“...we too define and decree the same regarding the privileges of the most holy church of the same Constantinople New Rome. The fathers appropriately accorded privileges to the see of Senior Rome because it was the imperial city and, moved by the same intent, the 150 most God-beloved bishops assigned equal privileges to the most holy see of New Rome, rightly judging that the city which is honoured with the imperial government and the senate and enjoys equal privileges with imperial Senior Rome should be exalted like her in ecclesiastical affairs as well, being second after her, with the consequence that the metropolitans alone of the Pontic, Asian and Thracian dioceses, and also the bishops from the aforesaid dioceses in barbarian lands, are to be consecrated by the aforesaid most holy see of the most holy church at Constantinople, while, of course, each metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses, together with the bishops

---

<sup>65</sup> The full text of the ninth canon of the Council of Constantinople is as follows: “If any cleric has a suit against a cleric, he is not to leave his own bishop and have recourse to civil courts, but is first to argue the case before his own bishop, or at least with the consent of the bishop himself let justice be done before whomever both parties choose. If anyone infringes this, he is to be subject to the canonical penalties. If a cleric has a suit against his own, or another, bishop, he is to plead his cause before the council of the province. If a bishop or cleric is in dispute with the metropolitan of the same province, he is to have recourse to the exarch of the diocese or to the see of imperial Constantinople and plead his case there.” Taken from: Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (Liverpool, 2005), 97.

<sup>66</sup> The full text of the seventeenth canon of the Council of Constantinople is as follows: “The rural or country parishes of each church are to remain undisturbed under the bishops who possess them, especially if they have held and administered them for a thirty-year period without recourse to force. If, however, within the thirty years there has occurred or shall occur dispute over them, those who claim to have been wronged are permitted to raise the matter with the council of the province. If anyone is wronged by his own metropolitan, he is to plead his case before the exarch of the diocese or the see of Constantinople, as has been said above. If any city has been founded by imperial authority or is in future so founded, the arrangement of the ecclesiastical dioceses is to follow the civic and public regulations.” Taken from: Price and Gaddis, *Acts*, 100.

of the province, ordains the bishops of the province, as is laid down in the divine canons. As has been said, the metropolitans of the aforesaid dioceses are to be consecrated by the archbishop of Constantinople...<sup>67</sup>

A few things immediately stand out when reading this canon: Constantinople is called New Rome, for it is the new capital of the Empire, and because of this status in the Empire should therefore be elevated in rank and honour. Second, the See of Constantinople is to have equal privileges as (Old) Rome; since the ranks were only indicative of honour and not of power, asserting that the Sees had equal privileges refers to Rome's presupposed right of appeal. Thirdly, the bishop of Constantinople obtained the right to ordain metropolitan bishops of the three Northern dioceses, Thrace, Pontus and Asia, as well as the bishops of the barbarian or missionary regions outside of the borders of the Empire. The right to ordain bishops should not be taken lightly, according to Brian Daley. He argues that this right was not merely ceremonial custom but in fact gave the bishops of Constantinople the right to act as referees and that their support also meant that local bishops ordained by them were dependent on them; they basically entered in a patron-client relationship in which loyalty and support were expected.<sup>68</sup> Taken together with canons nine and seventeen, discussed earlier, this canon shows the extent to which the Council of Chalcedon increased the power and jurisdiction of the See of Constantinople.

During the Council of Chalcedon, Bishop Juvenal (in office 422-458) of Jerusalem was able to obtain through private negotiations with the Bishop of Antioch that which his predecessors had not been able to obtain: elevation to a genuine See complete with a territory: the area south of Lebanon to Arabia.<sup>69</sup> Since the Council of Nicaea in 325, Jerusalem had already been awarded a higher position based on 'custom and ancient tradition' in the Council's seventh canon, but it was still under the metropolis of the diocese; Caesarea

---

<sup>67</sup> The full text of the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon is as follows: "Following in all things the decrees of the holy fathers and acknowledging the canon just read of the 150 most God-beloved bishops who assembled under the then emperor Theodosius the Great of pious memory in imperial Constantinople New Rome, we too define and decree the same regarding the privileges of the most holy church of the same Constantinople New Rome. The fathers appropriately accorded privileges to the see of Senior Rome because it was the imperial city and, moved by the same intent, the 150 most God-beloved bishops assigned equal privileges to the most holy see of New Rome, rightly judging that the city which is honoured with the imperial government and the senate and enjoys equal privileges with imperial Senior Rome should be exalted like her in ecclesiastical affairs as well, being second after her, with the consequence that the metropolitans alone of the Pontic, Asian and Thracian dioceses, and also the bishops from the aforesaid dioceses in barbarian lands, are to be consecrated by the aforesaid most holy see of the most holy church at Constantinople, while, of course, each metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses, together with the bishops of the province, ordains the bishops of the province, as is laid down in the divine canons. As has been said, the metropolitans of the aforesaid dioceses are to be consecrated by the archbishop of Constantinople, after elections by consensus have taken place according to custom and been reported to him." Translation taken from: Price, Gaddis, *Acts*, 75-76.

<sup>68</sup> Daley, 'Position and Patronage', 543-544.

<sup>69</sup> Ibidem, 539. Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 23.

Martina. According to David Barry Sheldon, the bishop of Antioch and bishop Juvenal were involved in a trade-off which made the independence of the See of Jerusalem possible; Juvenal most probably consented to be doctrinally orthodox in accordance with the See of Antioch in return for a political grant of territory.<sup>70</sup> Upon becoming autocephalous, meaning that the head-bishop did not have to answer to a higher-ranking bishop, the fifth see was established and the final form of the pentarchy took shape.

The proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon are available to us, and they show how the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was approved by the assembly.<sup>71</sup> The source shows how the issue was brought forth, first by the Patriarch of Antioch, and then by Juvenal of Jerusalem. The assembly then voices their approval, beginning with the papal representatives, followed by the Patriarch of Constantinople followed by everyone else.<sup>72</sup> These proceedings show clearly the relevance of Rome's primacy, which in this case meant that they were the first to voice their opinions on the matter at hand.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter, we have seen how through several Church councils the early Church sought to solve disputes and form a certain hierarchy of governance. A few things are important to note in conclusion. As we have seen, Church authority was based on a system of dioceses of the Roman Empire and in this sense, the organisation of the Church was adapted along with the Empire. Rome claimed an important place almost immediately from the beginning and the See of Rome sought to maintain a sense of supremacy based on its dual apostolic origin when it lost its central position in the Empire itself. Jerusalem, or Aelia, was originally of little importance both to Christianity and to the Roman Empire before being rebuilt by Emperor Hadrian and before it was re-Christianised by, among others, Emperor Constantine. Later on, it was recognised as a centre of Christianity and given a place of honour after the other major See's. In the first four ecumenical councils, the pentarchy had taken form, although it would not yet be called as such. They were the most important and highest ranking Sees and there was a hierarchy among them. The hierarchy at the end of the Council of Chalcedon was as follows: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem.

---

<sup>70</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 23.

<sup>71</sup> Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (Liverpool, 2005).

<sup>72</sup> Price, Gaddis, *Acts*, 244-249.



## Chapter 2, The Pentarchy in the Codex Justinian

After the Ecumenical Councils of the fourth and fifth century, the next important step in the formation of Church organisation was taken in the sixth century. Byzantine Emperor Justinian (482-565 CE) played an important part in this, for it was his overhaul of Roman law which enacted into secular law the organisation of the Church.

This chapter will begin with a short historical context and will then delve into Justinian's relationship with the Church, how he perceived his role in it as an emperor and his relationship with the See of Rome. These preliminary steps are necessary because they will help us understand the contents and contexts of the laws, particularly *Novellae* 131, which we will discuss and analyse in the second part of this chapter. The main question of this chapter is as follows: How was the position of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem affected by the Codex Justinianus? While answering this question, we will also analyse what this meant for the relationship of Rome with both Constantinople and Jerusalem.

### Historical Context

The last chapter stopped after the Council of Chalcedon of 451 CE. This chapter will focus on the period between this council until the death of Justinian in 565. Important to note here, is that the last western Roman emperor was deposed in 476 CE and that the Italian peninsula was ruled by Germanic and Gothic kings until it would be temporarily reconquered by the Byzantines in the middle of the sixth century. In this period, the bishops of Rome found themselves outside the borders of the empire unlike the eastern patriarchs, and this strengthened their feeling of independence and their arguments for the superiority of spiritual authority over secular power.<sup>73</sup> This is perhaps best exemplified by Pope Gelasius' letter to emperor Anastasius in 494 CE in which he explains that there are two powers in the world: "...although you are the ruler of the human race, nevertheless you bow your head devoutly before those who are leaders in things divine and look to them for the means of your salvation."<sup>74</sup>

Part of the motivation for Justinian for codifying ecclesiastical law were the many problems that arose after the Council of Chalcedon. The council's Christological Creed, its statement on the nature of Jesus Christ as being both human and divine, received a lot of criticism, most notably from Christians who believed Jesus to be solely divine, so-called

---

<sup>73</sup> Gwynn, *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire*, 125.

<sup>74</sup> Gelasius of Rome, *Letters* 12, to Anastasius, in Gwynn, *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire*, 125.

Monophysitism. The period between Chalcedon and Justinian's reign is riddled with schisms and other theological controversies and Justinian sought to end these by promulgating his laws.

### **Justinian and the Church**

Justinian saw himself as emperor as being the head of all things in his empire; this included the affairs of the Church.<sup>75</sup> When Justinian ascended the throne in 527 CE, he became emperor of a divided Church; a situation he wanted to mend.<sup>76</sup> The degree of control Justinian exercised over the Church has been a matter of historical debate: some scholars emphasise Justinian's inability to create lasting unity in Christianity, whereas others claim that he saw himself as a despot who "ruled the Byzantine Church with an iron hand".<sup>77</sup> Milton V. Anastos, for instance, claims that Justinian 'always succeeded in obtaining whatever ecclesiastical confirmation he wished' and that he 'felt free to interpret Christian dogma as he saw fit'.<sup>78</sup> According to him, Justinian sought ecclesiastical sanction for his decrees but did not bother about securing their autographs until after the decree was finished: leaving priests and patriarchs alike no possibility of refusing or suggesting changes.<sup>79</sup>

Dvornik points to the prevailing Hellenistic ideas on kingship to explain Roman and Byzantine emperors' involvement in the Church and especially Christian doctrine; enforcing the true faith was in this sense the emperor's duty.<sup>80</sup> But Dvornik also states that the church was not despotically ruled by the emperors, at least not in the period preceding the Eastern schism. In the case of Justinian, Dvornik argues this based on the opposition that broke out among African bishops and the pope when Justinian condemned three specific religious texts, the so-called Three Chapters, and the fact that due to the opposition he had to give in and call

---

<sup>75</sup> David Sheldon Barry explained Caesaropapism in the following manner: "The term Caesaropapism traditionally has connoted the notion that the Byzantine emperor from the time of Constantine (297-337) controlled various functions of the church. The term, however, in actuality is a nineteenth century creation, an artificial concept which would have had no meaning for a Byzantine. The church was the emperor's. Every Byzantine would have understood this. He would have had no need to devise a term for it." In Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 59. For more information on the history and historicity of the concept of Caesaropapism, see: Deno Genakopolis, 'Church and state in the Byzantine Empire: a reconsideration of the problem of Caesaropapism' *Church History* 34 (1965), here 381-403. John Meyendorff, 'Justinian, The Empire and the Church', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 22 (1968), here 43-60.

<sup>76</sup> Fergus Millar, 'Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church under Justinian: Two Synods of C.E. 536', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 98 (2008), 62-82, here 63.

<sup>77</sup> Milton V. Anastos, 'Justinian's Despotic Control over the Church as Illustrated by his Edicts on the Theophaschite Formula and his Letter to Pope John II in 533', chapter four in *Studies in Byzantine Intellectual History* (London, 1979), 2.

<sup>78</sup> Anastos, 'Justinian's Despotic Control', 2.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibidem*, 2-4.

<sup>80</sup> Francis Dvornik, 'Emperors, Popes, and Councils', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 (1951) 1-23, here 6-8.

for a new council on the topic; the fifth ecumenical Council of 553 CE.<sup>81</sup> John Meyendorff stresses that Justinian was opposed at several points in his reign.<sup>82</sup> To argue this, he points to several concessions Justinian made during the Fifth Council, which was held in Constantinople, on the topic of Christological matters; the exact details of which are beyond the scope of this study.<sup>83</sup> Meyendorff adds to this that this was ‘an admission on the part of the Emperor himself that theological issues could not be solved by state legalism’ but had to be left to bishops gathered in council.<sup>84</sup>

As we can see here, Justinian’s role in the Church should not be underestimated, for, in the end, it was he who decided on which councils received ecumenical status, which doctrines would be considered orthodox and which were considered heretical.

### **The laws**

Before we move on to the laws concerning the hierarchy within the Pentarchy, we will first comment on the frequent use of the ecumenical title in Justinian’s laws. A number of Justinian’s novels were directed specifically to the Patriarch of Constantinople, whom Justinian referred to as ‘ecumenical patriarch’.<sup>85</sup> It appears as though nothing much should be thought of it since Justinian also stressed Rome’s primacy and codified the canons which granted Rome this position.

In the preface of the sixth *Novellae*, published in 535 CE, Justinian states how he perceives the relationship between the *sacerdotium*, or ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the *imperium*, or secular rulers. Unsurprisingly, his account differed greatly from the way pope Gelasius saw their connection. The preface states the following:

“The greatest gifts among men, made by supernal kindness, are the priesthood and sovereignty, of which the former is devoted to things divine, and of which the latter governs human things and has the care thereof. Both proceed from the same beginning and are ornaments of human life. Nothing, therefore, should receive the same attention at the hands of emperors as the dignity of priests, seeing that the always supplicate God even on behalf of themselves (the emperors). If the one is blameless in every

---

<sup>81</sup> There seems to be a minor mistake in the article: Dvornik states that “Justinian had to yield and convoke the sixth ecumenical council.” This is impossible since the sixth ecumenical council was the Third Council of Constantinople which was held in 680-681 CE and which was convoked by Emperor Constantine IV. It, therefore, seems to me that this was a mistake and that Dvornik referred to the fifth ecumenical council, the Second Council of Constantinople which was held in 553 CE Dvornik, ‘Emperors, Popes, and Councils’, 21.

<sup>82</sup> John Meyendorff, ‘Justinian, The Empire and the Church’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 22 (1968), 43-60.

<sup>83</sup> Meyendorff, ‘Justinian, The Empire and the Church’, 59-60.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>85</sup> Examples of these *Novellae* are: 3, 5, 6, 7, 16, 42, 55, 56, 77.

respect, placing trust in God, and the other rightly and becomingly ornaments the slate delivered to him, there will be splendid harmony which will give to humanity whatever is for the best.”<sup>86</sup>

The full version of the sixth *Novellae* legislates on the legal status of the clergy, their marital status, church property and the manner in which clergy are appointed; this is what “human things” refers to. In Justinian’s mind, the Empire and the Church are one single body of the faithful.<sup>87</sup> The “sovereignty” i.e. the emperor is the one who “governs”; Justinian thus states that he is superior in the relationship with the clergy. Meyendorff explained Justinian’s vision, therefore, like so: “Ecclesiastical traditions and conciliar decisions are made laws by imperial decree, but they have no legal and binding existence by themselves.”<sup>88</sup>

Novels 131, which was given at Constantinople on March 18, 545 CE concerned the ecclesiastical canons and privileges. In this law Emperor Justinian codified certain matters into law regarding clergy of all levels; rules concerning for instance inheritances, construction of chapels and the management of church property. Relevant to this thesis, however, are the first two clauses, the first of which is as follows:

“We therefore ordain that the canons of the holy church which were enacted or confirmed by the four holy councils, that is to say, of the 318 at Nicaea, of the 150 holy fathers at Constantinople, and of the first held at Ephesus, at which Nestorius was condemned, and of that held at Chalcedon at which Eutyches and Nestorius were anathematized, shall have the force of law. We accept the dogmas of the aforesaid four holy councils as divine scriptures, and uphold their canons as laws.”<sup>89</sup>

From this clause, it becomes clear that a choice has been made regarding which councils were and were not endorsed in retrospect by Emperor Justinian. These are the same councils as were discussed in the previous chapter with the exception of the Council of Ephesus (431) which did not record any canons relevant to this thesis. Under the supervision of Justinian, the four councils were elevated in authority in a twofold manner: the canons were given the same status as the law and the dogmas were henceforth considered as divine. These were necessary measures for an emperor who wanted to end the divisions in the Church once and for all. Law abiding citizens would not question laws promulgated by the emperor, but this was not the case for the canons of the Ecumenical Councils which always seemed to

---

<sup>86</sup> Novels 6 in Fred H Blum, *Annotated Justinian Code* (New York, 1955), 268.

<sup>87</sup> Meyendorff, ‘Justinian, The Empire and the Church’, 49.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>89</sup> Novels 131 in Blum, *Justinian Code*, 405.

provoke some degree of resistance somewhere in the empire.<sup>90</sup> The Council of Nicaea was opposed by most of the Eastern Christians because of its Christological creed, the Council of Constantinople flew in the face of both Rome and Alexandria and Ephesus was opposed by Antioch.<sup>91</sup> One of Justinian's major objectives, according to Fergus Millar, was the reunification of the Church together with the implementation of the correct doctrine.<sup>92</sup> Effectively, this meant bringing the Sees of Rome, Constantinople and the Monophysites of the East, that is Alexandria and Antioch, together in order to (re-)establish the Christian *oikumene* that Justinian desired.<sup>93</sup>

“We further ordain that in accordance with their determinations, the holy pope of ancient Rome is the first of all the priests, the archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, occupies the place next after the holy apostolic seat of ancient Rome, and has precedence over the others.”<sup>94</sup>

The second clause of Novels 131 clearly shows the allotment of status within the pentarchy as it was codified by Justinian. It is a continuation of the hierarchy as it was set out in canon three of the Council of Constantinople in 381 CE. Interesting to note is the emphasis on the apostolic foundation of the Roman See, which Justinian had stressed also on numerous other occasions.<sup>95</sup> Although this second clause codifies the pentarchy, it is immediately noticeable that three Sees are not mentioned by name. Since the first clause of *Novellae* 131 enacted into law the first four ecumenical councils, it follows that the order described in their canons is maintained here also. For clarity purposes, this means Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem.

Interestingly, Rome retained its position as the ‘head of all churches’, even though by then its civic power must have been completely eclipsed by Constantinople.<sup>96</sup> This was an attempt by Justinian to flatter Rome.<sup>97</sup> Justinian depended on the cooperation of the See of Rome for the reconquest of the Italian peninsula.<sup>98</sup> As has been stated earlier, Justinian frequently to the Patriarch of Constantinople with the ecumenical title, whilst simultaneously stressing that Rome remained the ‘head of all Churches’.

---

<sup>90</sup> Meyendorff, ‘Justinian, The Empire and the Church’, 46.

<sup>91</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>92</sup> Millar, ‘Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church’, 62.

<sup>93</sup> Meyendorff, ‘Justinian, The Empire and the Church’, 47.

<sup>94</sup> Novels 131 in Blum, *Justinian Code*, 405.

<sup>95</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 68.

<sup>96</sup> Chris Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society 400-1000* (Hong Kong, 1981), 26.

<sup>97</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 70.

<sup>98</sup> Ibidem.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter, we have considered two things: the role of Justinian as emperor within the Church, and we have discussed the relevant source codes. Justinian's position in the Church was strong, but there is no consensus amongst historians that he ruled as a despot. His position was nevertheless powerful. Justinian's use of the ecumenical title in the codex is frequent, but since he continued to stress Roman primacy, it appears as if, for Justinian, there is no implication of greater jurisdiction. Especially since he knowingly accorded Constantinople the second place within the hierarchy. The relevant source codes show us that the canons discussed in chapter 1 were elevated in power for they received imperial backing. We also saw that both Rome and Jerusalem retained their position within the hierarchy of the Pentarchy, with Rome ranking first and Jerusalem fifth and last.

### **Chapter 3 , Jerusalem between 451 and 604 CE**

This chapter will focus on the role of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem between the Council of Chalcedon and the reign of Pope Gregory, 451-604 CE. These demarcations have been chosen to focus on the events and activities of the various actors in play. The political and ecclesiastical consequences of the Council of Chalcedon determined the history of the Holy Land for years to come, as it turned into the proverbial battleground for theological disputes that soon arose after the Council. The purpose of this chapter in relevance to the wider scope of this research is to see if there are any reasons to believe Rome, and/or Pope Gregory more specifically, had some sort of quarrel with the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. This, in turn, could explain why Gregory ignored Patriarch Amos in regards to the dispute over the ecumenical title. The purpose of this chapter is captured in its research question, which is: How did the Patriarchate of Jerusalem develop in the fifth and sixth century and how did this affect their relationship with Rome?

In order to get a clear picture of this period, there are several sources that will be discussed and analysed. The most important source for this chapter is 'The Lives of the Monks of Palestine' written by Cyril of Scythopolis (525-559). This source is one of the most important sources for our knowledge of fifth and sixth century Palestine. Cyril was a monk and hagiographer in the sixth century, and he wrote, among others, about the life of abbot Sabas (439-532), whom he met at a young age and who would later become his teacher. His hagiography of the lives of seven saintly abbots and monks is written against the background of their fight against continuous heretical insurgencies, most notably Origenism.

To get an idea of the position and power of the See of Jerusalem, as well as some important events that helped shape its history, we will discuss a number of topics concerning the Holy City in the fifth and sixth century. This segment will briefly describe the influence of pilgrims on the city, and delve into the special relationship the patriarch enjoyed and maintained with the monastic community. Special attention will also be paid to the two Jerusalemite councils that were held in this time period. This segment will underscore the notion that in Jerusalem, a special alliance was formed between the Patriarch, the Emperor and the monks that resided in and around Jerusalem, with the intent of bringing the heresies of Monophysitism and Origenism to a halt.

## Pilgrims of Jerusalem

An important aspect of Jerusalem's ecclesiastical power was the high number of pilgrims the city attracted. Ever since Emperor Constantine and his mother Helena (246/50-327/30) 'rebuild' the city in a grand Christian fashion and adorned her with many churches, a constant influx of pilgrims visited the city, many travelling great distances to see the Holy City of which they heard so much.<sup>99</sup> Some of these pilgrims, like for instance Euthymius (377-473) and Sabas whose lives are described by Cyril of Scythopolis, experienced a calling and joined a monastery in Jerusalem or its vicinity which enabled the local monastic community to maintain their numbers or grow.<sup>100</sup> These pilgrims became part of the monastic movement (324-642 CE) in Palestine and made Jerusalem a city of pilgrims and monks.<sup>101</sup> It is no coincidence that the period of the monastic movement corresponds roughly with the start of the building project of Constantine and ends with the Islamic conquest of Palestine: these were the centuries when Christian Jerusalem was at its most powerful. Those pilgrims who travelled back home took with them tales of what their experiences, sometimes in the case of detailed descriptions of the local liturgy.<sup>102</sup> In this way, the Jerusalemite liturgy, which adhered to the Chalcedonian creed, was spread through the Christian world giving Jerusalem a measure of theological influence. An example of this is presented to us by the pilgrim Egeria when she described a ceremony step by step on Good Friday before Easter when relics, discovered by Helena, are being presented to the crowd:

“The bishop's chair is placed on Golgotha behind the Cross, which stands there now. He takes his seat and a table is placed before him with a linen cloth on it. The deacons stand round, and there is brought to him a gold and silver box in which is the Holy Wood of the Cross. It is opened and the Wood of the Cross and the Title are taken out and placed on the table. As long as the Holy Wood is on the table, the bishop sits with his hands resting on either end of it and holds it down, and the deacons round him keep watch over it. They guard it like this because the custom is that the people,

---

<sup>99</sup> John Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314-631* (Oxford, 1994), 66.

<sup>100</sup> Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, 35.

<sup>101</sup> Doron Bar, 'Rural Monasticism as a Key Element in the Christianization of Byzantine Palestine', *The Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005), 49-65, here 49. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, 66.

<sup>102</sup> Jas Elsner, 'The Itinerarium Burdigalense: Politics and Salvation in the Geography of Constantine's Empire', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 90 (2000), 181-195, here 186-187.



catechumens as well as the faithful, come up one by one to the table. The lean over down over it, kiss the Wood and move on.”<sup>103</sup>

## **Monks of Jerusalem**

Another, more important, aspect of the power of Jerusalem comes in the form of the monastic community of Palestine and their close cooperation with the Patriarch.<sup>104</sup> These monks were the proverbial ‘warriors’ in the fight for the Orthodox cause and they were mobilized to this end by both the patriarchs and the emperors. According to Doron Bar, monasteries played a crucial role in the Christianization of Byzantine Palestine.<sup>105</sup> Relevant to this thesis is the role they played in the fight against Origenists which took place in the sixth century.<sup>106</sup> The following fragments have been included in this research to show two things: the cooperation between the See of Jerusalem and the monastic community of Palestine on the one hand, and the See’s relationship with the emperors on the other.

“Then the archbishop, Peter, together with the bishops under him encouraged our father Sabas to go up to Constantinople and to ask the emperor to grant a tax-remission in first and second Palestine because of the murders and atrocities committed by the Samaritans. Having acceded to the petitions of the high-priests, the old man journeyed to Constantinople in April of the eighth indiction.”<sup>107</sup>

Abbot Sabas, acting as an emissary for ‘the archbishop’ (Patriarch) Peter of Jerusalem (in office 524-552),-behaved in a rather confident manner in imperial circles, as becomes clear from the following passage, in which priests ask Sabas after meeting with Empress Theodora (500-548) why he refused to bless her womb. Her theological position as a Monophysite could have disastrous consequences for the Empire according to Sabas:

“‘Why did you anger Theodora by not acquiescing to her request?’ Sabas replied: ‘Believe me, fathers, she will never produce a child, for she still adheres to the doctrines of Severus and has subjected the church to them. This attitude will bring more troubles than did Anastasius’ position.’”<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Egeria, *Pilgrimage*, 67. Taken from F. Peters, *Jerusalem: The Holy City in the Eyes of the Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton, 1985), 149-150.

<sup>104</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 1-6.

<sup>105</sup> Bar, ‘Rural Monasticism’, 60-65.

<sup>106</sup> For more information on Origen, his teachings and his followers, see: Mark Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church* (Oxford, 2009), 64-68, 79-103.

<sup>107</sup> Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, Chapter 20. In Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 8.

<sup>108</sup> Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, Chapter 20. In Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 9.

Sabas was sent to the imperial court with a mission with both local and empire-wide implications: to ask the Emperor to grant a number of wishes and benefits to the Jerusalemite church as well as a plea to combat heresy in the empire. The monks and the patriarchs of Jerusalem were supporters of orthodoxy and the Chalcedonian creed, which made them the natural opponents of Origenism: a movement which in those centuries tried to gain a foothold in the Holy Land. Apart from the ideological and intrinsic motivation that drove the patriarchs and monks, there was also a more practical aspect: the hordes of pilgrims that visited Jerusalem each year could be affected and led away from the true faith by Origenists. Any dispute of faith could lead to a lasting schism in the Holy City, perhaps one that would scare away the pilgrims and immigrants thus lessening Jerusalem's power and influence.<sup>109</sup> In the following quotation we see Cyril's perspective on the event:

“... In return for these considerable benefits, I feel assured that God will add to your empire Africa, Rome, and all that other territory which your predecessor Honorius has lost. In order to achieve this result, you must get rid of the heresies of Arius, Nestorius, and Origen and also deliver Constantinople and its church from their teaching. ... He added the pernicious heresy of Origenism in his rejection of the above-named heresies because one monk who had accompanied Sabas, a Byzantine by birth, Leontinus, was one of the monks admitted by Nonnus into the New Lavra after the death of the higomen, Agepatus. Leontinus held the doctrines of Origen. Although Leontinus pretended to espouse the teaching of Chalcedon, his Origenist sentiments were apparent. ... Our emperor honoured all Sabas' demands without delay.”<sup>110</sup>

The identity of the above-mentioned 'Leontinus' has been a matter of debate.<sup>111</sup> A lavra is a type of monastery of which there were many in Palestine in these centuries, famous examples are the Great Lavra, founded by Sabas, and the New Lavra whose monks were at some point influenced by Origenism, we will return to the importance of this later in this research. According to David Sheldon Barry, the close connection between the diocese and

---

<sup>109</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 138.

<sup>110</sup> Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, Chapter 20. In Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 10-11.

<sup>111</sup> In this instance, it is most likely that 'Leontinus' refers to Leontinus of Byzantium (485-543), and not Leontinus of Jerusalem. For the discussion on the identity of Leontius, see: Marcel Richard, 'Léonce de Jérusalem et Léonce de Byzance' in *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 1 (1944), here 35–88. Richard was the first to claim, contrary to longstanding belief, that there were in fact two theologians by the name of Leontinus in the time of Emperor Justinian. Dirk Krausmüller, 'Leontius of Jerusalem, a Theologian of the Seventh Century' in *Journal of Theological Studies* 52 (2001), here 637–657. Carlo Dell'Osso, 'Leonzio di Bisanzio e Leonzio di Gerusalemme: Una Chiara Distinzione', *Augustinianum* 46 (2006), here 231–259. Modern historiography has criticised Richard regarding his estimated dating of the life of Leontinus of Jerusalem, Krausmüller and Dell'Osso believe he lived several decades later. Brian Daley, *Leontius of Byzantium: Complete Works* (Oxford, 2017). Daley is sceptical because the *corpus leontianum* does not hold any Origenist views; thereby questioning whether there might be a third 'Leontinus' in play.

monasteries in Palestine was important and noteworthy, especially when compared to the situation in monophysite Alexandria, where such a liaison did not exist.<sup>112</sup>

### **Synods of Jerusalem**

The cooperation between the Emperor and the See of Jerusalem can be observed through the use of local synods in the Holy City. Two Jerusalemite synods were held: once under Emperor Justin (450-527) in 518 CE and the second in 533 CE under Emperor Justinian.<sup>113</sup> In both instances, the synods were held to support the Orthodox cause and wipe out heresy.<sup>114</sup> In these synods, we can see the cooperation between the Emperor, the Patriarch, and the monastic community of Palestine.<sup>115</sup> The Jerusalemite synod of 518 is featured in Cyril of Scythopolis' *Vita Saba* and he describes the collaboration between imperial, ecclesiastical and monastic that took place. In the fragment below we see how the abbot Sabas, according to Cyril of Scythopolis, is ordered by the Patriarch to travel to Constantinople to make a plea to Emperor Justin for tax benefits and to oppose heresy, especially in his own capital.

“After Anastasius died in this manner, Justin immediately gained the throne and ordained in legal promulgations... that Chalcedon be inscribed in the diptychs. When the orders of Emperor Justin arrived in Jerusalem, a multitude of monks and clerics was assembled. Saint Sabas and the bishops gathered together in this synod August 6, and in their presence, the reading of the imperial orders was carried out... Furthermore, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, John persuaded Sabas... to publicize the imperial decrees... in Caesarea and Scythopolis.”<sup>116</sup>

The fragment above clearly shows how the Patriarch of Jerusalem employed monks to carry out imperial wishes for the Orthodox cause. Caesarea in this context refers to Caesarea Martina and Scythopolis to the historic metropolis, in modern-day Beth Shean. The source indicates that the abbot Sabas was used by the Patriarch to carry out for the second time imperial wishes to further the Orthodox cause in Palestine.<sup>117</sup> Sabas was thus tasked with spreading the dogmatic pronouncements of the imperial decrees in Palestine.

Another illustration of the imperial, patriarchal and monastic cooperation happens 35 years after the Jerusalemite synod, in 533 CE, when Justinian saw himself forced to convene the Fifth Ecumenical Council, also known as the Second Council of Constantinople. The Fifth

---

<sup>112</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 19.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibidem*, 56.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>116</sup> Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, Chapter 60. In Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 56-57.

<sup>117</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 59.

Council turned into a big victory for this coalition, one that Cyril describes as “the end of the war against orthodoxy.”<sup>118</sup> According to Dvornik, Justinian was forced to do so after his condemnation of the Three Chapters, “his most glaring intrusion into theology” Dvornik states, had generated widespread criticism because he had done so without convoking a synod to seek advice from his bishops.<sup>119</sup> Justinian convened the Council and packed it with his appointed anti-Origenist bishops, and Patriarch Euthychius of Constantinople (512-582) presided over it. At this council, at the request of Sabas and a retinue of monks from Palestine, Justinian reiterated his earlier condemnation of Origen which dated from 543 CE and contained ten anathemas, or curses.<sup>120</sup> All Eastern patriarchs were present while Pope Vigilius refused to attend, even though he was present in Constantinople, where he sat out the war that was raging in Italy with the Ostrogoths (the Gothic War of 535-554).<sup>121</sup> In the end, both Vigilius and the theology of Origen were condemned as well as some others, irrelevant to our research, whose Christological writings were found to be heretical.<sup>122</sup> Cyril of Scythopolis narrates the events of the Fifth Ecumenical Council in the *Vita Sabae* as follows:

“When the Holy Fifth Ecumenical Council was convened at Constantinople in the presence of the four patriarchs and their approval Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia were struck down by a common and Catholic anathema. ... Which all bishops of Palestine had confirmed and sanctioned by mouth and signature, except Alexander, bishop of Avila, who, for this reason, was deposed from his seat.... The Neo-laurites separated themselves from the Catholic community. Patriarch Eustochius... when he did not convince them to have fellowship with the Catholic church, by royal decrees through Dux Anastasius he drove them from the New Lavra and freed the entire province from their filth. ... We took possession of the New Lavra, February 21, of the second indiction, the 23<sup>rd</sup> year after the death of Sabas. And this ended the war against orthodoxy.”<sup>123</sup>

Following the condemnation of their theology at the council, Origenist monks were expelled and driven out of Jerusalem and the countryside by loyal monks, after attempts at reconciliation had failed.<sup>124</sup> These monks were replaced by loyal monks, coming from the Grand Lavra. Moreover, Patriarch Eustochius of Jerusalem (in office 552-564) ordained a

---

<sup>118</sup> Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, Chapter 91. In Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 153.

<sup>119</sup> Dvornik, *Emperors, Popes and General Councils*, 21.

<sup>120</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 154, 158.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibidem*, 154.

<sup>122</sup> Meyendorff, ‘Justinian, The Empire and the Church’, 58-59. Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 154.

<sup>123</sup> Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, Chapter 91. In Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 152-153.

<sup>124</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 155.

member of the imperial guard as higomen of the New Lavra. The patriarchs of Jerusalem considered it their political goal to eliminate the Origenist forces, and to this end, they encouraged the doctrinal activity of councils.<sup>125</sup>

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter, we have considered Cyril of Scythopolis' hagiography in order to find out more about the situation in fifth and sixth century Palestine. This would, in turn, help us establish an idea regarding our main research question.

Several aspects which gave Jerusalem a special, or simply slightly different, position compared to the other four sees of the Pentarchy. The first of which was the vast amounts of pilgrims which travelled to the Holy City. They were in turn influenced by Jerusalemite liturgy, which, carried in the memories of pilgrims travelling home, had a great reach and often served as exemplary.

In and around Jerusalem, a large monastic community was established, partially by the great number of pilgrims from which the monasteries recruited many. Many of these monks were staunch supporters of Chalcedon, as was the Patriarchs, and they collaborated in their efforts to drive out heretical forces. This cooperation between the Patriarch and the monastic community gave the See of Jerusalem more influence than sees who did not enjoy such relations.

The Byzantine emperors often relied on the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, as has been shown in the last segment of this chapter. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem also had good relations with the emperor and they were tasked with leading the fight against heresy on several occasions.

---

<sup>125</sup> Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, 163.

## Chapter 4, The letters of Pope Gregory the Great

Pope Gregory's *registrum* is an extraordinary historical source and it will be the focus of this chapter. In this chapter, we will take a closer look at two groups of Gregory's letters. The first group are the letters Gregory sent to Jerusalem (letters 1.24, 7.29 and 8.6), the second group are the letters that Gregory sent regarding the dispute on the ecumenical council (letters 5.37, 5.41, 5.44, 7.24, 7.30). As has been stated in the main introduction, Gregory did not send a letter to Patriarch Amos of Jerusalem to ask for his opinion or his support in fighting the use of the ecumenical title by the patriarch of Constantinople, John the Faster. He did, however, send three letters to Jerusalem on separate, other occasions and we will discuss these before we move on to the analyse the letters that Gregory did send on that topic. Before we look at Gregory's letters, we will discuss the development of the use of the title 'ecumenical patriarch'. How did the title come into being, how did its use evolve and how did Gregory's predecessors react to this? The main question we ask in this chapter is as follows: What do Gregory's letters to Jerusalem tell us about the dispute on the ecumenical title?

It is important to keep in mind the difficulties that arise in doing historical research in the early medieval period. Not all of Gregory's letters have survived the ages and that it is impossible to know for sure how many letters have been lost; Martyn's translation includes over 850 letters, some academics claim he may have sent a grand total of 25.000 during his papacy.<sup>126</sup> This thesis presumes that Gregory did not write a letter to Patriarch Amos and ignored him in this dispute, though it is possible that this letter has simply been lost at some point; perhaps it was deemed unworthy of being copied. This research also has to note that Gregory's correspondence has only been saved one-dimensionally, almost all letters addressed to Gregory have been lost; we will therefore only analyse Gregory's point of view in this affair. The last point of attention is the fact that in this chapter, this research heavily depends on the letters of Gregory for information, because our knowledge of some of his addressees, including Patriarch Amos, is very limited; for example, almost none of the patriarchs of Jerusalem in office during the fifth and sixth century can be found in *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* by J.R. Martindale.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Martyn, *Letters of Gregory*, 10. Demacopoulos, 'Gregory the Great', 605.

<sup>127</sup> J.R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire; Vol. II A.D. 395-527* (Cambridge, 1980).

## **The ecumenical title before Gregory the Great**

The first to be called ‘ecumenical patriarch’ is Patriarch Dioscorus of Alexandria at the ‘Robber Synod’ in 449 CE.<sup>128</sup> At the Council of Chalcedon two years later, Dioscorus was deposed, and at that same council, Pope Leo was honoured by this title.<sup>129</sup> After that, it is also known that both Pope Hormisdas (450-523) and Pope Agapitus I (487-536) were honoured in this fashion.<sup>130</sup> In sixth-century Constantinople, the title had been in use since it was given to Patriarch John II the Cappadocian (in office 518-520) and was passed on to his successors: Epiphanius (in office 520-535), Anthimus I (in office 535-536) and Menas (in office 536-552).<sup>131</sup> These successors were called ‘Ecumenical Patriarch’ in Justinian’s Novels which were directed at them specifically.<sup>132</sup> When Pope Gregory raises the issue of the title for the first time in 595 CE, it had already been in use for almost a 150 years and had been applied to honour many different prelates from three different Sees, including Rome. Demacopoulos states that it may be the case that Rome was unaware of the use of this title in Constantinople before 580 CE, but that it had been in use there since at least 518 CE when it was used to honour Patriarch John II of Constantinople.<sup>133</sup> After 580 CE, news of the use of this title reached Rome when Pelagius II (in office 579-590) received a letter from Patriarch John IV the Faster which included the title as part of his signature.<sup>134</sup> The use of this title infuriated Pelagius and he ordered his legate in Constantinople to break off communion with the Patriarch until he ceased using the title.<sup>135</sup>

## **First series of letters on the ecumenical title: 595 CE**

In the next paragraphs, Gregory’s letters sent on the subject of the ecumenical title will be analysed. These fall into broadly two categories: the first group Gregory sent in 595 CE, and the second group he sent in 597.<sup>136</sup> When we look at the dates on which these letters were sent, it becomes obvious that Gregory wrote and sent these letters in batches, often writing letters to all the key players involved; Emperor Maurice and the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria. As has been stated above earlier, Gregory did not include any veiled or explicit criticism of the use of the title in his synodical letter, which begs the question, why did he start this debate in 595 CE?

---

<sup>128</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 79.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibidem*, 79-80.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibidem*, 80.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>132</sup> Justinian Code Novels 3, 5, 6, 7, 16, 42, 55, 56, 77.

<sup>133</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 602.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibidem*, 603.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>136</sup> The first wave of letters are 5.37, 5.39, 5.41, 5.44 5.45, the second wave are 6.61, 7.4,7.5, 7.24, 7.30.

Although Gregory's main cause for starting the dispute is the use of the title itself, a couple of deeper lying causes should be noted. There was a growing dissatisfaction in Italy and the papal court about their position within the Byzantine Empire.<sup>137</sup> Decades of famine and war with Gothic and Lombard forces had reaped their toll and Italy was ravaged and depleted.<sup>138</sup> When Gregory, in a last bid to save Rome from being sacked, made a peace agreement with the Lombards using church funds, he found himself heavily criticized by the Exarch in Ravenna and Emperor Maurice himself.<sup>139</sup> Added to this, was the fact that Constantinople, with imperial approval, had denied Rome's jurisdiction in the Balkans by installing their own candidate for a bishopric seat in Salano, modern-day Croatia.<sup>140</sup> These transgressions taught Gregory that both the imperial court as well as the Patriarch of Constantinople had little respect for Roman sovereignty or their suffering which, according to Demacopoulos, prompted him to write the next series of letters.<sup>141</sup>

In Gregory's letters, three distinct arguments are laid out and repeated and each party is admonished to protest or cease, the use of the title for a different reason. In letter 5.35, dated June 1 595 CE, addressed to Emperor Maurice, Gregory emphasises that the issue is not merely ecclesiastical, but political, because the use of the title threatens the stability in the empire and even challenges the Emperor's authority.<sup>142</sup> The letter states the following:

“But because it is not my cause, but that of God, and because not only I but the whole Church is torn apart, because holy laws, because a venerable synod, because even the very commands of our Lord Jesus Christ are torn apart by the invention of some arrogant and pompous talk, let our most pious Lordship cut the seat of the wound and bind the sick man with bonds of your august authority if he resists. ... That man, therefore, should be persuaded all the more by the command of our most pious Lordship, as he refuses to show obedience to canon laws. That man should be restraint. For he does injury to the holy, universal Church, is proud in his heart, seeks to rejoice in the title of singularity and through his private title, places himself above the honor even of your empire.”<sup>143</sup>

The quotation above does not feature the title explicitly, but it is referred to as ‘arrogant and pompous talk’. Gregory saw in the use of the title a sign of vanity and pride;

---

<sup>137</sup> Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 62-63.

<sup>138</sup> Chris Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society 400-1000* (Hong Kong, 1981), 22.

<sup>139</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 606-607. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World*, 91-94. Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 62-65.

<sup>140</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 607.

<sup>141</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>142</sup> Ibidem, 608.

<sup>143</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 5.37*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).



characteristics which Gregory detested.<sup>144</sup> This line of reasoning constitutes the bulk of the argument Gregory sends to Patriarch IV of Constantinople, the proverbial ‘culprit’ in Gregory’s eyes. In his letter to him, Gregory admonishes him for his sinful pride in the opening statements of his letter addressed to him:

“At that time when your Fraternity was promoted to the rank of bishop, you remember how much peace and concord you found in the churches. But with what daring or what pride I know not, you have tried to seize a new title for yourself, which could have offended the hearts of all of your brethren. In this matter I am extremely surprised, as I remember that you wanted to run away, to avoid being promoted to the rank of bishop. And yet, after obtaining it, you desire to carry it out in such a way as if you had run to it with ambitious desire. For you who confessed that you are unworthy of being called a bishop, have at some time reached a stage where you despise your brethren, and seek to be called the one and only bishop.”<sup>145</sup>

The fragment above shows perfectly how agitated Gregory is by John’s use of the title, as well as how Gregory sees the use of the title: as a statement claiming supremacy within the imperial church. This is also exactly what Gregory warns his fellow patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch for when he writes to them simultaneously. In his letter, letter 5.41, addressed to both Patriarch Eulogius I of Alexandria (581-608) and Patriarch Anastasius I of Antioch (in office 561-571 and 594-599), Gregory argues that the ecumenical title undermines their own episcopal authority. This reasoning can be illustrated by this passage:

“For as your Holiness, so venerable to me, is well aware, this title of universal bishop was offered through the holy synod of Chalcedon [451 CE] to the pontiff of the apostolic see [Pope Leo I the Great], which I serve as directed by God. But none of my predecessors has ever consented to use this most profane title, because of course if one patriarch is called universal, the title is diminished for the rest of the patriarchs.”<sup>146</sup>

This quotation also shows why it is so peculiar that Patriarch Amos did not receive a letter simultaneously, and also why it is plausible to believe he indeed never received one as opposed to that letter being lost in later times. If the letter to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, had been sent to Jerusalem as well, Patriarch Amos would have been included in the heading as well and we would have known of its existence even if the original letter or later copies have been lost. This is interesting, because if the status of the patriarchal title is

---

<sup>144</sup> Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World*, 92.

<sup>145</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 5.44*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>146</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 5.41*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

diminished, surely that would have consequences for the Patriarch of Jerusalem as well. Based on the primary sources available, we can, therefore, conclude that Gregory made an explicit choice not writing to the See of Jerusalem.

### **Second series of letters: 596-7 CE**

The initial response to Gregory's letters was very disappointing for the papal court; the Oriental Patriarchs did not take offence to the use of the title the way Rome did; they saw it as either an empty title or a representation of Constantinople's power within its own territory.<sup>147</sup> Tired of waiting, Gregory upped the ante and sent a second series of letters in order to combat the use of the title by the Patriarch of Constantinople. The first letter he writes dates from July 596 CE and is addressed to Patriarch Eulogius of Alexandria, who did not even bother writing back to Gregory. Gregory expresses his frustration by reminding Eulogius of their Sees special relationship thereby pushing him to act in this dispute. This can be illustrated by the following quotation:

“There is something that binds us in a unique way to the Alexandrian Church and compels us in a special way to love it. For as everyone knows, the blessed Evangelist Mark was sent to Alexandria by his teacher Peter; and so we are bound by this unity of teacher and disciple to the extent that it appears that I am to preside over the see of the disciple in accord with [my relationship to] the teacher, and you are to preside over the see of the master in accordance with [your relationship to] the disciple.”<sup>148</sup>

In October of that same year, Gregory wrote to John IV's successor, Patriarch Cyriacus of Constantinople (in office 596-606). In this letter, a reaction to Cyriacus' synodical letter, he urges the Patriarch not to repeat the same mistake his predecessor made.

“... But I pray that almighty God may multiply the same love that exists between us, through the gift of his grace, and may remove and chance of offense, so that the Holy Church, united by the confession of true faith and brought close together with the joined hearts of the faithful, should not suffer any damage (Heaven forbid!), from disagreement between priests. For all that I speak about, for all that I refute the proud actions of certain men, ...”<sup>149</sup>

Together with the previous letter, Gregory also sent a letter to seven Greek bishops in preparation for a local synod, in which he instructed them to deny the legality of the synod if

---

<sup>147</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 80.

<sup>148</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 6.61*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>149</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 7.4*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

the Patriarch of Constantinople used the ecumenical title.<sup>150</sup> After a couple months that showed no signs of progress Gregory sent out a last batch of letters.<sup>151</sup> One letter he sent to Emperor Maurice, and it shows signs of his growing desperation.<sup>152</sup> It is dated to June 597 and in this letter, he says that any priest who calls himself the universal priest “anticipates the Antichrist in his pride”.<sup>153</sup> Another letter, sent to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, states the following:

“There certainly is a dispute between him [Cyriacus] and us, as your Beatitudes know, because of his use of a profane title. ... For, with a profane title, he has either committed or is practising the sin of arrogance. ... But I was keen to warn that same brother that, if he fails to correct this fault, he will in no way have peace with us.”<sup>154</sup>

Interestingly, Gregory insists on using the plural ‘we’ when describing his dispute with Cyriacus of Constantinople, even though the other patriarchs don’t show any sign of frustration or objection the way Gregory does. Perhaps this united front, as Gregory describes it, constitutes Jerusalem as well, as a silent partner whose assistance is without question.

In the last letter on the topic of the title that we will discuss, letter 7.37, we can clearly see Gregory’s increasing emphasis on the apostolicity of the See of Rome, but also Alexandria and Antioch. Constantinople did not have apostolic foundation, the invention of St. Andrew as apostolic founder would only start a century later.<sup>155</sup> This emphasis was according to Demacopoulos, a calculated attack on Constantinople, whose authority came from civic and imperial factors, not apostolic foundation.<sup>156</sup> By hammering on the shared connection enjoyed by Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, Gregory hoped to draw them into his corner. Rome’s connection to Peter is, of course, presented as being stronger than Antioch’s, and Alexandria is connected through its apostolic founder, Peter’s disciple Mark.

“Therefore, while there are many apostles with respect to preeminence, the see of the Prince of the Apostles has alone become valid in authority, which, in three, is unified as one. For [Peter] exalted the see in which he deigned to rest and complete the present life [i.e., Rome]; he adorned the see to which he sent his disciple, the Evangelist [i.e.,

---

<sup>150</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 7.7*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>151</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 7.29, 7.30, 7.31*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>152</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 613-614.

<sup>153</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 7.30*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>154</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 7.31*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>155</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 613-614.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibidem*.

Alexandria]; and he established the see in which he sat for seven years, though he would eventually leave it [i.e., Antioch].”<sup>157</sup>

## Letters to Jerusalem

It is now time to look into the letters of Gregory himself, in search of a clue that will help establish why he did not write to Patriarch Amos of Jerusalem about the ecumenical title. In this next segment, we will look into the letters that Gregory sent to Jerusalem. The first one Gregory sent to Jerusalem, was Gregory’s synodical letter which dates from February 591 CE.<sup>158</sup> It had become customary for patriarchs, upon their election to office, to send a letter with a profession of faith which would be a guarantee of the writers’ orthodoxy.<sup>159</sup> Patriarch John IV of Jerusalem (575-594), Patriarch Amos’ predecessor received this letter. This is one of the first letters Gregory sent and it does not include his anger over the ecumenical title in any way; he would start this debate four years later. Demacopoulos explains this delay by pointing at the fact that Gregory had spent years in Constantinople and may have cultivated a friendship with Patriarch John of Constantinople, therefore suspending his judgement on the title.<sup>160</sup> Important to note about this synodical letter, is that in his exordium, Gregory addresses the patriarchs in order of the traditional hierarchy Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and then Jerusalem. Gregory greeted patriarch John of Constantinople first and in doing so acknowledged his seniority.<sup>161</sup>

The second letter was to an abbot called Anastasius, in June 597.<sup>162</sup> The title of the letter in the translation states that Anastasius was a priest, but from the letter itself, we learn that he is ‘in command’ of the Neas Monastery, also known as the New Lavra which featured briefly in the third chapter. From this letter, it becomes clear that Gregory acted as an arbiter in a dispute between Anastasius and Patriarch Amos. Gregory makes a comparison between their disagreement, and the events that transpired earlier in the sixth century: “But quarrels between the father of the same monastery [i.e. the New Lavra] and the pastor of the church of Jerusalem have always tended to arise.”<sup>163</sup> Gregory urges them to cease their hostilities: “I say this, dearest brother, because I love both of you greatly, and I am very much afraid that the sacrifices of your prayers may be polluted by some dissension between the two of you.”<sup>164</sup> It

---

<sup>157</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 7.37*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>158</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 1.24*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>159</sup> Martyn, *Letters of Gregory vol. I*, 135.

<sup>160</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 604.

<sup>161</sup> Demacopoulos, ‘Gregory the Great’, 604. Richards, *Consul of God*, 217.

<sup>162</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letters, 7.29*. trans. by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>163</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>164</sup> Ibidem.

is possible that after the Fifth Ecumenical council of 553 CE, after which the Origenist monks were driven from the New Lavra, some form of heretical resistance remained or was reignited.

The third letter that Gregory send to Jerusalem was addressed to Patriarch Amos, though it had a different subject. This letter, number 8.6 sent in November 597 does not mention the dispute on the ecumenical title in any way; it is a request to keep an eye out for an acolyte who is ordered to be returned to Rome for abandoning his post in Constantinople.<sup>165</sup> The letter opens with the following statement:

“We are confident that your Fraternity readily accepts the statutes of the canons and the vigor of Church discipline, and yet, so that the falsehood of one of our clerics should not be able to induce you to avoid the strictness of ecclesiastical order, we have taken care to indicate his Fault to your Holiness. Thus, through your concern, he should be submitted to the discipline from which he has fled. For we have found out that an acolyte, Peter, whom we had made servant to our most beloved son and deacon, Sabinian, who gives, the church’s responses in the royal city, has run away and come to your church, If this is true, let your Fraternity be keen to keep him secure, and send him back here, when an opportunity is found.”<sup>166</sup>

From this passage, several observations can be made. Gregory’s emphasis on obeying the canons may be a reference to his struggle with Abbot Anastasius concerning the heretical activities in the New Lavra Gregory wrote about in the previously discussed letter.<sup>167</sup> The ‘ecclesiastical order’ Gregory refers to, remains somewhat of a mystery. It could be a reference to the pentarchy, which one could rightfully call an ecclesiastical order, but the letter gives us no conclusive evidence to know this for sure.

The point of these three letters is to show that although Gregory did not send a letter to Amos regarding his dispute, he did send several letters to Jerusalem, both in a general fashion, but also showing an in-depth knowledge of the situation in and around Jerusalem. Gregory points to struggles with heretical monks, about which he said he was asked to arbitrate. This could point to the possibility that Patriarch Amos may not have been firmly in the saddle.

---

<sup>165</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letters*, 8.6. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

<sup>166</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letters*, 8.6. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004). Important to note is that this translations differs slightly from the –significantly older- translation of Phillip Schaff in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series II Volume 12* (Grand Rapids, 1894), 233. That version translated: “...one of your clerics...” instead of “our”. This difference in translation changes the possession of the man in question, which could be interesting. Nonetheless, this research opted to follow the most recent translation.

<sup>167</sup> Gregory the Great, *Letter 7.29*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn (2004).

## Conclusion

In the end, Gregory achieved nothing in his bid to stop the Patriarch of Constantinople from using the title. It seems that Gregory was unwilling to cause too much trouble over the title, and wanted to avoid a schism at any rate, regardless of his growing frustration with the imperial court.<sup>168</sup> It was only Emperor Phocas (in office 602-610) who, shaken by the tumult that had arisen because of the title, that acted and sent out a decree in 607 CE, the *Liber Potificalis*.<sup>169</sup> In this decree, he redefined, in vague terms, the status of the Sees of Rome and Constantinople, stating that Rome was the head of all the churches.<sup>170</sup>

It seems that however many batches of letters Gregory writes, he seems to forget about the existence of the See of Jerusalem completely, although it also seems Gregory could have used his help quite obviously. Why, with his back against the wall and unwilling to break the otherwise stable relationship with the Oriental Sees and imperial court, did Gregory not write to Patriarch Amos? It is possible that the patriarch of Jerusalem had his hands tied or his authority questioned by the heretical elements in the monasteries of the Palestinian desert perhaps making him unable to assist the pope in this dispute.

Important is, is that Pope Gregory did not forget about Patriarch Amos but made a conscious decision not to seek his help or advise. This statement can be underscored when we take into account the fact that the letter he sent to the abbot Anastasius, letter 7.29, is followed by letter 7.30 which he sent to Emperor Maurice about the dispute. Although the first is dated in June and the letter to Maurice is dated in August, and plenty of other letters sent in between may have been lost, that still means that the Patriarch of Jerusalem was in his mind that summer, although not as a possible ally in the fight against the ecumenical title.

---

<sup>168</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 80. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World*, 91-94. Demacopoulos, 'Gregory the Great', 613-614.

<sup>169</sup> Dvornik, *Byzantium*, 80.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibidem*, 81.

## Conclusion

In the research above, an overview has been presented of the development of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and power of both Rome and Jerusalem, the contextual history of Palestine in the fifth and sixth century and the letters of Pope Gregory. This has been done with the intent: to show the developments and evolutions that helped shape the context in which the dispute on the ecumenical title took place. This conclusion will start with a short recapitulation of the chapters, one by one, and will then move on to focus on the results of this research.

In the first chapter, we have analysed the canons of the Ecumenical Councils in order to show the development of the position of both Rome and Jerusalem within the hierarchy of the Church. This has shown that Roman primacy within this structure changed in the sense that..... We also see the emergence of the See of Jerusalem, being elevated in honour first in Nicaea in 325 CE and later in Chalcedon in 451. This has greatly added to their strength and influence within the context of the administration of the Church. The hierarchy that developed in these councils dictated that Rome held the first position followed by Constantinople, who was second since it was new Rome, followed by Alexandria and Antioch and finally Jerusalem.

In the second chapter, we considered the continuation of the development of ecclesiastical administration a century later, in the Codex Justinianus. The emperor's role in the church was discussed as well as the laws in which the Pentarchy was codified. Here we saw that Rome still held their primacy in honour as the head of all churches, and Jerusalem again ranked last in the hierarchy.

The third chapter analysed the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the fifth and sixth century when it saw itself having to fight against Origenist intrusions which threatened to envelop Palestine. Different aspects of Jerusalem's power were discussed, such as the hordes of pilgrims and the collaboration of the patriarchs with both the monks and the emperors. This chapter added an in-depth knowledge of the situation in Palestine preceding the period of which we have next to no primary source material.

The final chapter focussed on Gregory's letters. The relevant letters were divided into two groups and analysed according to their topic: on the ecumenical dispute or on other occasions. Based on the chronology of the letters and their headings we learned that Gregory, for unspecified reasons, purposefully chose to ignore Patriarch Amos.

The research above has a wide scope, going all the way back to the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE. The expansion of the scope was justified and even a necessity due to the relative lack of sources on Patriarch Amos or the Patriarchate of Jerusalem at the end of the sixth century in general. This has helped us understand the complex situations and circumstances beyond the immediate context of Gregory's letters. The main objective was to answer the research question; How was the relationship between Gregory I the Great and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem from the fourth to the sixth century and why was Patriarch Amos not involved in the dispute over the ecumenical title?

Based on the research of the chapters described above, this thesis has come to the following conclusions which are non-exclusive from each other; both scenarios can be considered as explanations by themselves as well as combined. Both explanations contain a relatively high measure of speculation, which, again, is due to the scarcity of information and sources.

The first explanation bases itself on Gregory's focus on apostolicity in his letters X X and 7.37. In these letters he tries to draw the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch into his corner by reminding them of their common founding father, the apostle Peter; in Alexandria's case, the fact that Mark is Peter's disciple is stressed. Together, strengthened by their shared foundation, these three Patriarchs could turn on Patriarch John of Constantinople and force him to relinquish his use of the ecumenical title, or so Gregory thought. Jerusalem lacked this Petrine foundation, as did Constantinople. Gregory's focus on strengthening his bonds with Alexandria and Antioch meant that Amos of Jerusalem was deemed unnecessary or redundant in this dispute and was thus overlooked by Gregory.

The second explanation is based on the struggles between the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and the Originists in Palestine as described by Cyril of Scythopolis. Although the source states that the "war on Orthodoxy had ended" in 553 CE following the Fifth Ecumenical Council, this thesis considers the possibility that these struggles were far from over. This statement can be backed up by one of Gregory's few letters to Jerusalem, specifically the letter to the abbot Anastasius of the New Lavra, written on the topic of heretical elements in his monastery and to settle Anastasius' differences with Patriarch Amos. It is possible that these heretical elements point to a situation comparable with the struggles Cyril had described in his hagiography. This intrusion of heresy, whether continuous or renewed, combined with bad relations with certain abbots in Palestine, weakened the position of the Patriarch of Jerusalem to such a degree that Gregory burdened him only with fetching runaway acolytes



(letter 8.6) instead of involving him in a dispute with the rest of the Pentarchy and the emperor over a title.

This research holds the conviction that Gregory either deemed Jerusalem superfluous in his dispute with John of Constantinople because of his focus on shared Petrine apostolicity, or the Jerusalem Patriarchate was in no position to engage in the dispute because it's Patriarch was preoccupied in domestic struggles with heresy. It is possible that the second scenario may have forced Gregory's hand to focus on Alexandria and Antioch for support since he had to do without the support of Jerusalem and was left with the only other two patriarchates who might help him oppose John's use of the ecumenical title. In this sense, the two stated explanations are linked.

Lastly, reflecting on the process which led to this paper, this research would like to express a degree of understanding as to why the question on the position of Patriarch Amos in the ecumenical dispute has never been considered in writing. The question as to why Patriarch Amos did not receive a letter from Gregory is a difficult question, albeit an interesting one. The amount of source material limits our factual knowledge of the period severely, making all possible explanations a product of at least a degree of speculation. Having said that, it is obvious that not all researches and academic ventures can produce ground-breaking results. What has been achieved here, however, is an overview which led to two explanations which are at least partially grounded in the available primary sources.

## Appendix 1: Byzantine Emperors and Patriarchs of the Pentarchy

### Byzantine Emperors

Constantine I the Great	324 - 337
Constantius II	337 - 361
Julian	361 - 363
Jovian	363 - 364
Valens	364 - 378
Theodosius I	379 - 395
Arcadius)	395 - 408
Theodosius II	408 - 450
Marcian	450 - 457
Leo I	457 - 474
Leo II	474
Zeno	474 - 475
Basiliscus	475 - 476
Zeno	476 - 491 (restored)
Anastasius I	491 - 518
Justin I	518 - 527
Justinian I the Great	527 - 565
Justin II	565 - 578
Tiberios II	578 - 582
Maurice	582 - 602
Phokas (Phocas) I	602 - 610

### Patriarchs of Rome

Sylvester I	314 - 335 –Archbishop-
Marcus	336
Julius I	337 - 352
Liberius	352 - 366
Damasus I	366 - 384
Siricius	384 - 399
Anastasius I	399 - 401
Innocent I	401 - 417
Zosimus	417 - 418
Boniface I	418 - 422
Celestine I	422 - 432
Sixtus III	432 - 440
Leo I the Great	440 - 461 –Patriarch-
Hilarius	461 - 468
Simplicius	468 - 483
Felix III (II)	483 - 492
Gelasius I	492 - 496
Anastasius II	496 - 498
Symmachus	498 - 514
Hormisdas	514 - 523
John I	523 - 526
Felix IV (III)	526 - 530
Boniface II	530 - 532
John II	533 - 535

Agapetus I	535 - 536
Silverius	536 - 537
Vigilius	537 - 555
Pelagius I	556 - 561
John III	561 - 574
Benedict I	575 - 579
Pelagius II	579 - 590
Gregory I (the Great)	590 - 604
Sabinian	604 - 606
Boniface III	607
Boniface IV	608 - 615

### **Patriarchs of Constantinople**

Alexander	314 - 337 –Bishop-
Paul I the Confessor	337 - 339 –Archbishop-
Eusebius of Nicomedia	339 - 341
Paul I	341 - 342 (restored 1st time)
Macedonius I	342 - 346
Paul I	346 - 350 (restored 2nd time)
Macedonius I	351 - 360 (restored)
Eudoxius of Antioch	360 - 370
Demophilus	370 - 380
Evagrius	379
Maximus I	380
Gregory I of Nazianzus	380 - 381
Nectarius	381 - 397
John Chrysostom	398 - 404
Arsacius of Tarsus	404 - 405
Atticus	406 - 425
Sisinnius I	426 - 427
Nestorius	428 - 431
Maximianus	431 - 434
Proclus	434 - 446
Flavian I	446 - 449
Anatolius	449 - 458 –Patriarch-
Gennadius I	458 - 471
Acacius	471 - 488
Fravitta (Flavian II)	488 - 489
Euphemius	489 - 495
Macedonius II	495 - 511
Timothy I	511 - 518
John II the Cappadocian	518 - 520
Epiphanius	520 - 535
Anthimus I	535 - 536
Menas	536 - 552
Euty chius	552 - 565
John III Scholasticus	565 - 577
Euty chius	577 - 582 (restored)
John IV the Faster	582 - 595
Cyriacus	596 - 606

### **Patriarchs of Alexandria**

Alexander I	313 - 326 –Archbishop-
vacant	326 - 328
Athanasius I	328 - 339
Gregory of Cappadocia	339 - 346
Athanasius I	346 - 373 (restored)
Peter II	373 - 380
Lucius of Alexandria	373 - 377
Timothy I	380 - 385
Theophilus I	385 - 412
Cyril I	412 - 444
Dioscorus I	444 - 451
Proterius	451 – 457 -Patriarch-
vacant	457 - 460
Timothy III Salophakiolos	460 - 475
vacant	475 - 477
Timothy III Salophakiolos	477 - 482 (restored)
John I Talaias	482
vacant	482 - 536
Gainas	536 - 537
Paul	537 - 542
Zoilus	542 - 551
Apollinarius	551 - 569
John IV	569 - 579
vacant	579 - 581
Eulogius I	581 - 608
Theodore I	608 - 610

### **Patriarchs of Antioch**

Meletius	360 - 361 –Archbishop-
-Meletian Schism-	361 - 417
Theodotus	417 - 428
John I	428 - 442
Domnus II	442 - 449
Maximus II	449 - 455 –Patriarch-
Basil of Antioch	456 - 458
Acacius of Antioch	458 - 461
Martyrius	461 - 469
Peter the Fuller	469 - 471
Julian	471 - 476
Peter the Fuller	476
John II Codonatus	476 - 477
Stephen II of Antioch	477 - 479
Calendion	479 - 485
Peter the Fuller	485 - 488
Palladius	488 - 498
Flavian II	498 - 512
Severus	512 - 518
Paul the Jew	518 - 521

Euphrasius	521 - 526
Ephraim of Amid	526 - 546
Domnus III	546 - 561
Anastasius I of Antioch	561 - 571
Gregory	571 - 594
Anastasius I of Antioch	594 - 599 (restored)
Anastasius II	599 - 610

### **Patriarchs of Jerusalem**

Macarius I	325 - 333
Maximus III	333 - 348
Cyril I	350 - 386
John II	386 - 417
Praulius	417 - 422
Juvenal	422 - 458 –Patriarch-
Anastasius I	458 - 478
Martyrius	478 - 486
Sallustius	486 - 494
Elias I	494 - 516
John III	516 - 524
Peter	524 - 552
Macarius II	552
Eutychius	552 - 564
Macarius II	564 - 574 (restored)
John IV	574 - 594
Amos	594 - 601
Isaac	601 - 609
Zacharias	609 - 631
Modestus	632 - 633
Sophronius	634 - 638

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

- Canons of the Ecumenical Church Councils
  - William Bright, *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils* (Oxford, 1882).
  - Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (Liverpool, 2005).
  - David M. Gwynn, *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire: a Sourcebook* (London, 2015).
- Codex Justinianus
  - Annotated Justinian Code, trans. Fred H. Blum, edit. Timothy Kearly (New York, 1955).
- Cyril of Scythopolis, *The lives of the Monks of Palestine*.
  - Translation by David Sheldon Barry, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the fifth and sixth centuries* (Michigan, 1976).
- Pope Gregory I the Great, *letters*.
  - Translation by John R.C. Martyn, *The Letters of Gregory the Great* (Toronto, 2004).

### Literature

- Amirav, Hagit, *Authority and Performance: sociological perspectives on the council of Chalcedon (AD 451)* (Göttingen, 2015).
- Anastos, Milton V., 'Justinian's Despotism over the Church as Illustrated by his Edicts on the Theophaschite Formula and his Letter to Pope John II in 533', chapter four in *Studies in Byzantine Intellectual History* (London, 1979).
- Armstrong, Gregory T, 'Imperial Church Building and Church-State Relations, A. D. 313-363', *Church History* 36:1 (1967), here 3-17.
- Bar, Doron, 'Rural Monasticism as a Key Element in the Christianization of Byzantine Palestine', *The Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005), 49-65
- Barker, Ernest, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: from Justinian I to the last Palaeologus* (Oxford, 1961).
- Barry, David Sheldon, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the fifth and sixth centuries* (Michigan, 1976).

- Berger, Albrecht, *Das Leben des Heiligen Gregorios von Agrigent: Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Berlin, 1995).
- Binns, John, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314-631* (Oxford, 1994).
- Bittermann, Helen Robbins, 'The Council of Chalcedon and Episcopal Jurisdiction' *Speculum* 13:2 (1938), here 198-203.
- Bright, Williams, *The Canons of the Four General Councils of Nicaea, Ephesus, Constantinople and Chalcedon* (Oxford, 1892).
- Cameron, Averil, *The Mediterranean World in late Antiquity AD 395-600* (London, 2001).
- Chadwick, Henry, 'Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea: a note on the background of the sixth canon', *The Harvard Theological Review* 53:3 (1960), here 171-195.
- Chadwick, Henry, *The Church in Ancient Society, from Galilee to Gregory the Great* (New York, 2001).
- Collins, Roger, *Keepers of the Keys of Heaven; a History of the Papacy* (New York, 2009).
- Daley, Brian E., 'Position and Patronage in the Early Church: the original meaning of 'Primacy of Honour'', *Journal of Theological Studies* 44:2 (1993), here 529-553.
- Daley, Brian E., *Leontius of Byzantium: Complete Works* (Oxford, 2017).
- Deanesly, Margaret, *A History of the Medieval Church; 590-1500* (London, 1969).
- Dell'Osso, Carlo, 'Leonzio di Bisanzio e Leonzio di Gerusalemme: Una Chiara Distinzione', *Augustinianum* 46 (2006), here 231–259.
- Demacopoulos, George E., 'Gregory the great and the sixth-century dispute over the ecumenical title', *Theological Studies* 70 (2009).
- Demacopoulos, George E., *The Invention of Peter: apostolic discourse and papal authority in late antiquity* (Philadelphia, 2013).
- Duffy, Eamon, *Saints & Sinners, A History of the Popes* (New Haven, 2006).
- Dunn, Geoffrey D., 'The Church of Rome as a court of Appeal in the early fifth century: the evidence of Innocent I and the Illyrian Churches' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 64:4 (2013), here 679-699.
- Dvornik, Francis 'Emperors, Popes, and Councils', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 (1951), here 1-23.

- Dvornik, Francis, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York, 1966).
- Edwards, Mark, *Chatolicity and Heresy in the Early Church* (Oxford, 2009).
- Elliot-Binns, John, *Cyril of Scythopolis and the monasteries of the Palestinian desert* (London, 1989).
- Elsner, Jas, 'The Itinerarium Burdigalense: Politics and Salvation in the Geography of Constantine's Empire', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 90 (2000), 181-195.
- Evans, James Allen, *The Emperor Justinian and the Byzantine Empire* (Westport, 2005).
- Evans, G.R., *The Thought of Gregory the Great* (Cambridge, 1986).
- Florovsky, Georges, *Bible, Church, Tradition: an eastern orthodox view vol.1* (Harvard, 1972).
- Frank, G.L.C., 'The Council of Constantinople II as a Model Reconciliation Council', *Theological Studies* 52 (1991), here 636-650.
- Gahbauer. Ferdinand D., *Die Pentrachiethorie; Ein Modell der Kirchenleitung von dem Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main, 1993).
- Geanakoplos, Deno J., 'Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism', *Church History* 34:4 (1965), here 381-403.
- Gwynn, David M., *Christianity in the Later Roman Empire: a sourcebook* (London, 2015).
- Honigmann, Ernest, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 5 (1950), here 209-279.
- Hussey, J.M., and Louth, Andrew, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1990).
- Kaiser, Denis, 'Leo the Great on the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome', *Andrews University Seminary Student Journal* 1:2 (2015), here 73-89.
- Krausmüller, Dirk, 'Leontius of Jerusalem, a Theologian of the Seventh Century', *Journal of Theological Studies* 52 (2001), here 637-657.
- Mannion, Gerard and Mudge, Lewis S., *The Routledge Companion to the Christian Church* (New York, 2008).
- Markus, Robert A., 'Gregory the Great's Europe', *Royal Historical Society* 31 (1981), here 21-36.
- Markus, Robert A., *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge, 1997).



- Martindale, J.,R., *The Prosopography Of The Later Roman Empire; Vol. I A.D. 260-395* (Cambridge, 1971).
- Martindale, J.,R., *The Prosopography Of The Later Roman Empire; Vol. II A.D. 395-527* (Cambridge, 1980).
- Martindale, J.,R., *The Prosopography Of The Later Roman Empire; Vol. IIIA A.D. 527-641* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Martindale, J.,R., *The Prosopography Of The Later Roman Empire; Vol. IIIB A.D. 527-641* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Meyendorff, John, 'Justinian, The Empire and the Church', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 22 (1968), here 43-60.
- Meyendorff, John, *Byzantine Theology; Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (Thetford, 1974).
- Meyendorff, John, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions* (Crestwood, 1989).
- Millar, Fergus, 'Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church under Justinian: Two Synods of C.E. 536', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 98 (2008), here 62-82.
- Moorhead, John, *Gregory the Great, the Early Church Fathers* (Oxon, 2005).
- Morrison, Karl F., *Tradition and Authority in the Western Church, 300-1140* (Princeton, 1969).
- Noble, Thomas F.X., Smith, Julia M.H., *The Cambridge History of Christianity; Early Medieval Christianities c. 600-1100* (Cambridge, 2008).
- Peters, F., *Jerusalem: The Holy City in the Eyes of the Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton, 1985).
- Price, Richard and Gaddis, Michael, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (Liverpool, 2005).
- Renna, Thomas, *Jerusalem in Medieval Thought 400-1300* (Lewiston, 2002).
- Rennie, Kriston R., *The Foundations of Medieval Papal Legation* (London, 2013).
- Richard, Marcel, 'Léonce de Jérusalem et Léonce de Byzance', *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 1 (1944), here 35–88.
- Richards, Jeffrey, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476-752* (London 1979).
- Richards, Jeffrey, *Consul of God. The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London, 1980).

- Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity. A.D. 311-600* (Grand Rapids, 1882).
- Schaff, Philip, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series II Volume 12* (Grand Rapids, 1894).
- Swanson, R.N., *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (Oxford, 1996).
- Taylor, J.J., 'Eastern Appeals to Rome in the Early Church: a little known witness' *The Downside Review* 89 (1979), here 142-146.
- Treadgold, Warren, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society* (Stanford, 1997).
- Tuilier, André, 'Le sens de l'adjectif «oecuménique» dans la tradition patristique et dans la tradition byzantine', *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 86:3 (1964), here 260-271.
- Ullmann, Walter, 'Leo I and the Theme of Papal Primacy', *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1960), here 25-51.
- Ullmann, Walter, *A Short History of the Papacy* (New York, 2003).
- Vailhé, Siméon, 'Saint Grégoire le Grand et le titre de patriarche œcuménique', *Échos d'Orient* 70:11, (1908), here 161-171.
- Vries, Wilhelm de, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens* (München, 1963).
- Wickham, Chris, *Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society 400-1000* (Hong Kong, 1981).
- Yarnold, Edward, *Cyril of Jerusalem: the early Church Fathers* (London, 2000).