

# Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Ecclesiastical History* (CPG 6582)

*Lieve Van Hoof, Panagiotis Manafis,  
and Peter Van Nuffelen*

**T**HIS ARTICLE publishes the fragments of the lost *Church History* of Hesychius of Jerusalem, a presbyter and prolific preacher and exegete who lived in the first half of the fifth century. Being a history of the Council of Ephesus (431) in four books, the work is of interest for the development of the genre, as it is the first ecclesiastical history dedicated to a single council. Although the only secure *terminus post quem* is 431, we suggest that it best fits the years 434–439 when, in the aftermath of the council, a debate about Theodore of Mopsuestia raged in the East. The fragments are only preserved in the context of the debate about the Three Chapters in the middle of the sixth century and only refer to Theodore.

Besides its interest for the development and transmission of ecclesiastical history, the work has important implications for our understanding of Hesychius. Pelagius, the future bishop of Rome (556–561), attributes to Hesychius an anti-Chalcedonian stance and several works against that council. Although this evidence has often been rejected, we suggest that it should be accepted. This means not only that Hesychius died after 451, but also that he stuck to the support which his bishop, Juvenal of Jerusalem (ca. 422–458), had given to the miaphysites Dioscorus and Eutyches before Chalcedon. Juvenal himself changed sides during the council, causing an uproar in his diocese. Hesychius must, therefore, have abandoned his bishop. In the preserved oeuvre of Hesychius polemic is generally absent, but his *Church History* and the works against Chalcedon show that this has little to do with an irenic spirit: sermons were apparently not his chosen medium for polemic, whilst a history

---

*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 56 (2016) 504–527

© 2016 L. Van Hoof, P. Manafis, P. Van Nuffelen

could serve that function. We offer first a general introduction, followed by an edition, our translation, and commentary on the fragments.

*General discussion*

Hesychius was a presbyter of the Church of Jerusalem and a prolific commentator of the Old and New Testament, as well as a celebrated preacher.<sup>1</sup> Born presumably in the last third of the fourth century, he had achieved great fame as a teacher by the early fifth century: Theophanes (ca. 760–817/8) signals his prominence in A.D. 414/5, Cyril of Scythopolis (ca. 525–559) calls him a “luminary, resplendent in the whole world” when noting his presence at the consecration of the church of the Laura on 7 May 429, and the *Itinerarium Antonini Placentini*, datable to roughly the same period, notes his charity.

His death is dated by Theophanes to A.M. 5927 (434/5).<sup>2</sup> But two bits of evidence suggest a later date for his death: in John Rufus’ collection of pro-miaphysite anecdotes (ca. 512–518), Hesychius is alive during the Council of Chalcedon in 451,<sup>3</sup> and Pelagius (T2 below) ascribes to Hesychius works against the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. Scholars have

<sup>1</sup> For his production see CPG 6550–6596. See also K. Jüssen, *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen des Hesychius von Jerusalem I–II* (Münster 1931–1934); M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d’Hésychius de Jérusalem* (Brussels 1978); M. Stark, “Hesychios von Jerusalem. Scholien zum Propheten Joel,” *JAC* 37 (1994) 37–44; P. Allen, “Hesychius of Jerusalem,” in P. Allen et al. (eds.), *“Let Us Die That We May Live”: Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine, and Syria* (London/New York 2003) 194–214. For Hesychius’ biography see J. Quasten, *Patrology II* (Utrecht 1963) 488–489; L. Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche* (Brescia 1980) 73–76; P. Blaudeau, “Du bon usage de l’histoire. Remarques sur les enjeux identitaires véhiculés par les histoires ecclésiastiques incomplètement conservées,” in B. Bleckmann and T. Stückler (eds.), *Griechische Profanhistoriker des fünften nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart 2014) 216.

<sup>2</sup> Theophanes *Chron.* A.M. 5907 and 5927 (I 83, 92 de Boor); Cyril of Scythopolis *V.Euthym.* 16 (26.20 Schwartz); *Itin. anton. Placentini* 20–28 (CCL 175.130–135).

<sup>3</sup> John Rufus *Plerophories* 10 (*PO* 8.23).

tended to dismiss the content of both bits of information—viz., the fact that he was anti-Chalcedonian—but to accept them for the chronology of Hesychius. He would then have lived until after the Council of Chalcedon but would have actually supported it. This position is based on three arguments. First, Hesychius' exegesis and homilies are Cyrillian in tendency, but generally moderate: they can hardly be read as aligning themselves with strong anti-chalcedonism. Second, the staunchly Chalcedonian Cyril of Scythopolis, writing ca. 555–558, mentions Hesychius without commenting on his possible miaphysitism, which would seem surprising given Cyril's rejection of all things miaphysite.<sup>4</sup> Finally, the evidence from T2 is considered to be untrustworthy (see below on T2 for further discussion).<sup>5</sup>

This is not a very satisfactory position as it tends to amalgamate pro- and anti-Chalcedonian sources without paying much attention to their tendency. One must note that the Chalcedonian sources who consider Hesychius to be one of them would all be compatible with the early date for his death given by Theophanes. Sources that claim Hesychius for miaphysitism, by contrast, presuppose a late death, after Chalcedon. Although sources are not numerous, this pattern is unlikely to be the result of the hazards of transmission. Hesychius was clearly claimed by both the miaphysite and the Chalcedonian camps in Palestine. This undoubtedly reflects the respect he commanded in this region in the first half of the fifth century, as well as the turmoil that engulfed Palestine after 451. Juvenal of Jerusalem had travelled to Chalcedon as a supporter of Dioscorus and Eutyches. After being a prominent

<sup>4</sup> *V.Euthym.* 16, 27 (26.20, 41.20–42.5 Schwartz).

<sup>5</sup> Aubineau, *Les homélies festales lxxiv–lxxv*; A. Grillmeier, “Eine Flucht des Eutyches nach Jerusalem?” in G. Wirth (ed.), *Romanitas-Christianitas. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit: Johannes Straub zum 70. Geburtstag* (Berlin 1982) 645–653; T. Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition II.3 The Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch from 451 to 600* (Oxford 2002) 49–64, building on Jüssen, *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen*.

supporter of theirs at the Council of Ephesus in 449, he switched sides during the council of 451. This caused upheaval when he returned to Jerusalem. A substantial opposition asked for his deposition, which resulted in his temporary removal.<sup>6</sup> It is very well thinkable that in such a climate, both sides sought to claim the respected presbyter Hesychius for themselves.

The following scenarios present themselves. If one prefers a low chronology for Hesychius' life and a death ca. 434, the Chalcedonian sources represent the correct memory of his doctrinal stance and the miaphysite claim that he supported their side is an invention with the aim of drawing an esteemed local figure posthumously into their camp. If one accepts the high chronology, with Hesychius passing away after 451, he probably sided with the miaphysite opposition against Juvenal. The fact that Hesychius welcomed Eutyches and wrote against the Tome of Leo (see T2) would then only be the logical consequence of him sticking to the position that Juvenal had defended at the Second Council of Ephesus (449), when Eutyches had been rehabilitated. The Tome of Leo was explicitly directed against that council. In this scenario, then, Hesychius resisted the volte-face of Juvenal at Chalcedon and the Chalcedonian sources conveniently forgot this episode at the end of Hesychius' life, as it clashed with their claim on him. As we argue in our commentary on T2, the second option is the more plausible one.

The fragments of the *Church History*<sup>7</sup> do not help to solve the conundrum. Its four books were concerned with the Council of Ephesus (431) (T2). Extant fragments focus on events of im-

<sup>6</sup> E. Honigmann, "Juvenal of Jerusalem," *DOP* 5 (1950) 209–279; C. Fraisse-Coué, "D'Ephèse à Chalcédoine: 'La paix trompeuse' (433–451)," in J.-M. Mayeur and L. Pietri (eds.), *Histoire du christianisme III Les Églises d'Orient et d'Occident* (Paris 1998) 57; P. Maraval, "La réception de Chalcédoine dans l'empire d'Orient," in *Histoire du christianisme III* 109–111.

<sup>7</sup> It is sometimes stated that there is only one fragment (e.g. Allen, *Hesychius* 194; C. B. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian* [Oxford 2006] 371), but see below.

portance in the context of the Three Chapters controversy and only talk about Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 350–428). All information in them is derived from works of Theodore and the acts of the Council of Ephesus and there is therefore no proof for the suggestion that Hesychius was himself present in Ephesus.<sup>8</sup> F1 is highly polemical: Hesychius clearly understood Theodore as a source of inspiration for Nestorius. Anti-Nestorianism was, then, its main characteristic. Such a position is understandable against the background of Hesychius' adherence to the theology of Cyril of Alexandria and his rejection of the exegetical methods of the Antiochenes.<sup>9</sup>

If the obvious *terminus post quem* for the history is 431, it is difficult to provide further contextualisation. For Pelagius, it is a work of old age (F1b), but this does not help much, as we have no clue about the age of Hesychius. Various suggestions for dating the work have been made.

The work has been dated shortly after the council of Ephesus.<sup>10</sup> In that case we can interpret the *Church History* as a settling of scores with an exegetical tradition that Hesychius clearly rejected, but which was represented by the see of Antioch and thus may have had quite a number of followers in Palestine too.

Two propositions for a later date have been made. Lorenzo Perrone has argued that the work was written ca. 439–440 and is to be understood in the context of a joint offensive of Cyril of Alexandria and the empress of Eudocia against Nestorius, on the occasion of her arrival in Jerusalem, and also expressed in the deposition of the relics of S. Stephen in 439.<sup>11</sup> P. Blaudeau, in turn, has suggested that the work should be dated between the end of 448 and the middle of 449, before the Second

<sup>8</sup> Jüssen, *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen* 158–159.

<sup>9</sup> Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition* II.3 49–64.

<sup>10</sup> Jüssen, *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen* 44–46.

<sup>11</sup> Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina* 73–75.

Council of Ephesus.<sup>12</sup> Blaudeau's suggestion is based on the fact that Hesychius highlights Theodore's critique on the position of Jerusalem as the place of the mysteries of Christ's life, thus participating in the attempts of Juvenal of Jerusalem to raise the status of Jerusalem. According to Blaudeau, Hesychius thus responds to the recently pro-Antiochene, that is, pro-Theodore, *Church History* of Theodoret.<sup>13</sup>

Given the lack of evidence, neither of these two suggestions for a later date is falsifiable. It is, however, far from compelling that Hesychius' critique of Theodore's understanding of Jerusalem should be understood as betraying more than a sensitivity for Jerusalem as the *locus incarnationis* that is constant in Hesychius' homiletic oeuvre. Perrone rightly points to the fact that the years 434–439 were years of intense discussion about Theodore of Mopsuestia and about the question whether he was considered to have been implicitly condemned by the Council of Ephesus or not.<sup>14</sup> It was a debate which involved the bishops of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria. The period 434–439 is therefore the most plausible context for the polemic against Theodore that we find in Hesychius' *Church History*. Contrary to Perrone, however, we do not see compelling evidence for dating the work at the end of this period of debate; it may have been published at any moment in this period. Indeed, the vitriol of Hesychius against Theodore may seem out of place after both Cyril of Alexandria and Theodosius II had spoken out against attempts to seek explicit condemnation of Theodore in 439.<sup>15</sup> Hesychius' history may, then,

<sup>12</sup> R. Devreesse, *Pelagii Diaconi ecclesiae romanae In defensione trium capitulorum* (Vatican City 1932) 2 n.2, suggested that Hesychius also dealt with the Council of Ephesus in 449, which is implausible: see Blaudeau, in *Griechische Profanhistoriker* 217.

<sup>13</sup> Blaudeau, in *Griechische Profanhistoriker* 219–220.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. L. Abramowski, "Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesinischen Konzilien," *ZKG* 67 (1955/6) 252–287, for a detailed chronology; Fraise-Coué, in *Histoire du christianisme* III 29–31.

<sup>15</sup> *Ep. Cyrilli ad Iohannem Antiochenum* (ACO I.5 314–315) and *Ep. imp. Theo-*

have been the contribution by Jerusalem to these debates. Such a context helps us to understand why it was dug up again in the sixth century when the same debate was conducted all over again.

There is one final possibility. If one accepts the high chronology, as we suggest one should, the *Church History* may have been part of Hesychius' anti-Chalcedonian output. The defense of the Council of Ephesus could be an implicit rejection of Chalcedon, for the anti-Chalcedonian perception of the Council of Chalcedon was that it marked a return to Nestorianism, which had been condemned in Ephesus in 431. Although this scenario is not impossible, it should be noted that Theodore of Mopsuestia was not at the heart of ecclesiastical debate in the years following Chalcedon, which renders it a less likely context for the outpouring of Hesychius' vitriol.

Hesychius' *Church History* probably had a limited circulation. Fragments only surface in the middle of the sixth century (551) in the context of the Three Chapters controversy, with Justinian first referring to it (T1) in support of the condemnation of Theodore, eliciting a response from Pelagius (T3 and FF1–3) in 554. Pelagius probably drew on the florilegium composed by those wishing to see the Three Chapters condemned. As argued by L. Perrone, this may actually have been produced by Theodore Ascidas or the author of the anonymous libellus of 546, who both belonged to the Origenist milieu of Palestine.<sup>16</sup> It is interesting to note, however, that Facundus of Hermiane, who also replied to the works of his opponents (ca. 545), does not mention Hesychius. This might suggest that Hesychius was added to the proof-texts against Theodore after the publication of Facundus' work but before the publication by Justinian of his edict of 551.

Hesychius' history is of considerable interest for the genre of ecclesiastical history. If we accept the dating of the work sug-

<sup>15</sup> *dosii* (ACO I.4 241). See also Liberatus *Breviarium* 10 (ACO II.5 112).

<sup>16</sup> Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina* 220–221.

gested here, 434–439, the work postdates the first fully-fledged history written in Greek in continuation of Eusebius, that of the Eunomian Philostorgius, but predates the well-known Nicene church histories of Socrates (ca. 439–440), Sozomen (ca. 445), and Theodoret (ca. 448–451).<sup>17</sup> It clearly deviates from the format adopted by these historians: Hesychius only dealt with Ephesus, whereas the four others covered history from Constantine to their own times. We know of only one other such work: the history of the Council of Nicaea composed in the last quarter of the fifth century by the Anonymus of Cyzicus on the basis of the earlier church historians.<sup>18</sup> Both examples show that the genre was much more diverse than the set of preserved histories suggests—Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Evagrius, who all follow the Eusebian format. If that format would dominate ecclesiastical historiography in the fifth and sixth centuries, Hesychius' history shows that even at the time when Socrates was writing, it was still possible to espouse an alternative format.

Hesychius of Jerusalem<sup>19</sup>  
ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία

TESTIMONIES

T1: Justinian *Edictum rectae fidei*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians* (Munich 1939) 108.16–18, repr. *Legum Iustiniani Imperatoris Vocabularium Subsidia* 2 (Milan 1973) 166.14–18. The edict is also quoted in *Chron.Pasch.* 31b (ed. L. Dindorf 680–681). Transl. R. Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553* (Liverpool 2009) 157

<sup>17</sup> P. Van Nuffelen, *Un héritage de paix et de piété: étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène* (Leuven 2004) 10–14, 59–61, and review of A. Martin et al., *Théodoret de Cyr I*, and G. Sabbah, *Sozomène III*, in *AntTard* 15 (2007) 410–416, with further references.

<sup>18</sup> *Anonyme Kirchengeschichte (Gelasius Cyzicenus, CPG 6034)*, ed. G. C. Hansen (Berlin 2002).

<sup>19</sup> For the texts, we follow the standard edition, indicating possibly significant variant readings. Translations are our own.



Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς Θεόδωρον τὸν Μοψουεστίας, οὐκ ἐπαίνων δέ, ἀλλὰ μέμψεων καὶ ἐπιτιμήσεων οὖσαν μεστὴν ὡς ἐκπεσόντος αὐτοῦ τῆς θεοσεβείας. συνασκήσας γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸν μονήρη βίον ἐν ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ μοναστηρίῳ τῆς ἐκεῖσε συνδιαγωγῆς ἀναμιμνήσκει αὐτόν. καὶ ταῦτα μαρτυροῦσιν Σωζομενὸς καὶ Ἡσύχιος καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ Θεοδώρητος ὁ πολλοὺς ὑπὲρ Θεοδώρου λόγους τε καὶ ἐπαίνους ἐκτείνας.

John of Constantinople wrote an epistle to Theodore of Mopsuestia, which was full not of praise but of complaints and criticisms, as the latter had left behind all fear of God. Having shared with him the monastic life in one and the same monastery, he reminds him of the time they spent together there. Sozomen, Hesychius, Socrates, and Theodoret—the latter spending many words of praise on Theodore—bear witness to this.

*Commentary*

The edict of Justinian dates from mid-July 551<sup>20</sup> and condemns the ‘three chapters’, along with Theodore of Mopsuestia. The episode in Hesychius to which the passage alludes is cited during the council of 553 (= F1 below, cf. F2). The identification of Theodore of Mopsuestia with the addressee of John Chrysostom’s *Ad Theodorum lapsus* is indeed made in Sozomen (*HE* 8.2.7–17), but is absent in Socrates (*HE* 6.3) and Theodoret (*HE* 5.40). If one does not wish to accuse Justinian of inflationary rhetoric, he may have relied on the church history of Theodore Lector (ca. 518): its first four books were a compilation of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, and they indeed mention the episode in question.<sup>21</sup> Justinian may have assumed that all three sources of Theodore, as well as Hesychius, mentioned the identification.

John Chrysostom, of undisputed orthodoxy in the sixth cen-

<sup>20</sup> Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften* 116; R. Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553* (Liverpool 2009) 122.

<sup>21</sup> Theodore Lector *Ecclesiastical History, Epitome* 282, ed. G. C. Hansen, *Theodoros Anagnostes*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1995) 86. The reference to praise by Theodoret for Theodore may also derive from Theodore Lector (*Epitome* 318).

tury, was regularly cited to defend Theodore of Mopsuestia, as he mentioned Theodore positively.<sup>22</sup> The ‘criticism’ in *Ad Theodorum lapsum* was used by Justinian to undermine that view.<sup>23</sup> In fact, Justinian’s edict may respond to the support of John invoked by supporters of Theodore like Facundus of Hermiane (*Pro defensione* 2.1.8). Pelagius, in turn, responded to the use of the episode at the Council of Constantinople in 553 by attacking Hesychius (F2), who was clearly the crown witness, as the other church historians are favourably disposed towards Theodore. It seems, then, that Hesychius’ *Ecclesiastical History* was unearthed by the sources of Justinian precisely to challenge the otherwise positive representation of Theodore of Mopsuestia in what were, by the sixth century, the standard church histories.

T2: Pelagius *In defensione trium capitulorum* 2.19–3.2 Devreesse

*Nunc ad illa, Deo iuvante, respondeo quae de Esychii presbiteri Hierosolimitani historia, quam in quattuor libellis de eis quae apud Ephesum sunt acta composuit, adversum sepe dictum Theodorum episcopum posuerunt. Et quamvis nihil gravent personam memorati Theodori, quia de causis quibus eum lacescere voluit facile ostenditur excusatus, tamen constat eundem Esychium Eutychem heretici fuisse consortem in tantum, ut fugientem sanctae synodi Calchedonensis examen apud se eundem Eutychem in Hierosolimis libenter exceperit, et libros contra sanctam synodum Calchedonensem et contra aepistolam beatae memoriae Leonis ad Flavianum Constantinopolitanum antistitem datam scripserit.*

With the help of God, I now respond to the arguments that have been turned against the often-mentioned bishop Theodore on the basis of the history of Hesychius, presbyter of Jerusalem, which he wrote, in four books, on what happened at Ephesus. And while they in no way charge the person of the memorable Theodore, as

<sup>22</sup> Facundus *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 2.1.8, 4.1, 7.7.22–23, 11.5, 12.5.17, ed. J.-M. Clément et al., *Facundus d’Hermiane. Défense des trois chapitres* (Paris 2002–2006). For discussion see A. Le Boulluec, “L’historiographie dans les écrits théologiques de l’empereur Justinien,” in B. Pouderon and Y.-M. Duval (eds.), *L’historiographie de l’Eglise des premiers siècles* (Paris 2001) 516, 528.

<sup>23</sup> See also Council of Constantinople, Actio quinta (ACO IV.1 114).

it is easy to show him to be innocent on the grounds on which he wanted to harm him, it is a fact that this very Hesychius was a companion of the heretic Eutyches in so much as he willingly received Eutyches when the latter ran away from the examination by the holy synod of Chalcedon, and that he wrote books against the holy synod at Chalcedon and against the letter which Leo of blessed memory wrote to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople.<sup>24</sup>

*Commentary*

The information provided in this passage, Hesychius' reception of Eutyches and his works against the Council of Chalcedon, is unique and usually rejected.<sup>25</sup>

The reception of Eutyches is problematic. In the run-up to the Council of Chalcedon, the Constantinopolitan archimandrite Eutyches was exiled to a place close to Constantinople and then sent to Doliche (presumably the city in Asia Minor) by the emperor Marcian shortly before the council opened. In 454, pope Leo I asked Marcian to send Eutyches to a more distant place of exile.<sup>26</sup> A. Grillmeier has argued that it is impossible that Hesychius received Eutyches in the run-up to the Council of Chalcedon, as Eutyches was probably under constant surveillance. This may be correct. Yet our information is not detailed enough to make this absolutely sure. We do not know under what conditions Eutyches was exiled,<sup>27</sup> nor

<sup>24</sup> The reference is to the "tomus ad Flavianum" (449), composed by Leo I of Rome (440–461) to Flavian of Constantinople (446–449).

<sup>25</sup> Aubineau, *Les homélies festales* lxxiv–lxxv; Perrone, *La chiesa di Palestina* 94; Grillmeier, in *Romanitas-Christianitas* 645–653; Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition* II.3 54; Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy* 371; Blaudeau, in *Griechische Profanhistoriker* 216.

<sup>26</sup> Leo *Ep.* 84.3 (*PL* 54.922B) (9 June 451); Theodore Lector (100.17 Hansen); Leo *Ep.* 134.2 (*PL* 54.1095A).

<sup>27</sup> It is, for example, unclear if Eutyches was initially subjected to a *relegatio* and only expelled from Constantinople or if he was already subjected to a *deportatio* and assigned to a specific location. The exile to Doliche was clearly a *deportatio*. The first may be implied by Leo *Ep.* 84. In that case, he would have had freedom of movement. See Julia Hillner, *Prison, Punishment and Penance in Late Antiquity* (New York 2015) 198–199, 216, 317.

whether he was re-assigned to a different location after the Council of Chalcedon. We cannot exclude either that the information provided by Pelagius is inaccurate: Hesychius may have received Eutyches after Chalcedon and Pelagius may have turned this into a reception of a fugitive Eutyches before the council. At any rate, the allegation betrays that, in the eyes of Pelagius, Hesychius had real sympathy for Eutyches.

We know nothing of the other works by Hesychius against the synod of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo.<sup>28</sup> Yet it is far from impossible that Hesychius would have spoken out against the council. His bishop, Juvenal of Jerusalem, was a leading figure at the council of Ephesus in 449, when Eutyches was rehabilitated. If we suppose that Hesychius followed the line of his superior then and continued to follow that same line even after Juvenal changed sides at Chalcedon in 451, his rejection of Chalcedon and reception of Eutyches would not be surprising. Indeed, in the uproar that engulfed Palestine after Juvenal's return from Chalcedon, Hesychius would have sided with the camp that defended the council of 449.

If one rejects the account of Pelagius, one must interpret it as an invention. One possible inventor would be Pelagius himself. Because Hesychius' history served the cause of the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and because the attack on the Three Chapters was understood by their defenders as an indirect attack on the Council of Chalcedon, Pelagius may have sought to dismiss the credibility of Hesychius by making these severe allegations against him. In the polemic of Facundus of Hermiane, the instigators of the condemnation of Theodore are the 'Eutychians'.<sup>29</sup> This label may then have been projected back onto Hesychius by Pelagius. The weakness of this explanation is that a fully fictitious claim could be easily dis-

<sup>28</sup> C. Mango, R. Scott, and G. Greatrex, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor* (Oxford/New York 1997) 129, wrongly state that Hesychius wrote a history of the Council of Chalcedon in four books, an error repeated by Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy* 371.

<sup>29</sup> *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 10.1.

proven in a period when so much hinged on exact citations. It would have been a dangerous tactic to follow for Pelagius.

The other possibility, that the reception of Eutyches and the anti-Chalcedonian works are a miaphysite invention in order to claim Hesychius as one of their own, is even less likely, as Eutyches was also condemned by the Egyptians at the Council of Chalcedon and came to represent a wrong, extreme position within miaphysitism too. An association with Eutyches would have made Hesychius also a heretic from a miaphysite perspective.<sup>30</sup> This renders it unlikely that Pelagius is reproducing a miaphysite invention.

In sum, it is best to assume that the allegations of Pelagius reflect at least a kernel of truth: Hesychius aligned himself with the opposition against Juvenal after the Council of Chalcedon.<sup>31</sup> As shown by F2, Pelagius knew more about the *Church History* of Hesychius than what can be found in the florilegium read at Constantinople in 553. This renders it at least possible that the additional contextual information he gives here is not completely fictitious.

T3: *Life of Theodore, abbot of the Chora monastery* (BHG 1743), ed. J. Bidez and F. Winkelmann, *Philostorgius. Kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig 1913) 177.25–30; B. Bleckmann and M. Stein, *Philostorgios Kirchengeschichte* (Paderborn 2015) 128–129

πολλὰς γὰρ βίβλους καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκζητήσαντες κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐρευνήσαντες, καθάπερ μέλισσα τὰ ἄνθη συλλέξαντες, τὸν τοῦ ὁσίου Θεοδώρου βίον συνεγραψάμεθα, οὐδὲν ἄφ' ἑαυτῶν συντάξαντες, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ ιστοριογράφων, Θεοδωρήτου φημὶ καὶ Φιλοστοργίου Ἡσυχίου τε καὶ Δωροθέου τῶν λογογράφων ἀναλεξάμενοι ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις τόποις τετάχαμεν. καὶ γὰρ οὐ μικρὰν ὠφέλειαν, ὡς οἶμαι, καρποῦται ὁ τῶν ἁγίων τοὺς βίους ἐντυγχάνων.

Because we also searched out and scrutinized many books to the best of our proficiency, like a bee making a pick of flowers, we

<sup>30</sup> Council of Chalcedon *ACO* II.1 112.29–32. Cf. L. R. Wickham, “Eutyches/Eutychianischer Streit,” *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 10 (1982) 558–565.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Blaudeau, in *Griechische Profanhistoriker* 220.

composed the life of the holy Theodore. We composed nothing that came from ourselves, but we gathered material from the holy fathers and historiographers, I mean Theodoret and Philostorgius, and we also selected from the prose writers Hesychius and Dorotheus, and we put everything in its appropriate place. And I believe that he who gets acquainted with the lives of the saints gains no little profit.

*Commentary*

The hagiographer could not have used any of the authorities cited, as they all predate the life of his subject (Theodore died in 595). He did his best, however, to cite authorities: besides Theodoret of Cyrrihus, he mentions the lost Philostorgius (early fifth century), Hesychius, and (Pseudo-)Dorotheus of Tyre, who seems first attested towards the end of the eighth century.<sup>32</sup> This dates this pre-metaphrasteian life to the ninth/tenth century. The reference to Hesychius probably derives, ultimately, from T1.

FRAGMENTS

F1a: Council of Constantinople, Session V (17 May 553), *ACO* IV.1 90.1–91.7 (transl. Price, *The Council* 305–307). This passage is partially quoted, with some variant readings, in Pelagius II papa, *Epistula ad episcopos Histriae*, *ACO* IV.2 124.27–125.16

*Ab ecclesiastica historia Hesychii presbyteri Hierosolymorum de Theodoro*

*Ita Photinum multis et aliis apud eos secutis Theodorus quidam praecipue imitatus est, malitiosus quidem loquendi et lingua paratissimus, et ipse tamen instabilis voluntate, qui huc et illuc inclinans ferebatur. Clericatu enim*  
 5 *Antiocheno a prima aetate connumeratus et bene conversari pollicitus, ad saeculares libidines reversus iterum delectabatur. In omnibus autem bonis imitabilis et beatus vir Iohannes Constantinopolitanus episcopus scripsit epistolam quae usque adhuc in codicibus legitur, et a peiore ad meliorem poenitentiam eum transferre praevaluit; et iterum bene conversari, iterum in clericatu esse*  
 3 *lingua: in lingua Pelagius II papa* 4 *instabilis: instabili Pelagius II papa*

<sup>32</sup> Dorotheus is attested as the author of a list of apostles and bishops of Byzantium; cf. F. Dolbeau, *Prophètes, Apôtres et Disciples dans les traditions d'Occident* (Brussels 2012). In the later tradition, he becomes a full-fledged historian: cf. Theophanes, *Chronicle* A.M. 5816 and 5854.

10 *coepit. Et Antiochia relicta in Tarson transmigravit, ex qua in Mopsuestiam  
transiit, ordinatus in eam episcopus, nondum deo volente manifestam impietatis  
illius praedicationem fieri. Prima autem elementa suae doctrinae ex iudaico  
vaniloquio incipiens codicem in prophetiam psalmorum conscripsit omnes de  
15 domino praedicationes abnegantem; culpatus vero et periclitatus contraria sibi  
dixit non ex voluntate, sed compulsus omnium querimoniis, et codicem ipsum  
delere pollicitus latenter conservabat Iudaicae impietatis viaticum. Igni enim  
sua commentaria simulans tradere malitiose abscondere inlecebram conabatur.  
Tempus quidem plurimum in exiguo loco prava loquens, qui esset merito,  
latebat. Quoniam vero loquax constitutus, vana solitus loqui doctoris famam  
20 consecutus est, paucis quibusdam apud eum studentibus qui veneno dictionum  
decipiebantur, calicem bibentes verbis quidem bene compositis coloratum,  
blasphemis vero intellectibus et veneno plenum. Senectute iam cana debilitates et  
minima pietatis scintilla, si qua forte in eo fuisset, inveterata libros componere  
adversus domini dei apparitionem praesumpsit, quorum multitudinem  
25 praetermittentes (nec enim fas et impios eius proferre sermones) unius in  
praesenti memoriam faciamus. Christum enim Iesum, generis nostri salvatorem  
et dominum, quem splendorem paternae gloriae et imaginem substantiae Paulus  
vocat, ferre eum omnia dicens verbo suae virtutis, qui purificationem nostrorum  
fecit peccatorum et ad dexteram paternae maiestatis consedit, de quo ad Colos-  
senses scripsit epistolam, Quod in eo omnia sunt creata quae sunt in caelis et in  
30 terra, visibilia et invisibilia, quod per eum et in eum creata sunt omnia et ipse  
est ante omnia,—hunc non incarnatum verbum, sicut evangelicis verbis edocti  
sumus, sed hominem per vitae profectionem et passionum perfectionem  
coniunctum deo verbo scripsit stultus in omnibus et haec in mysticis sermonibus  
ausus est. Et ille quidem talia. Sed et sequaces eius extollebantur, de quibus  
35 dicere convenit: dicentes se sapientes stulti facti sunt; mutaverunt enim vere et  
isti gloriam incorruptibilis dei in similitudinem corruptibilis hominis, Christum  
non sicut deum incarnatum glorificantes, sed sicut unum simile nobis hominem  
iniuriantes. Nos vero ad cetera orationis procedimus. Non enim multum tempus  
40 supervivens Theodorus praedictis contra mysterium blasphemus et novae Hieru-  
salem iniuriam addidit, minorare et eam tamquae patriam incarnationis  
mysterii properans.*

10 Mopsuestiam: Mompsuestinam *Pelagius II papa* 11 eam: ea *Pelagius II papa*  
29-30 Colossenses: Corinthios *Pelagius II papa* 31 terra: terris *Pelagius II papa*  
32 verbis: vocibus *Pelagius II papa*

From the Ecclesiastical History of Hesychius, presbyter of Jerusalem, concerning Theodore

So while many others among them followed Photinus, a certain Theodore imitated him especially. He was a shrewd talker with a most ready tongue, and at the same time of unstable purpose, inclining and being carried away now in this direction, then in that. For although he was enrolled amongst the clergy of Antioch from a young age and had made a vow to live a good life, he reverted to secular pleasures, and took his delight in them again. But John, the bishop of Constantinople, a man worthy of imitation and blessed in all good things, wrote him a letter which can be read until this day in the codices, and was able to deflect him from a worse to a better repentance: he again started to live a good life, again to be in the clergy. And leaving Antioch, he migrated to Tarsus, and from there went to Mopsuestia when he had been ordained as its bishop, as God did not yet want the preaching of his impiety to become well-known. But taking the first elements of his doctrine from Jewish prattle, he composed a book on the prophecy of the Psalms which denies all the predictions about the Lord. But when accused and in danger, he contradicted himself, not out of free will, but under compulsion from the complaints of all. He promised to destroy the book itself, but secretly conserved this viaticum to Jewish impiety. For whilst feigning to consign his commentary to the fire, he perfidiously tried to hide this bait. And for a very long time, he said bad things in a tiny place, hiding who he really was. But since he happened to be a talkative person, he, by speaking idle words, gained the fame of a teacher: his few students were deceived by the venom of his words, drinking a chalice that was, indeed, disguised by well-composed words, but full of blasphemous ideas and venom. But with the weaknesses caused by hoary old age and the ageing of a minute spark of piety—if, accidentally, there had ever been one in him—he ventured to compose books denying the appearing<sup>33</sup> of the Lord God. Leaving aside the majority of them (for it is not right to repeat his impious words), let me, at present, recall one. Take Christ, Jesus, the Saviour and Lord of our race, whom Paul calls the Splendor of His Father's Glory and the image of His substance, saying that He sustains the universe by

<sup>33</sup> That is, the Incarnation.



the word of His virtue, who ensured the purification of all our sins and sits at the right hand of His Father's Majesty,<sup>34</sup> and on whom he wrote a letter to the Colossians: "For in Him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible," and "all things have been created through Him and for Him and He is before all things."<sup>35</sup> Of Him, in his stupidity, he had the audacity to write in all his sermons (secret ones, at that), that he is not the incarnate Word, as we have been instructed by the Gospels, but a man who, through his course of life and his full bearing of the sufferings, was joined to God the Word. That was his view. But his followers, too, were exalted. On them, it is fitting to say: "Claiming to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like a mortal human being,"<sup>36</sup> not glorifying Christ like God incarnate, but insulting Him as if He were but one like us, a man. But I proceed to the rest of my discussion. For Theodore, although he did not live much longer, added to the blasphemies against the Mystery discussed above an injury against the new Jerusalem, eager to diminish it, too, as the city of the incarnation of the Mystery.

*Commentary*

The passage comes from a florilegium advocating the condemnation of the Three Chapters and read at the council of 553. The correspondance with T1 suggests that Justinian inspired the composition of this florilegium or that he relied on (a version of ) it. The fragment makes five allegations. First, Theodore of Mopsuestia lapsed and left the clergy of Antioch. This is based on the letter of John Chrysostom to Theodore, known as *Ad Theodorum lapsum II*. The addressee is indeed generally identified as Theodore of Mopsuestia.<sup>37</sup> Second, Theodore denied all the prophecies in the Psalms. This is a polemical distortion, as Theodore only reduced the prophecies

<sup>34</sup> Heb 1:3.

<sup>35</sup> Col 1:16–17.

<sup>36</sup> Rom 1:22–23.

<sup>37</sup> Jean Dumortier, *Jean Chrysostome. A Théodore* (Paris 1966) 23. Sozomen *HE* 8.2 is the first to make the identification.

in the Psalms to four in number.<sup>38</sup> Hesychius had himself commented on the psalms and his criticism of Theodore in this respect probably stems from this activity.<sup>39</sup> Third, he recognised his errors, promised to destroy the book, but finally did not do so. Fourth, Theodore misunderstands the Incarnation of the pre-existent Logos and reduces Jesus to a man. Here one sees in all clarity that Hesychius understands Theodore as a source of inspiration for Nestorius. The fact that Theodore is said to have travelled to Tarsus probably suggests a link with Diodorus of Tarsus, another forerunner of Nestorianism.<sup>40</sup> The allegation that Theodore expressed his ideas mainly in secret sermons indicates the level of polemic. These first four accusations are already refuted in Facundus of Hermiane, writing ca. 445.<sup>41</sup> This confluence of arguments shows that those seeking the condemnation of the Three Chapters relied on older polemic. The fifth and last accusation is that Theodore of Mopsuestia diminishes the importance of Jerusalem as the concrete place of Jesus' divine actions by denying the incarnation. This is, probably, only a polemical inference drawn by Hesychius: if Jesus was not fully God, the prestige linked to the places where he had been on earth would have been far lower. Hesychius often referred to the holy places in his sermons and these were an obvious source of prestige for the local Church.<sup>42</sup> According to Blaudeau, this particular attack on Theodore shows that Hesychius defended the higher status that Jerusalem sought to obtain in the Eastern Church in the first half of the

<sup>38</sup> Facundus *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 3.6.

<sup>39</sup> On the commentary see R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (Vatican City 1948) 28–31; C. Leonhard, *Ishodad of Merw's Exegesis of the Psalms 119 and 139–147* (Louvain 2001); L. De Coninck, *Expositiones psal-morum duae* (Brepols 2012).

<sup>40</sup> This is rendered explicit in Leontius *Adv. corrupticolas* 9 (PG 86.1364C), who claims that Theodore wished to be the successor of Diodorus in the see of Tarsus.

<sup>41</sup> *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 3.4, 3.6, 10.2.1–3.

<sup>42</sup> Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition* II.3 51–52.

fifth century, in relation to the other patriarchates.<sup>43</sup>

The fragment bears clear witness to Hesychius' anti-Nestorianism as well as to his hierosolymite background. The fragment may have been part of his account of the origins of Nestorianism in his history of the council of Ephesus. At the very least, this makes it clear that Hesychius' *Church History* was concerned with more than a strict account of the proceedings at Ephesus.

F1b: Pelagius *In defensione trium capitolorum* 3.3–26 Devreesse

*Sed haec omittentes, quae tam nimis dura sunt, ut ad libitum hereticorum, qui Theodorum Mompuestenum post mortem reprehendere voluerunt, a catholicis nunc sacerdotibus ad crimen episcopi in pace Ecclesiae mortui proferantur, illud videamus, quod dixit memoratus Esychius: quia Theodorus ad*  
 5 *concupiscentiam carnalem lapsus fuerit, sed litteris sancti Iohannis Crisostomi ad bonum propositum revocatus sit. Et licet commendari ex his Theodori debuisset opinio, si homo tunc iuuenis et a iuvene atque coevo sibi, videlicet sancto Iohanne, correctus, impudicitiae renuntians ad affectum continentiae semel ammonitus remeavit, tamen post paululum demonstrabitur quomodo*  
 10 *fatuus senex, memoratus videlicet Esychius, per invidiam Theodorum aepiscopum, et hunc iam mortuum, falsa adsertione voluerit infamare. Sed prius etiam quae de eodem Theodoro dicit adiungam: rursus enim accusat eum, quod in commento Psalmorum multa deliquerit, et quia a pluribus culpatus sit, et promiserit se commentarios ipsos exurere, sed eos malitiose*  
 15 *reservaverit. Et quamuis nullius nomen, qui eum de hac re viventem culpaverit, in commemorationem deducat, ego tamen e contrario magis ostendam, quia dum eosdem commentarios memoratus Theodorus per Callistratum quendam valde laudari agnovisset, mox eum ammonere curavit, ne eos tamquam inreprehensibiles recenseret, adserens eos se adhuc iuvenem*  
 20 *scribendi inexpertem fecisse et temporis qualitate ita actum ut sepius mutaretur.*

But leaving aside these, which are so much too hard, that they are now being brought forward to the charge of a bishop who died in peace with the Church by priests who are catholics, to the liking of

<sup>43</sup> Blaudeau, in *Griechische Profanhistoriker* 219. For further details see Honigmann, *DOP* 5 (1950) 217–227.

the heretics, who wanted that Theodore of Mopsuestia be reprimanded posthumously, let us look at what the well-known Hesychius said: for he claims that Theodore had lapsed into carnal desire, but was recalled to a good course of life by a letter of the holy John Chrysostom. And although it should have been possible to commend Theodorus' reputation on the basis of this—if a man who was then young, corrected by a young man of the same age as him, namely the holy John, renounced unchasteness and, after a single reminder, returned to the sense of continence—nevertheless, it will be shown shortly afterwards how a silly old man, namely the well-known Hesychius, out of envy, wanted to defame bishop Theodorus on the basis of a false claim, and that after the latter's death. But first I shall add also what he says about the same Theodore: for he accuses him again, because he failed, in many respects, in his commentary on the Psalms, and because he was accused by many and had promised to burn this commentary, but perfidiously conserved it. And although he does not call to mind the name of any person who accused him of this during his life, I will make a better case from the opposite side, as the well-known Theodore, when he was informed that those commentaries were highly praised by a certain Callistratus, immediately took care to warn him not to consider them irreprehensible, adding that he composed them when still young and inexperienced at writing and that it had happened, with the evolution of time, that he often experienced change.

#### *Commentary*

Writing in 554, Pelagius responded to the council of 553 and had access to the similar but earlier work of Facundus of Hermiane (ca. 545). He took the arguments of his opponents as his starting point: he picks up the main arguments against Theodore as found in Fl. Pelagius counters the claims with reference to John Chrysostom's *Ad Theodorum* and to an otherwise unknown letter to Callistratus in which he distances himself from his earlier work.<sup>44</sup> He seeks to demonstrate that Theodore had indeed repented, even if he had not destroyed his com-

<sup>44</sup> See Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore* 51, on letters by Theodore. He does not mention this one.

mentary.

Pelagius notes that Hesychius was an old man when writing against Theodore. This may be a polemical jab, but it could reflect the fact that the *Church history* is a late work of Hesychius. As explained above, this does not help us very much for dating the work.

Flc: Pelagius *In defensione trium capitolorum* 4.12–26 Devresse

*Quia facile posset corrigere, si eum ab alio—sicut mentitur Esychius—reprehendi contingeret; cum potuisset magis laudibus opusculorum suorum elatus, de illis qui eum, sicut memoratus Esychius dicit, culpaverant, si tamen verum esset, accepta opportunitate causari et dicere: “Ecce quale opus nostrum, <quod> aut non intellegentes alliqui, aut male sentientes reprehendere voluerunt,” sicut et de illis libris, quos de Incarnatione Domini conscripserat, ad Cerdonem scribendo fecit quaerula voce eos falsatos esse pronuntians. Quia vero <se> Theodorus episcopus de psalmorum expositione reprehenderit, et si non adhibuisset quae superius continentur, etiam ipse Esychius adtestatur, ita in eadem historia dicens: “Librum in psalmorum prophetiam omnes de Christo predicationes negantem scribit. Reprehensus [est] autem et periclitatus, retractationem cecinit non ex voluntate, sed quoniam reprehensio ab omnibus facta cogebat.” Haec Esychius.*

For correction would have been easy if, as Hesychius lyingly claims, it had happened that he had been reprimanded by someone other than himself, since, elated more by the praises for his works, he could have seized the opportunity offered by those who, according to the well-known Hesychius, accused him—if this were true—by saying: “Look what this work of mine is like, which some out of lack of understanding, some out of bad feelings, have wanted to reprimand.” He developed the same argument also concerning those books that he composed *On the Incarnation of the Lord*, when, in writing to Cerdo, he said in a lamenting tone that they had been misrepresented. But that bishop Theodore reproached <himself> for his interpretation of the Psalms, Hesychius himself testifies to that even if he had not said what was stated above, by saying as follows in the same History: “He writes a book on the prophecy of the Psalms which denies all predictions about the lord. But reprimanded and threatened, he retracted, not voluntarily, but because the reprimand made by all forced him to.” This is what Hesychius says.

*Commentary*

The fragment refers to the same episode as Fl a–b. Pelagius picks up the argument of Facundus, that Theodore admitted his own earlier errors. Facundus also refers repeatedly to the work addressed to Cerdo.<sup>45</sup> Facundus, however, refers in this context to a work “On allegory and history,” and not to a treatise on the incarnation.<sup>46</sup>

F2: Pelagius *In defensione trium capitulorum*, 4.31–5.16 Devreesse

*Ergo, quia se Theodorus episcopus reprehenderit de expositione psalmorum, etiam accusatoris eius Esychiei testimonio comprobatur; quia vero repraesentatus sit ab aliis et periclitatus, ostendant illi, qui Esychiei historiam ad testimonium detulerunt. Et ut breviter aliquid dicam: Isti, qui historiam Esychiei ad medium*  
 5 *deduxerunt, sancto Cyrillo, cuius se ardentem contumelias dolere et ulcisci simulant, mendacii crimen impingere per nescio quam mentis hebetudinem temptaverunt; et licet non ignoremus quid de simbolo, quod in sancta synodo Ephesena Charisius presbyter innotuit, gesta illic habita contineant, tamen in epistola sua sanctus Cyrillus dicit: “Simbolum, quod a Charisio presbytero, perversarum*  
 10 *intellegentiarum plenum, in Epheso prolatum est, proferentes dixerunt a Theodoro Mompuesteno fuisse conscriptum”; Esychieus autem dicit: “Quia transiens quidam in medio Charisius, vir presbyteri in sede Philadelphorum ecclesiae functus officio, multa quidem habuisse praedictam civitatem hereticorum zizania referebat; quae cum exhauriri et expelli coepissent, invidisse mutationi*  
 15 *de malis ad bona Nestorium et symbolum fidei, quae est in Christo, extra consuetudinem aliud transmisisse.” Haec Esychieus.*

Therefore, the fact that bishop Theodorus reprehended himself on his interpretation of the Psalms is confirmed even by the testimony of his prosecutor Hesychius. But that he would have been reprehended and threatened by others is shown by those who have adduced Hesychius’ history by way of testimony. And to put it

<sup>45</sup> *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 3.6.13–15, 10.1.29, 11.6.15. On *De incarnatione*, often discussed in the polemics of the fifth/sixth century, see Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore* 44–48; T. Jansen, *Theodor von Mopsuestia, De incarnatione* (Berlin 2009); J. Behr, *The Case against Diodore and Theodore: Texts and their Contexts* (Oxford/New York 2011).

<sup>46</sup> *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 3.6.13–15; on this work see Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore* 51.

briefly: those who brought forward the history of Hesychius, whilst feigning to be offended by, and take revenge for, the offences against the holy Cyril, managed—by a stupidity of mind which I cannot understand—to heap upon him the accusation of lying. Although we do not ignore what the acts of the Council of Ephesus contain on the creed which the presbyter Charisius suggested in that council,<sup>47</sup> still, the holy Cyril in his letter says: “Those proclaiming the creed full of wrong ideas which the presbyter Charisius produced in Ephesus, said that it had been composed by Theodore of Mopsuestia.”<sup>48</sup> But Hesychius says: “For a certain Charisius, a man who had fulfilled the office of presbyter at a see of the church of the Philadelphians, put himself in the middle and alleged that a lot of heretic discord had the aforementioned city in its grips; and that as this had started to be taken out and expelled, Nestorius had begrudged the change from worse to better, and had, exceptionally, transmitted a different creed of faith in Christ.” This is what Hesychius says.

*Commentary*

In the first session of the council of Ephesus (22 July 431),<sup>49</sup> cited at Chalcedon,<sup>50</sup> the presbyter Charisius brought up that Novatians and Quartodecimans had been converted to a false, that is, ‘Nestorian’ creed by Nestorius, during his controversial campaign of 428.<sup>51</sup> Cyril of Alexandria attributed the creed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, but in the account of Charisius, Nestorius is blamed. Pelagius exploits this ambiguity and plays Cyril off against Hesychius. Presumably, this episode from Hesychius was mentioned in the florilegium that Pelagius sought to refute. It seems unlikely that Pelagius would have looked up Hesychius himself, but this cannot be excluded given the ad-

<sup>47</sup> Pelagius alludes to the fact that the acts do not mention that the creed would be by Theodore of Mopsuestia. He thus brings two proofs against Cyril: the acts of the council and Hesychius.

<sup>48</sup> Cyril of Alexandria *Ep.* 91 (*ACO* I.5 314–315).

<sup>49</sup> *ACO* I.1.2 3–64.

<sup>50</sup> *ACO* I.1.7 96–97.

<sup>51</sup> Socr. *HE* 7.29; *Cod. Theod.* 16.5.65 (30 May 428).

ditional information he offers in T2. Facundus refers to the same episode (3.2.22), but without reference to Hesychius.<sup>52</sup> It is possible that between 545 and 551 Hesychius was looked up by the opponents of Theodore to add weight to their accusations, but it may also be that Hesychius only started to draw the attention of the supporters of Theodore once he had been mentioned in the edict of Justinian.

On the basis of this fragment, Hesychius knew only what was said in the council acts about the author of the creed. This shows that he relied on (a version of) the acts.<sup>53</sup>

May, 2016

Department of History  
Ghent University  
Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 35  
9000 Ghent, Belgium  
lieve.vanhoof@ugent.be  
panagiotis.manafis@ugent.be  
peter.vannuffelen@ugent.be

<sup>52</sup> See also Justinian *Edictum rectae fidei*: Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften* 101.34–36.

<sup>53</sup> The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007–2013) / ERC Grant Agreement no. 313153.