Patrick Brimioulle: Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 536. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2020 (Roma Aeterna 8). 323 p. € 58.00. ISBN: 978-3-515-12666-3.

As the title suggests, the book contains an analysis of the context and the proceedings of the council of Constantinople 536, that is, the *Endemousa* (Resident) Synod at which the Miaphysites Anthimus of Constantinople, Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamea, the monk Zooras and their followers were condemned and expelled from Constantinople. Patrick Brimioulle's study comes to cover a gap in scholarship with regard to the council in question (12). Indeed, the paucity of scholarly works on the council of 536[1] does not do justice to the council's importance, especially in relation to Justinian's religious policy, as well as to the wealth of the relevant surviving evidence, above all the council's acts. The latter are extent in their entirety and have been made accessible (albeit only in the original Greek text)[2] through the splendid edition of Eduard Schwartz in the monumental "Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum" series.[3] Brimioulle's book, as the first monograph to focus on this significant but under-researched topic, is an important contribution.

In the Introduction (chapter 1, 11–19), Brimioulle states that his study comprises two parts (15): the first, descriptive part ("darstellender Teil", chapters

1 Brimioulle (12 n. 4) mentions, nevertheless, the articles by Jakob Speigl and Fergus Millar which deal with the council of 536 exclusively: J. Speigl: Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel. In: OS 43, 1994, 105–153; Synoden im Gefolge der Wende der Religionspolitik unter Kaiser Justinos (518). In: OS 45, 1996, 3–20; F. Millar: Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church under Justinian. Two Synods of C.E. 536. In: JRS 98, 2008, 62–82. It should be noted that Millar's article is not included in the book's bibliography, while two more fundamental articles by Millar that examine the acts of 536 could have been mentioned: Linguistic Co-existence in Constantinople. Greek and Latin (and Syriac) in the Acts of the Synod of 536 C.E. In: JRS 99, 2009, 92–103; Presenting a Case against Peter of Apamea before the *Praeses* of Syria Secunda in 519. In: F. Millar (ed.): Empire, Church and Society in the Late Roman Near East. Greeks, Jews, Syrians and Saracens (Collected Studies, 2004–2014). Leuven/Paris/Bristol 2015 (Late Antique History and Religion 10), 71–92.

2 An annotated English translation of the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople 536 is in preparation by the reviewer.

3 E. Schwartz (ed.): Collectio Sabbaitica contra Acephalos et Origeniastas destinata. Insunt acta synodorum Constantinopolitanae et Hierosolymitanae a. 536. Berlin 1940 (Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum 3); hereafter abbreviated as ACO III.

2–4 and 5.1) consists of the presentation of the historical and religious backdrop of the council from the reign of Anastasius (491–518) up to the time of the council's convocation in 536, as well as a detailed description of the council's proceedings and of the texts incorporated in its acts. The second part, which the author calls "strukturanalytischer Teil" (chapter 5.2 and 6), contains a discussion on the significance of the *Endemousa* as an institution and the role of the different actors involved in church politics at the time of the council. In addition, the book includes a chapter (chapter 6) which explores the social and religious framework of the council, i.e., the question of the establishment of theological-religious-political identities, a topic which, according to Brimioulle (14), has not been studied adequately. In what follows, I will comment on each chapter separately, aiming to demonstrate the most important contributions thereof, as well as any deficits I detected in the analysis.

Before proceeding to that, however, we have to note an oversight in the section of the Introduction where Brimioulle presents the primary sources he employed in his study. More specifically, in the part referring to the acts of the council, Brimioulle appears to have misinterpreted Schwartz's comments on the peculiar arrangement of the various records within the acts (16).[4] Schwartz in his edition preserved the arrangement he found in the manuscripts preserving the acts, which goes as follows: the record of the fifth and final session on Severus, Peter and Zooras appears first, followed by Justinian's constitution confirming the council's decrees; this is ensued by the acts of the synod of Jerusalem that encompass the records of the first four sessions of the council dedicated to the case of Anthimus. Schwartz justified this arrangement by suggesting that the representatives of the monasteries of the Palestinian desert[5] carried the record of the council's last session to Jerusalem as soon as this had been completed, since its proceedings were of greatest interest for Peter of Jerusalem. Later on, they delivered to Peter Justinian's constitution and Menas' letter (both were read out at the Jerusalem synod) together with the entire record of the acts. This explains why the last session comprises a separate dossier.[6] Brimioulle, however, mis-

4 ACO III (n. 3) VIIII–X.

5 In Schwartz's view, the collection was compiled in Palestine, see ACO III (n. 3) VIIII.

6 ACO III (n. 3) VIIII–X: *postquam apocrisiarii monasteriorum deserti Hierosolimitani constitutionem quae d. 6. m Aug. a. 536 ab imperatore subscripta est* [p. 123, 14] *et Menae*

understands Schwartz's Latin and claims (16) that Schwartz believed it happened the other way around: that the representatives from Jerusalem first carried the records of sessions I–IV, Justinian's constitution and Menas' letter to Paul of Jerusalem, while after the judgement against Severus, Peter and Zooras was pronounced, the second set of records was carried to Jerusalem and the two were then joined together.[7] A possible explanation for the misreading of Schwartz's comments is the fact that the acts of the sessions on Anthimus, Justinian's *diataxis* and Menas' letter were the documents recited at the synod in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, it is certainly not possible that the latter two documents were carried to Jerusalem after the completion of the fourth session, as they were surely composed only after the end of the fifth session.

Chapter 2 ("Die Kirchenpolitik des Anastasios [491–518]", 20–73) examines Anastasius' religious policy and its consequences, particularly in view of the situation in Constantinople (22–50) and in the patriarchate of Antioch (51–70). Brimioulle (37–44) emphasises that Anastasius' aim was the unity of the church, first by using the *Henoticon* as the basis for reconciliation between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites, and secondly through his intervention in favour of the *Staurotheis* addition to the *Trisagion*. Brimioulle is right in stressing the difficulties Anastasius encountered in controlling the opposition

patriarchae litteras [5, 48] *quibus adiuncta sunt gesta synodalia* [p. 125, 1], *Hierosolima portaverunt* [p. 123, 28], *congregata est Hierosolimis a Petro patriarcha synodus episcoporum trium Palaestinarum d. 19. m. Sept. 536* [p. 123, 16 sq.] *atque lectae sunt illo die constitutio et quattuor actiones priores synodi Constantinopolitanae, dilata est in alium diem lectio ultimae actionis, quippe quae dudum nota sit patriarchae episcopisque Palaestinis* [p. 125, 32]. *facile suppletur gesta ultimae actionis statim post illius diem, qui erat d. 4 m. Iun. a. 536, ab apocrisiariis monasteriorum deserti Hierosolimitani ad Petrum patriarcham Hierosolima esse destinata, antequam ipsi redierunt con-stitutionem universaque gesta portantes, quoniam iis Petroque patriarchae condemnationis magis intererat Severi et consortium quam Anthimi. eandem ob causam is qui collectionem composuit, ipsa ultimae actionis gesta priore posuit loco, actiones de Anthimo ita distulit ut synodo Hiero-solimitanae insererentur.*

7 "Nachdem nach der vierten Sitzung Anthimos von dem Konzil in Konstantinopel 536 verurteilt worden war, wurden die Apokrisiare aus Jerusalem zusammen mit den Akten der Sitzungen I–IV, der Diataxis Justinians und einem Brief von Menas von Konstantinopel an Paul von Jerusalem gesandt, wo sie dann in einer zum 19. September 536 einberufenen Synode verlesen und von den tagenden Bischöfen bestätigt wurde. Nachdem am 4. Juni auf der fünften Sitzung das Urteil gegen Severos, Petros von Apameia und den Mönch Zooras gesprochen und es am 6. August durch die Diataxis Justinians bestätigt wurde, wurde der zweite Aktenblock nach Jerusalem geschickt, wo die beiden Blöcke dann zusammengefügt wurden".

raised by the Chalcedonian monks in Constantinople and Syria. Brimioulle's presentation (70–73) of the increasing division of the Chalcedonian camp in Constantinople into confrontational Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians willing to follow Anastasius' policy, and of the radicalisation of Chalcedonian monks in the Palestinian desert as consequences of Anastasius' unsuccessful policy efficiently prepares the ensuing chapters.

Chapter 3 ("Die kirchenpolitischen Entwicklungen unter Justin I.", 74–106) deals with the religious policy in Justin's reign, which was characterised by a Chalcedonian turn. The discussion (74–77) begins with the stormy gatherings that took place in Hagia Sophia shortly after Justin's elevation to the throne at which the crowd raised acclamations asking for the restoration of the communion with Rome, the rehabilitation of the deposed Chalcedonian bishops in the *diptychs*, the endorsement of Chalcedon and the condemnation of Severus. There follows (77–82) a section on the synods that took place in 518 with a special emphasis on the *Endemousa* Synod of Constantinople. Although the documents related to the *Endemousa* and the ensuing local synods are preserved in the acts of the council of 536, Brimioulle refers only summarily to them (also in chapter 5, see below). In the part dedicated to the *Endemousa* of 518, Brimioulle seems to have misinterpreted the letter of the monks to the synod, as he states (77–78) that it must have been written during the synod, for it praises the rehabilitation of Euphemius and Macedonius, which had apparently already been decided by the synod, and now requests the addition of Chalcedon to the *diptychs*, the condemnation of Severus etc.[8] In reality, however, the monks asked for the ratification of the decisions taken in Hagia Sophia, thus the letter was certainly written before the

8 "Einer der Briefe, mit denen sich die Mönche der Stadt an die Synode wandten, entstand, wie seinem Inhalt zu entnehmen ist, während der Synode. Denn er lobt zum einen die Rehabilitierung des Euphemios und Makedonios, die anscheinend schon von der Synode beschlossen worden war, und fordert nun zusätzlich die Einfügung Chalkedons in die Diptychen sowie die Verurteilung des Severus". The same document is commented upon in a similar way in chapter 5, p. 179: "Die Mönche der Stadt wandten sich zusätzlich in einem Brief an die noch tagende Synode, bestätigten ihre Beschlüsse und forderten nun auch die Rückführung der Überreste des Euphemios und Makedonios nach Konstantinopel", and p. 179 n. 187: "Dass die Synode zu diesem Zeitpunkt noch tagte beziehungsweise noch nicht abgeschlossen war, geht daraus hervor, dass die Mönche in ihrem Brief einige der Beschlüsse, die die Synode offensichtlich schon gefällt hatte, bestätigten und weitere Forderungen erhoben, die sich später in der Anaphora wiederfanden, die alle Beschlüsse der Synode festhielt".

synod.[9] A more detailed analysis of the local synods which confirmed the decisions of the *Endemousa* would have allowed a reflection on the existence of communication networks across the East, the interrelations between state and Church, bishops and monks etc., especially in relation to the material from Syria Secunda.[10] In the last part of this section of the chapter (80–82), the *Endemousa* synod as an institution is also taken into consideration: Brimioulle emphasises its distinct features in comparison to other synods (such as the fact that bishops from other patriarchates could attend it or that it could be convened very promptly), which made it a useful instrument of Church politics in the hands of the bishop, the emperor or even the monks and the bishops residing in the capital, as was the case in the synod of 518, which served as a model for that of 536.

In chapter 4 ("Die Kirchenpolitik Justinians bis zum Konzil von 536", 107–125), Brimioulle focuses on the Church policy of Justinian up to the time of the council's convocation in 536. He outlines (107–120) Justinian's efforts to achieve the Miaphysites' integration into the Church, both indirectly, e.g., through his carefully enunciated profession of faith in 527 or the introduction of the hymn ὁ Μονογενής into the liturgy and of the *theopaschite* formula,

9 ACO III (n. 3) p. 67, l. 14–23: ἐπὶ τὴν παροῦσαν ἰδεῖν δέησιν, δι' ἧς ἀξιοῦμεν πάντες ἡμεῖς καὶ δι' ἡμῶν ὁ λοιπὸς κατάλογος τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων μοναχῶν ὡς ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης τὰ καλῶς καὶ συμφερόντως κινηθέντα ἐν τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς βασιλίδος ταύτης πόλεως παρὰ τοῦ πιστοτάτου λαοῦ καὶ τὰ προσφωνηθέντα πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν φιλόχριστον λαὸν παρὰ τοῦ τὰ πάντα ὁσιωτάτου καὶ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Ἰωάννου ταῦτα διὰ φωνῆς τῆς ἁγίας ὑμῶν συνόδου ἐγγράφως δέξασθαι τὸ κῦρος καὶ τοὺς οὐκ ἴσμεν ὅπως ἐξεωθέντας ἐν ὁσίαι τῇ μνήμῃ γενομένους πατέρας ἡμῶν, φαμὲν Εὐφήμιον καὶ Μακεδόνιον, τούτους ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος δικαίως καὶ κανονικῶς ἀνακληθῆναι καὶ ἀποδοθῆναι τῶι καταλόγωι τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν ἐνταῦθα ἐν κυρίωι ἀναπαυσαμένων ἀρχιεπισκόπων ("to attend to the present petition, through which all of us and, through us, the rest of the list of the most devout monks beseech, as of one accord, that what had been rightly and profitably raised by the most faithful people in the great most holy church of this imperial city as well as the pronouncements addressed to the same Christ-loving people by our most sacred in respect of everything and most holy archbishop and oecumenical patriarch John, these be validated in writing through the verdict of your holy council, and our Fathers of sacred memory who had been expelled – how, we do not know – that is, Euphemius and Macedonius, be presently, rightfully and in accordance with the canons recalled and restored into the list of the archbishops who had rested in the Lord here before them"). Cf. A. A. Vasiliev: Justin the First. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great. Cambridge, Mass. 1950 (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 1), 145; Millar: Presenting a Case against Peter of Apamea before the *Praeses* of Syria Secunda in 519 (n. 1), 75.

10 Millar's article "Presenting a Case against Peter of Apamea before the *Praeses* of Syria Secunda in 519" (n. 1), could have served as a basis for such a discussion.

and directly, e.g., through the religious conversations between representatives of the Chalcedonians and the non-Chalcedonians held in Constantinople in 532. With regard to the latter, Brimioulle articulately explains (111–115) how concern arose among the Chalcedonians in the wake of the concessions made on the part of Justinian and some of the Chalcedonians (among them Anthimus) during the – eventually unsuccessful – conversations, such as the acquittal of Dioscorus from the accusation of heresy as well as the abandonment of the Chalcedonian theological formula. Crucial for the analysis in the ensuing chapter is also the part on Justinian's condemnation of the Acoemeti monks (115–118), known as the most radical champions of Chalcedon, which alarmed the Chalcedonians, especially in view of the condemnation's confirmation by the bishop of Rome. Brimioulle's observation that this contributed to the Acoemeti becoming a significant actor in the events that led to the council of 536 is also on point. Besides, greatly useful is the excursus (121–125) on the political situation in the 530s which sets the historical-political context of the council of 536 and the importance of Rome for Justinian's policy.

Let us have a closer look at chapter 5 ("Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 536", 126–228), which makes up one third of the book and is the core of Brimioulle's study: following a discussion (126–132) of the immediate context of the council (i.e., the situation in Constantinople in terms of the increasing influence of the Miaphysites, Agapetus' arrival, Anthimus' election), Brimioulle presents the course of the council's proceedings mainly through the description of the documents which were recited at it and later incorporated in its acts. The discussion begins (133–150) with the documents sent to (and from) Agapetus and Justinian before the council, which were recited at the council's first session. Although Brimioulle claims that these letters allow for a reconstruction of the exact chronology of the events in the years 535 and 536 (150), he does not comment on the dating of the documents themselves. In relation to the letter of the monks of Constantinople, Syria Secunda and Palestine to Justinian (§ 59), Brimioulle (135) interestingly sees in the monks' parallelism between Agapetus' intervention in Anthimus' case and Celestine's condemnation of Nestorius which preceded the summoning of the Council of Ephesus in 431 a concealed request on the part of the monks for the summoning of an ecumenical council in Anthimus' case as well. Brimioulle's claim (134), however, that Severus, Peter and Zooras were the main targets of the monks rather than Anthimus seems far-fetched: the

letter centers on Anthimus' indiction and the events surrounding his deposition, while it refers only briefly and in passing to the Miaphysites. In fact, the reference to Anthimus as μεῖζον καὶ ἐγκόλπιον ἡμῶν κακόν ("the greatest evil and one that is in our bosom")[11] leaves little doubt that the council which the monks possibly had in mind would have aimed primarily at the condemnation of Anthimus. This idea is further supported by the fact that the *Didascalicon* of the monks (§ 62) composed for the *Endemousa* focuses exclusively on Anthimus and the request for a ratification of Agapetus' decision.

Brimioulle's discussion in the section concerned with Anthimus (153–155) and the council of 536 is rather brief, especially with regard to the relevant synodal proceedings, as opposed to the part (155–166) on Anthimus' theological position which is quite thorough. That is, there is no precise reference to the standard – and in the council in question, in fact, extremely comprehensive – threefold summons procedure which was in the centre of the proceedings on Anthimus, neither to its components, such as the delegations and their composition,[12] the means by which the summonses were delivered (especially the public announcement of the summons, a *programma*, which is unique in late antique conciliar acts), the deadlines set, etc.[13] In addition, Brimioulle's observation that when the first delegation failed to find Anthimus, they delivered the summons to some clerics they met at the places where they had been searching for him in order that they could pass it on to him (153), possibly goes back to a misunderstanding of the passage where it is mentioned that the delegates had asked the clerics if they had known where Anthimus had been residing at the time.[14] At any rate, it should be

11 ACO III (n. 3) p. 131, l. 35–36.

12 Brimioulle (153 n. 98) does state that it is not explained in the text why specific clerics were chosen to be included in the delegations sent to Anthimus: "Warum gerade diese Kleriker ausgewählt wurden, um Anthimos vorzuladen, geht aus den Akten nicht hervor und bleibt im Dunkeln. Dasselbe gilt für die Zusammensetzung des zweiten und dritten Suchtrupps." According to the typical threefold summons procedure, different delegates from among the bishops and clerics present at the council were appointed for each of the summonses, without a certain explanation for their choice ever being given.

13 On the topic of the threefold summons in conciliar acts in general and the Acts of Constantinople 536 in particular, see M. Constantinou: The Threefold Summons at Late Antique Church Councils. In: Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung 107, 2021, 1–47, esp. 37–44.

14 ACO III (n. 3) p. 159, l. 17–24.

noted that in all the other instances of threefold summonses in conciliar acts, the summons had to be delivered strictly to the person for whom it was destined.

The part on the fifth session of the council of 536 which dealt with Severus, Peter of Apamea and Zooras is also presented in the form of an analysis of the documents recited (170–181). It is useful to note here that there are some inconsistencies in the argumentation on the time of composition of the letter of the bishops from the Antiochian patriarchate to Justinian and the conclusions drawn from it. More specifically, Brimioulle argues (171) that the bishops from Syria Secunda, who were apparently not present at the council, composed and signed the letter as soon as they had been informed about the course of events by the participants of the council, that is, in the interval between the fourth and fifth session.[15] Brimioulle goes on to suggest (171–172) that, given the short period (14 days) within which the metropolitan bishop of Apamea Paul managed to gather his suffragans and got them to sign the letter, the bishops of Syria Secunda were aware of the plans of the monks and the bishops residing in Constantinople beforehand and were thus able to react quickly.[16] It is of course very likely that the bishops in Antioch were in communication with the monks and bishops residing in the capital, but it is not clear why one should assume that the letter to Justinian was composed after the council's fourth session, since it contains no reference to the issuing

15 "Was auffällt, wenn man die Unterschriftenliste des Briefes mit der Teilnehmerliste der Synode vergleicht, ist, dass die hier schreibenden Bischöfe nicht an der Synode teilnahmen. Es scheint, dass diese in der Zwischenzeit von den Teilnehmern der *synodos endemousa* über den Ablauf der Ereignisse informiert worden waren, sodass diese noch vor Einberufung der fünften Sitzung darauf mit einem Bestätigungsschreiben reagieren konnten".

16 "Das heißt, innerhalb dieser kurzen Zeit gelangten die Beschlüsse der Synode zu den Bischöfen der Syria II, der Metropolit Paul von Apameia versammelte seine Suffragane, setzte den Brief auf, ließ die Bischöfe unterschreiben und sandte den Brief an die Teilnehmer der Synode in Konstantinopel, die der Brief pünktlich zur fünften Sitzung erreichte. Es erscheint sehr zweifelhaft, dass die Bischöfe der Syria II unvorbereitet gewesen sind. Zwar ist das im Brief dargelegte Glaubensbekenntnis sehr formelhaft und nicht innovativ, sodass sichtlich wenig Arbeit und Diskussion darin investiert wurde, doch muss Paul von Apameia trotzdem einige Zeit benötigt haben, die Bischöfe zu versammeln, um sie von der Synode in Konstantinopel zu unterrichten und ihre Unterschriften einzusammeln. Es scheint also, dass die Bischöfe der Syria II in die Planungen der Mönche und Bischöfe in Konstantinopel eingeweiht waren, sodass sie schnell reagieren konnten". The same idea is repeated in p. 201, 215.

of the verdict on Anthimus – or to the council altogether – as the request to Justinian to expel Anthimus demonstrates.[17] It is safer to consider that the Antiochene bishops wrote the letter to Justinian soon after Agapetus died and before the council was summoned.[18] In fact, Brimioulle (172) himself mentions that the bishops of Syria Secunda were probably involved in the machinations aiming at Anthimus' deposition and Severus' condemnation also before the council's convocation.

There follows (175–181) the presentation of the dossier of relevant documents from the time of Justin's ascension to the throne which were recited at the council and inserted into the acts. With regard to Hormisdas' letter to the monks of Syria Secunda, Brimioulle (175) suggests that Hormisdas' concealed criticism of Anastasius as a lay person devoid of authority to interfere in church matters is applicable to Justinian's case as well and considers it the main reason for it being chosen to be recited at the synod. This is a clever observation, but it should not annihilate the letter's importance as evidence of Hormisdas' condemnation of Severus and Peter of Apamea. Brimioulle (175) goes so far to say: "Ansonsten scheint der Brief keine relevanten Informationen betreffs der Fälle Severos und Petros zu enthalten, weshalb sich die Frage stellt, wozu er in der fünften Sitzung, noch dazu zu Beginn der Beweisaufnahme zitiert wird. Denn der Brief geht nur in unkonkreten Worten auf die Vergehen der Miaphysiten ein, die in den weiteren präsentierten Dokumenten ausführlich beschrieben werden, sodass der Brief in dieser Hinsicht keinen Mehrwert bietet. Der Grund für die Anführung dieses Brie-

17 ACO III (n. 3) p. 31, l. 16.19–25: ἡμεῖς δὲ [...] παρακαλοῦμεν ἀποστραφῆναι τὸν ἐν σκαμβῇ καρδίαι καὶ μὴ ἐξ ὅλης καὶ καθαρᾶς διανοίας δεξάμενον τὰ ὀρθὰ καὶ ἀνεπίληπτα δόγματα τῶν εἰρημένων ἁγίων πατέρων, ἀλλ' ἐν ὑποκρίσει μὲν σχηματισάμενον δέξασθαι τὰς ἁγίας τέσσαρας συνόδους καὶ τὴν ἀοίδιμον ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πάπα Λέοντος διὰ τὸ ἀξιόπιστον τῶν προσώπων, ἔργοις δὲ ἀρνησάμενον καὶ μὴ ὁμολογήσαντα τὴν ἀγαθὴν αὐτῶν πίστιν καὶ ὀρθόδοξον καὶ ἰδικῶς τὰς φωνὰς ἐκείνας δι' ὧν Εὐτυχῆ τὸν παράφρονα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξέτεμον, καὶ ἀπελάσαι τοῦτον τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐσεβοῦς πολιτείας, φαμὲν δὲ Ἄνθιμον ("we [...] request that you turn away from the man who had adhered to the right and blameless doctrines of the said holy fathers with a crooked heart rather than with a sound and pure intention, feigning with deceitfulness that he adhered to the four holy councils and to the notorious letter of the pope Leo, [now] among saints, in order to be seen as trustworthy, while with his actions he repudiated and did not confess their revered and orthodox faith, particularly those utterances by which they separated from the church the mad Eutyches. [We request] that you also expel from your pious state that man, that is, Anthimus").

18 Cf. Speigl: Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel (n. 1), 132.

fes dürfte wohl die Kritik sein, die Hormisdas an herrschenden Laien äußert". This is unconvincing, since the letter refers to Severus and Peter by name, said to be considered as equal to those condemned by the Roman see and thus have to be condemned as well.[19] All statements by the Roman delegates stress Hormisdas' judgement on Severus and Peter which is included in the letters they present. Accordingly, it was important to include the evidence from Rome as a parallel of Agapetus and Anthimus and it is very likely that this letter was the only evidence of Hormisdas' condemnation of Severus and Peter.

In the part where the confirmation of the synod of Constantinople decrees by the Synod of Jerusalem is discussed, Brimioulle presents the course of the latter synod's proceedings differently than in Chapter 1:[20] that is, he mentions (192) that the acts of the fifth session of Constantinople 536 and Justinian's constitution were read out and ratified first, while the acts of the four sessions on Anthimus were recited at a later time.[21] However, according to the text, the Jerusalem synod's verdict concerns Anthimus exclusively and it is clear from the text that the records of proceedings on Anthimus' case were examined in the first place, while the rest of the proceedings was said to be examined another day or the next day.[22]

19 ACO III (n. 3) p. 55, l. 16–22: οὓς ἡ ἀποστολικὴ καθέδρα καὶ κατέλαβε παραπλησίους ὄντας τοῖς ἑαυτῶν διδασκάλοις καὶ τοῖς κατακριθεῖσι συνέζευξε, [...] ἀλλὰ καὶ Σεβῆρον τοῦ αὐτοῦ τόπου οὐδὲν ἧττον [...], Πέτρον τὸν Ἀπαμείας, οὐ μόνον ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ὁμοίως ἀπωλείας κατακριτέους.

20 There (16) Brimioulle mentions that the set of minutes of the first four sessions on Anthimus was brought to Jerusalem in the first place and hence was the first to be discussed. See also above.

21 "In der Synode in Jerusalem wurden zuerst die Akten der fünften Sitzung des Konzils in Konstantinopel, die sich mit Severos von Antiocheia, Petros von Apameia und dem Mönch Zooras befassten, zusammen mit der Diataxis Justinians verlesen, woraufhin die Jerusalemer die Beschlüsse bestätigten und sich in einem zweiten Schritt mit dem Fall Anthimos befassten. Hierzu verlas man die Akten der ersten vier Sitzungen in Konstantinopel, woraufhin die Jerusalemer Synodalen auch das Urteil über Anthimos bekräftigten".

22 ACO III (n. 3) p. 125, l. 30–34: Τέως τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀνθίμῳ πεπραγμένα δῆλα γινέσθω διὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ἐγγραφόμενα τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῖν πραττομένοις. οὕτω γὰρ καθ' ἑτέραν εἰσόμεθα καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶι ἀναθεματισμῶι παρακολουθήσαντα Σεβήρου καὶ Πέτρου καὶ Ζώρα τῶν δυσσεβεστάτων, κἂν τὰ μάλιστα οὐκ ἄγνωστα ἡμῖν ταῦτα καθέστηκε ("To begin with, let the proceedings on the case of Anthimus be made manifest through their quotation in order to be inserted into the records of our proceedings. Hence, tomorrow/some

There are many interesting points in the separate subchapter that refers to the *Endemousa* of 518 as a model for 536. Brimioulle (200) argues that the bishops and monks in Constantinople used the *Endemousa* of 518 as model, since the experience of 518 helped them plan their course of action with greater precision in 536. That is, the synod of 518 proved to them that it was possible to expel Severus and determine the emperor's ecclesiastical political course without the active engagement of the emperor and the bishop of Constantinople through an *Endemousa* synod. An important contribution of Brimioulle's analysis that is also pointed out by the author himself (202) is that he, unlike the previous scholarship on the Council of 536 that focused on the role of Agapetus, lays strong emphasis on the role of the monks and bishops as primary actors who led to the summoning of the synod and determined the course of its proceedings.

In chapter 6 ("Zur Herausbildung kirchenpolitischer Identitäten", 229–303), Brimioulle lays out a fruitful discussion on how the Council of 536 and the events surrounding it may be used to investigate the way certain religious identities were formed in the context of christological disputes. Brimioulle (230–296) effectively explains how factors such as everyday religious practice, local theological traditions (e.g. established theological formulas in the community) and the authority or interventions (e.g. with material resources) of certain persons determined a community's religious identity. In the "Ausblick", the last part of the book (304–309), Brimioulle presents the interesting idea that the turn of events at the Council of 536 may had played a role in Justinian's decision to convene an ecumenical council – with predetermined agenda and heavily staged proceedings – to settle the Three Chapters controversy in 553. In Brimioulle's view, the council of 536 proved that a council could be an instrument in that hands of bishops and monks and could be used even against the emperor's policy and intentions.

Overall, Brimioulle's study is a worthwhile and interesting read, in that it includes a well written, original and multidimensional analysis of an important and under-researched source of the sixth century and its context. However, it could have been an even better book, had the distinction between the "darstellender Teil" and the "strukturanalytischer Teil" been clear-

> other day we will go through the proceedings which followed concerning the anathematisation of the most impious Severus, Peter and Zooras, even though these have not been unknown to us at all").

er, as this structural choice led to several repetitions in different sections of the book, e.g., the analysis of the idea of the distinction between lay people and priests in the letter of Hormisdas reoccurs in p. 175, 208–209, 219. Another weakness is the linguistic unreliability. Often the original Greek (or Schwartz's Latin) is misunderstood. While Brimioulle undoubtedly provides a valuable contribution to the study of late antique church councils and Justinian's religious policy, readers are advised to verify details with the original text.[23]

This review is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 677638.

23 Further, many Greek names are misspelled, e.g. "Dolmetios" instead of Dometios and "Enkratadon" instead of Eukratadon (128 n. 6); "Akakios von Pissinuntos" instead of Akakios von Pissinus or Pessinus (Πισινούντων is the genitive form) (153): "Kalomynos" instead of Kalonymos (153); "Petrobolos" instead of Pterobolos (233).

Maria Constantinou, Open University of Cyprus, Nicosia
School of Pure and Applied Sciences
maria.constantinou5@ouc.ac.cy

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Maria Constantinou: Rezension zu: Patrick Brimioulle: Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 536. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2020 (Roma Aeterna 8). In: Plekos 23, 2021, 285–296 (URL: http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2021/r-brimioulle.pdf).