



Iowa Research Online

The University of Iowa's Institutional Repository

[Honors Theses at the University of Iowa](#)

Spring 2020

Severus of Antioch and the Anti-Chalcedonian Movement

Benjamin Kimball

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.uiowa.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [European History Commons](#), [History of Christianity Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [Intellectual History Commons](#), [Islamic World and Near East History Commons](#), [Medieval History Commons](#), and the [Medieval Studies Commons](#)

This honors thesis is available at Iowa Research Online: https://ir.uiowa.edu/honors_theses/352

SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH AND THE ANTI-CHALCEDONIAN MOVEMENT

by

Benjamin Kimball

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for graduation with Honors in the History

Michael Moore
Thesis Mentor

Spring 2020

All requirements for graduation with Honors in the
History have been completed.

Kyle McEvily
History Honors Advisor

Benjamin Kimball

History Honors Thesis

“Severus of Antioch and the Anti-Chalcedonian Movement”

The Council of Chalcedon in 451 was a watershed moment for the history of the Eastern Roman Church, which set in motion one of the most lasting divisions in the history of the Church. Core to the council's purpose had been resolving disputes over the relationship between the humanity and the divinity of Jesus Christ. The supporters and opponents of Chalcedon struggled over its impact on the meaning of orthodoxy. To the supporters of Chalcedon or the Pro-Chalcedonians, the Council represented a firm rejection of both Nestorianism and Eutychianism. To its opponents, the Anti-Chalcedonians the Council had gone too far rejecting not only heresy but also important aspects of orthodoxy. These Anti-Chalcedonians were a fairly diverse collection of different groups within the Eastern Roman Church, which all had different ideas about what made the Council of Chalcedon heretical. All Anti-Chalcedonians had in common at least two key points: their vehement rejection of the Council of Chalcedon and their reverence for Saint Cyril of Alexandria.

It is important to understand these realities when considering the life and influence of Severus of Antioch. Severus (d.538) played an important role in redefining the Anti-Chalcedonian movement both in its theology and its role in politics, to the point that even long after his death it was his theology that Pro-Chalcedonian theologians were still struggling against. In order to understand his role and influence on Anti-Chalcedonian Movement, it is necessary to consider the influence of the culture and politics of the late Roman world on his life, as well as the influence of his monastic origins on his later political and theological career. The role that the broader politics of the period, and that Severus's own monastic career had in shaping his thought and works is vital.

These influences shaped Severus into one of the most influential theologians of his day, leading him to play a major role in redefining the 'Anti-Chalcedonian' Movement. Taking it from a loose

collection of groups sharing only their hatred for Chalcedon and turning it into a unified movement that sought to establish itself as ‘Orthodox’ over any other alternatives. To that end Severus was not only the architect of the theology that drove this movement, but also played a vital role in seeing its political ambitions achieved, through Severus’s relationship with the Emperor Anastasius.

Even after his death Severus’s legacy continued to be of considerable importance, such that even centuries after his death the supporters of Chalcedon still felt the need to attack him directly. To some all of this might not seem that important but Severus’s life sheds light on the relationship between politics and the church in the Late Roman Empire. However, Severus’s thought has left an even more influential legacy among modern Miaphysite Christians, as it is his theology that sits at the heart of their beliefs. Yet everything has a beginning, and to understand Severus’s later influence it is necessary to look back at his early life.

The Early Life of Severus: The Late Roman World in the Late Fifth and Early Sixth Centuries

Severus of Antioch was born in the city of Sozopolis in Pisidia, to a wealthy family which had long been part of Sozopolis’s local elite.¹ It is here that one of the most important controversies around Severus’s youth, must be addressed, that he and his family were Hellenes or Pagans. While traditionally this has been a much debated topic when it comes to Severus’s life, the discovery of one of Severus’s own homilies in Coptic, wherein he describes himself as being a ‘Hellene’ when he was young, has rendered this dispute pointless.² Nonetheless, this dispute does bring to light some of the important issues in considering Severus’s life, namely the trustworthiness of the sources on his life. The two best sources on Severus’s life, both titled the *Life of Severus*, were written during Severus’s life or shortly thereafter. The

¹ Zacharias Scholasticus. “Life of Severos”. *Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch*. Translated by Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013. P. 35.

² Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald. “Introduction: Severos outline of his life”. *Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch*. Translated by Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013. P. 1-3.

First and perhaps most trustworthy source on Severus's life was written by Severus's friend the historian Zacharias Scholasticus. The second *Life of Severus* is more mysterious and though it is attributed to John the Abbot of Beth Aphtonía, it is more likely the work of an otherwise unknown monastic author.³ There are other Lives of Severus but these two are the only ones which appear to have been written by Severus's own contemporaries.⁴ Of the two biographies of Severus which were written by Severus's contemporaries Zacharias's *Life of Severus* deals more heavily with Severus's early life, while the anonymous *Life of Severus* is more hagiographical focusing on portraying Severus as a Saint rather than providing much in the way of details of Severus's life.

Returning however to Severus's early life, his family's status among the elites of Sozopolis meant that when he came of age he was sent to Alexandria to receive a good classical education.⁵ It would be there that he first met one of his chief biographers, Zacharias Scholasticus who at the time was also receiving an education in Alexandria and the two quickly developed a close friendship.⁶ One important thing to note when considering Zacharias's *Life of Severus*, is that on many occasions he was quick to downplay anything which suggested Severus was a pagan. For example, claiming that Severus's failure to be baptized while young was because people in Pisidia usually waited until adulthood to be baptized.⁷ This in spite of the fact that shortly after making this claim, he notes that as a young man Severus was an admirer of the pagan philosopher Libanius.⁸ Nonetheless, even though Zacharias is quick to downplay Severus's paganism, his efforts to do so do little to conceal the truth. As many of these details still made their way into the narrative, and with enough elements left intact for the truth to be read in between the

³ Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald. "Introduction: Biographical Materials For the Life of Severos". *Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch*. Translated by Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013. P. 12-13.

⁴ Brock and Fitzgerald. "Introduction: Biographical Materials For the Life of Severos". *Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch*. P. 13-14.

⁵ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P.35-36.

⁶ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 36-37.

⁷ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 36.

⁸ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 37

lines. That Severus was a pagan as young man, and that before his arrival in Alexandria he seems to have had very little to do with the Christianity.

Severus's first serious experience with Christianity came through the influence of Zacharias who exposed him to the writings of Christian theologians such as Basil and Gregory which were written in opposition to Libanius.⁹ According to Zacharias, these works had a profound influence on Severus, such that after reading them Severus switched from praising Libanius to praising Basil.¹⁰ Though Zacharias would make much of Severus's newfound appreciation for the writings of Basil, their actual effect on Severus seems more questionable. In large part because Zacharias felt the need to assure his readers that in spite of claims to contrary Severus was a devout Christian when he left Alexandria.¹¹ While Zacharias would prefer his readers to see Severus as being by this point thoroughly Christian albeit one with a deep love of classical culture.¹² It seems more likely that Severus had merely begun to develop an interest in Christianity that would in time lead to his conversion.

The next step in Severus's path to conversion took place in the city of Berytos where he had gone to study law.¹³ He was followed there after a few years by Zacharias, and upon the renewal of their friendship it did not take long before Zacharias was able to persuade Severus to embrace the Christian Faith.¹⁴ Though according to Zacharias, Severus continued in spite of his conversion to pursue his law studies.¹⁵ There is clearly some reluctance on Severus's part to take an active role in the activities of his friend Zacharias, and Severus seems to have been only a tentative convert in the beginning.¹⁶ It seems likely that for Severus his conversion was to begin with an experiment, driven by the influence of his friend Zacharias and by his growing interest in the works of Christian authors. Severus's journey from a

⁹ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 36-37

¹⁰ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 36-37

¹¹ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 56

¹² Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 56

¹³ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 57.

¹⁴ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 57-61.

¹⁵ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 61.

¹⁶ W.H.C. Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1972. Page 205.

tentative convert and law student, to fervent believer and theologian began when he and Zacharias fell under the influence of a fellow student named Evagrius.

Evagrius had been sent to Berytos by his father to study law, but Evagrius had desired instead to pursue a monastic career.¹⁷ So having been forced to study law, Evagrius took the opportunity to form a group of Christian law-students in Berytos which Severus and Zacharias were quick to join.¹⁸ Not long after Evagrius suggested to Zacharias that Severus be baptized however Severus expressed reluctance preferring to wait until he had finished his studies and be baptized in Alexandria.¹⁹ Eventually however Severus gave in, and Evagrius, Zacharias, and his other friends brought him to a Christian monk known as John.²⁰ This man prepared Severus for his baptism by giving him special lessons.²¹ It would be his baptism that sealed Severus's future as a monk and one of the greatest 'Anti-Chalcedonian' Theologians of his age.

After his baptism Severus quickly began to live the life of an ascetic, fasting regularly, and studying both religious texts and law.²² He continued to practice that ascetic lifestyle even though out of his group of friends, he was the one who waited the longest before entering a monastery.²³ His friend Zacharias however was a notable exception, as alone among Severus's friends Zacharias did not choose to become a monk.²⁴ Severus's decision to become a monk came rather late even though he was already living the life of an ascetic. He only made that decision after he had completed his law studies and subsequently filled with religious zeal set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.²⁵ During that pilgrimage he also paid a visit to Evagrius and other friends of his who had taken up residence in the Monastery of Peter

¹⁷ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 62-63.

¹⁸ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 62-64

¹⁹ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 75-76

²⁰ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". 76-77

²¹ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 78

²² Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 79

²³ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 80-85

²⁴ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 80-85

²⁵ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 84-85

the Iberian.²⁶ That meeting was all that it took to convince Severus to take up the monastic life, and thereafter he took up residence with his friends in that monastery.²⁷

The monastic world that Severus entered into was an austere one, which thrived on the dramatic asceticism of various charismatic leaders and saints.²⁸ During Severus's life time these monastic communities were thriving most especially in the regions of Roman Syria and Egypt.²⁹ While the Monastic tradition had emerged in Egypt, the Syriac tradition emerged almost on its own under St. Ephrem.³⁰ Ephrem's own writings clearly show his support for the ideas of asceticism, and his belief in the importance of these ascetic ideals which he attributes to John the Baptist as a sort of ideal to strive toward.³¹ In many ways Ephrem's emphasis on these ascetic ideals helped to establish trends which would continue to affect Syriac monasticism to the time of Severus.³² Yet one of the most influential figures in Syriac, and especially 'Anti-Chalcedonian' monasticism during Severus's youth was Peter the Iberian.

It is perhaps interesting then that out of all the possible monasteries where Severus might have taken up residence, he ended up in the monastery founded by the Peter the Iberian.³³ Peter the Iberian was both a prominent Monastic leader and one of the early leaders of the Anti-Chalcedonian movement, having played a major role in the expulsion of the Patriarch Juvenal of Jerusalem.³⁴ Peter was also one of the most hardline Anti-Chalcedonians, breaking with fellow Anti-Chalcedonian leader and Patriarch of

²⁶ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 84-85

²⁷ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 84-85

²⁸ Peter Brown. *The Rise of Western Christendom*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. P. 172-173.

²⁹ Brown. *The Rise of Western Christendom*. P. 173-174.

³⁰ Philip K. Hitti. *The History of Syria: Including Lebanon and Palestine*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. P. 364-365.

³¹ Brian E. Colless. "The Mystic Pearlers: An Introduction". *The Wisdom of the Pearlers: An Anthology of Syriac Christian Mysticism*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications Inc., 2008. P. 46-49.

³² Colless. *The Mystic Pearlers. The Wisdom of the Pearlers*. P. 46-49.

³³ Zacharias Scholasticus. *Life of Severos*. P. 85-87.

³⁴ Cornelia B. Horn. "The Life and Career of Peter the Iberian." In *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Oxford Scholarship Online, 2006. <https://www-oxfordscholarship-com.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/view/10.1093/0199277532.001.0001/acprof-9780199277537-chapter-3>

Alexandria, Peter Mongus over the latter's willingness to compromise with the Pro-Chalcedonians.³⁵ Peter's hardline approach to 'Anti-Chalcedonianism' may have influenced Severus's own views, and own future unwillingness to consider any form of compromise with the 'Pro-Chalcedonians'. For now, however, Severus took up residence in Peter's monastery, and found the harsh austerity of the Monastic life there to be to his liking.³⁶

Severus remained at this monastery for a number of years until the death of his old friend and first mentor Evagrius, which compelled him to depart from the monastery and try to live the life of a hermit.³⁷ In this endeavor he was joined by a friend, and they chose to take up residence in the region of Eleutheropolis, where the two attempted to practice the ascetic life in solitude.³⁸ The harshness of this lifestyle, particularly in the wilderness around Eleutheropolis, would have brought a premature end to Severus's life and career however his residence in the region was noticed by Romanus, the leader of a nearby monastery.³⁹ Romanus, after checking in on Severus, swiftly convinced him and his friend to come and take up residence in his monastery.⁴⁰ So Severus and his companion took up residence in the monastery for a time, but it was not long before the restless young Severus departed Romanus's Monastery.⁴¹ However, this time instead of seeking to live the life of a hermit, he instead used what remained of his inheritance from his family to set up a new monastery in the region of Maiuma, where in time he quickly gained a not inconsiderable number of a followers.⁴² This was the beginning of Severus's rise to prominence, though for the time being he remained merely a fairly popular monastic leader, known mostly to monks and Anti-Chalcedonians in Syria and Palestine.

³⁵ Horn. "The Life and Career of Peter the Iberian.". <https://www-oxfordscholarship-com.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/view/10.1093/0199277532.001.0001/acprof-9780199277537-chapter-3>

³⁶ Zacharias Scholasticus. "Life of Severos". P. 87.

³⁷ Zacharias Scholasticus. "Life of Severos". P. 87

³⁸ Zacharias Scholasticus. "Life of Severos". P. 87

³⁹ Zacharias Scholasticus. "Life of Severos". P. 87

⁴⁰ Zacharias Scholasticus. "Life of Severos". P. 87

⁴¹ Zacharias Scholasticus. "Life of Severos". P. 87-88

⁴² Zacharias Scholasticus. "Life of Severos". P. 88-89

During Severus's life time and especially in the regions of Syria and Palestine, where Severus spent most of his adult life, the monastic world was thriving and amidst these thriving monasteries the Anti-Chalcedonian movement thrived as well. As the 'Anti-Chalcedonian' movements had strong ties to monasticism and the monastic world, with most 'Anti-Chalcedonian' leaders in some way or fashion coming from monasteries. When considering the origins and depths of 'Anti-Chalcedonian' influence on monastic life in Severus's day, it is necessary to take a look at the political and religious controversies which set in motion the Council of Chalcedon as well as their relationship with monastic life and thought in the East of the Late Roman World.

The Anti-Chalcedonian Movement: The Legacy of Chalcedon

When studying the Council of Chalcedon, in the context of the late antique Church in the time of Severus it is important to first consider the events that led to Chalcedon. The first of these events begins with the heresy known as Nestorianism, which the late antique Church condemned in 431.⁴³ The 'heresy' which led to the condemnation of the Nestorians, was their belief that Jesus Christ has two natures: one human and one divine.⁴⁴ Their chief opponent had been a figure whose views would in time serve as the foundation of the 'Anti-Chalcedonian' position, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, who in contrast to the Nestorians implied Jesus Christ to be possessed of one nature, which he came very close to implying was purely divine.⁴⁵ This would be the beginning of the road to Chalcedon, as it established two very different interpretations of the nature of Christ, which were in direct opposition to each other. In time this opposition turned violent with the arrival of a student of Cyril's known as Eutyches, who took the step that Cyril never had and said outright that Jesus Christ had never been human but had was only divine.⁴⁶

⁴³ John Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church AD 450-680*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press 1989. Pages 165-167

⁴⁴ Warren Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997. Page 92

⁴⁵ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 165-167

⁴⁶ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 165-167

Many bishops and theologians of the day saw this as going too far, leading them to call for a new council of bishops to debate the teachings of Eutyches, but this first council occurred not at Chalcedon, but at Ephesus.⁴⁷ This council, which came to be known as the ‘Robber’ Council, was presided over by Dioscoros of Alexandria, Cyril’s protégé and successor as Patriarch of Alexandria.⁴⁸ Dioscoros’s fierce loyalty to Cyrilian theology drove him to protect Eutyches and his followers, while violently condemning their opponents as Nestorians.⁴⁹ Using that excuse Dioscoros deposed most of the opponents of Eutyches, with the assistance of a large group of armed monks who intimidated Eutyches’s opponents into compliance.⁵⁰ The aftermath of the ‘Robber’ Council left so great a number of simmering theological, political, and personal problems for the late antique Church that it did not take long for a new council to be called to rectify the matter.⁵¹

The Council of Chalcedon from its very beginning in 451, was conducted under the strict control of the Emperor, who sought to avoid a repetition of the ‘Robber’ Council.⁵² To that end he placed the Council under a strict guard, with Imperial officials present to ensure that whatever decision the Council made would align with the will of the Emperor.⁵³ This meant that the Council of Chalcedon proceeded in a fairly orderly manner, with even the most heated debates being carried out with more care and less vitriol than previous Church councils.⁵⁴ The greater Imperial control of Chalcedon did not however mean its disputes were any less heated than at earlier Councils. Instead it meant that the driving force of this Council was more controlled, and consequently the majority of its vitriol and anger was directed toward Dioscoros and his followers.⁵⁵ Nonetheless, while Chalcedon condemned Dioscoros, it was quick to

⁴⁷ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 165-167

⁴⁸ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 165-167

⁴⁹ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Division*. P. 165-167

⁵⁰ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997. Pages 96-99

⁵¹ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 165-167

⁵² R.V. Sellers. *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*. London: S.P.C.K., 1953, Pages 103-104

⁵³ Sellers. *The Council of Chalcedon*. P. 103-104

⁵⁴ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 168-169

⁵⁵ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 169-171

defend the orthodoxy of Saint Cyril of Alexandria's position, even though it was the position of Dioscoros, and to some degree the position of Eutyches.⁵⁶ As a result, the Council of Chalcedon adopted a middle ground between the Nestorians and Eutychians, which held that Christ had two natures: One human and one divine, in one person.⁵⁷ With this, the Council of Chalcedon condemned both the Nestorian and the Eutychian positions, and established a new middle ground between the two heresies. In large part because of the influence of the Emperor and Imperial officials who had been eager to resolve a vicious dispute which had divided the Late Roman Church. Yet this dispute only grew more bitter in the aftermath of Chalcedon, and it formed largely along lines between the Bishops in the cities and the monastic communities in the desert.

The reasons for the monastic rejection of Chalcedon are many, but they can be boiled down into two main categories. The first of these was the introduction of tighter controls over monasteries and monastic life.⁵⁸ The primary reason for this push for tighter controls over the monasteries was the association between many monastic communities and Eutychianism as well as the role that many monks had played in the more violent episodes of the 'Robber' Council of Ephesus.⁵⁹ So the Council of Chalcedon effectively changed the rules placing all monastic communities under the authority of the nearest bishop and allowing the bishops to police these monasteries.⁶⁰ This upset many monks in large part because they distrusted the bishops, who in view of the monks were part of the secular world and thus could not be fully trusted in matters of faith.⁶¹ In part this may have been a reaction to the transformation of bishops, from a purely religious office dedicated to running the Church in their cities into a vital part of the Imperial administration.⁶² The result however was that in the aftermath of Chalcedon monastic communities across the late Roman Empire were faced with the loss of their

⁵⁶ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 169-171

⁵⁷ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 172-178

⁵⁸ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 185-187

⁵⁹ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 185-187

⁶⁰ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 185-187

⁶¹ Brown. *The Rise of Western Christendom*. P. 173-176.

⁶² Brown. *The Rise of Western Christendom*. P. 166-171.

institutional independence. In the eyes of many this would have put the monasteries at the mercy of the secular world. It is perhaps unsurprising then that so many monastic communities vehemently rejected it, and that the great strongholds of monasticism Syria and Egypt quickly became important centers of the Anti-Chalcedonian movement.

The other driving force behind most Anti-Chalcedonian resistance was theological, and this was in large part caused by the high regard in which most Anti-Chalcedonians held St. Cyril of Alexandria, and his theological teachings.⁶³ The Anti-Chalcedon rejection of the Council of Chalcedon then was driven in large part by the fact that it did not accept all of Cyril's theological works as Orthodox.⁶⁴ There are many factors for this support, at least one part of which must have been Cyril's support of monasticism in Egypt.⁶⁵ A variety of factors drove the Anti-Chalcedonian rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, from unhappiness with its institutional and political ramifications for them as well as their dislike for its treatment of theology most especially its treatment of St. Cyril of Alexandria. The consequences of this dispute however, would not be felt immediately as it was pushed aside and left to simmer as the Empire entered a period of political turmoil following the extinction of the Theodosian Dynasty.

When the Emperor Marcian died in 457, the late Roman empire entered a period of political instability and uncertainty.⁶⁶ In this chaotic situation the Leonid Dynasty rose to power, amidst political intrigue against their rivals and despite vicious infighting between many members of the Dynasty.⁶⁷ In these struggles the conflict between Anti-Chalcedonians and Pro-Chalcedonians played a small but growing role, as a minor arena in the greater political struggles of the early Leonid Dynasty.⁶⁸ The struggle between the Anti-Chalcedonians and the Pro-Chalcedonians only really began to emerge as a

⁶³ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 173-178

⁶⁴ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 165-194

⁶⁵ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 165-194

⁶⁶ J.B. Bury. *History of the Later Roman Empire: From the death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian*, Vol. I. New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1958. Pages 314-317.

⁶⁷ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 149-162.

⁶⁸ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 149-153.

serious threat to the Imperial Government during the reign of the Emperor Zeno when his wife's uncle Basiliscus usurped power and drove Zeno into exile.⁶⁹ Basiliscus used his newly won position to attempt to impose Anti-Chalcedonianism on the whole of the Empire.⁷⁰ Basiliscus's rule ultimately proved short-lived almost entirely due to his own incompetence and Zeno's careful planning.⁷¹ This entire episode was only the beginning for Zeno as much of his early reign was spent in conflict, against a variety of foes including at one point a rebellion at least nominally led by his own mother-in-law.⁷² The defining characteristic of the late Roman empire during the early Leonid dynasty was instability, as it dealt with vicious infighting and multiple civil wars, conflicts which left the Imperial government weak and distracted. In turn this meant that for the most part the nascent conflict between the Anti-Chalcedonians and Pro-Chalcedonians was left to grow unchecked. In fact, both movements thrived during this period as they each received patronage and support from rival factions within the Imperial government.

It would not be until 482 that the Emperor Zeno was finally in a position where he could afford to deal with the growing conflict between the Pro-Chalcedonians and the Anti-Chalcedonians, and what he saw troubled him.⁷³ Nearly as troubled by the conflict over Chalcedon was the Patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius, who proved instrumental in the establishment of the *Henotikon*.⁷⁴ The purpose of the *Henotikon*, was to smooth-over the tense relations between the Pro-Chalcedonians and the Anti-Chalcedonians, largely by bypassing Chalcedon without condemning it and by avoiding a condemnation of the more moderate Anti-Chalcedonians.⁷⁵ In effect, it created a compromise position, in which both the Pro-Chalcedonians and the Anti-Chalcedonians could survive and coexist within the church. Unfortunately the Anti-Chalcedonians' in many places had long since abandoned the idea of compromising with the Pro-Chalcedonians, and no small part of this resistance came from monastic

⁶⁹ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 156-158

⁷⁰ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 156-158

⁷¹ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 156-158

⁷² Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 156-164

⁷³ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 160-161

⁷⁴ Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 174-183

⁷⁵ Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 174-183

communities in Egypt and Syria.⁷⁶ But at least while Zeno lived, the *Henotikon* was a vital force of the late antique Church in the east, even as it failed to gain anything more than a small following among the moderates of both the Pro-Chalcedonian and Anti-Chalcedonian movements.

By the time Severus had settled into monastic life Zeno was dead, and in his place was the Emperor Anastasius who was widely known to have Anti-Chalcedonian leanings. Nonetheless Anastasius set out to maintain the *Henotikon*'s importance in the late Roman Church, at least at first.⁷⁷ Anastasius made no secret of his Anti-Chalcedonian preferences, which brought him into conflict early on in his reign with the more committed Pro-Chalcedonians such as Euphemius, Patriarch of Constantinople.⁷⁸ In spite of this conflict Anastasius remained committed to the *Henotikon*, and so he supported the moderate Pro-Chalcedonian and supporter of the *Henotikon*, Macedonius as Patriarch of Constantinople at least before Severus's rise to prominence.⁷⁹ In time Anastasius would begin to move deeper and deeper into the Anti-Chalcedonian camp. But during the early days of Severus's career, Anastasius was a fairly moderate Anti-Chalcedonian willing to accept the *Henotikon* as a possible solution to the political and religious conflict caused by the Council of Chalcedon. It would not be until Anastasius and Severus actually met that Anastasius actually began to consider any radical change in his religious policies.

This was the state of religious and political affairs in the late Roman world during Severus's life, it was a world firmly divided between the Bishops in the cities especially in the north, who were more firmly Pro-Chalcedonian, and the monks in desert, most especially in Egypt and Syria, who were firmly Anti-Chalcedonian. In between these two groups was the East Roman church, which found itself struggling to reconcile the two increasingly combative movements. Not helping matters was the degree to which this religious struggle had turned into a political conflict, as it played a role in civil disorder and dynastic conflict. In all the conflict over Chalcedon, had become a massive and almost insurmountable

⁷⁶ Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 174-183

⁷⁷ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 164-166.

⁷⁸ F.K. Haarer. *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns, 2006. P. 136-139.

⁷⁹ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 139.

problem for the Imperial government such that by Severus's time there was no longer any real hope of reconciliation between the Pro-Chalcedonians and the Anti-Chalcedonians. The real choice left to the Emperor and imperial government then was the question of which side they should back, the Anti-Chalcedonian or the Pro-Chalcedonian. Before considering Severus's own role in this decision, and in the broader Anti-Chalcedonian movement, it perhaps necessary to consider his thought and writings, as in many respects they played a considerable role in his rise to prominence.

Severus of Antioch: His Thought and Works

The Influence of Severus's thought and works on the Anti-Chalcedonian movement in the early Sixth Century, is hard to overstate as in many ways his writings established what swiftly became the orthodox Anti-Chalcedonian position.⁸⁰ Severus's teachings achieved this, by assuming a more moderate approach to the Christological dispute at the center of the dispute of Chalcedon. By firmly rejecting the Christological views of the more radical Anti-Chalcedonians and then rejecting the Council of Chalcedon, adopting instead a position somewhere in between the radicals and the Chalcedonians.⁸¹ In effect, much of Severus's work and thought helped to establish a more moderate understanding of the Anti-Chalcedonian position. However, he remained in firm opposition to the Council of Chalcedon, a reality which was further complicated by Severus's view that his writings were possibly compatible with the *Henotikon*.⁸² Understanding the influence of Severus's writings, and their role in helping redefine the Anti-Chalcedonian movement also requires a look at the works and theologians which influenced Severus himself.

The first and most important of these figures is without a doubt St. Cyril of Alexandria, whose writings were already at the core of the Anti-Chalcedonian movement. In fact, Severus seems to have held Cyril up as one of the greatest Christian theologians to ever live, with Severus even going so far as to say

⁸⁰ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 216-217.

⁸¹ John Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 216-217

⁸² Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 143-147.

that ‘every utterance of [Cyril] one would say is a law of the Church’.⁸³ But the greatest proof of the high esteem in which Severus clearly held Cyril is clearly seen in the frequency with Cyril is mentioned in his works, from *Adversus apologiam Juliani*, to *Contra Impium Grammaticum*, and in his letters as well. In fact Severus’s first great work *Philalethes*, was a defense of Cyril’s work from what Severus saw as a ‘Pro-Chalcedonian’ attempt to corrupt and misuse Cyril’s own teachings, which was inspired by a ‘pro-Chalcedonian’ Chronicler’s compilation of the works of Cyril.⁸⁴ The depth of Cyril’s influence on Severus while great is also hardly surprising, given just how deeply most ‘Anti-Chalcedonians’ revered Cyril’s work. Yet while Severus’s adoration of Cyril was hardly an uncommon tendency among Anti-Chalcedonian, and even among some Pro-Chalcedonians, it is important to understand just how deep of an influence Cyril’s teachings had on Severus’s own thought and work. Severus in many respects saw his own works as existing only to defend St. Cyril’s legacy. In that light, then Severus seems to have seen his own works not as independent works of theology but as a continuation of Cyril’s legacy. Whether or not Severus’s theology was really a continuation of Cyril’s teachings is however an entirely different matter, and one worth its own analysis, but it does raise the question then as to what Severus’s theology actually taught.

Severus left no single great work of theology.⁸⁵ Perhaps because among other reasons he felt no need to, since as far as Severus was concerned there was no difference between his teachings and Cyril’s.⁸⁶ The result is that much of Severus’s theology must be reconstructed either from works such as *Philalethes* or *Contra Impium Grammaticum* which were written specifically to attack theological views

⁸³ Severus of Antioch. “I.9: Letter of Severus to Stephen Bishop of Tripolis”. *The Sixth Book of the Selected Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch*. Translated and edited by E.W. Brooks. Oxford: Williams and Norgate, 1903. P. 44-46. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044095071528&view=1up&seq=9>

⁸⁴ Severus of Antioch. “Text 2: Philalethes, from prologue and ch.1”. *Severus of Antioch, the Early Church Fathers*. Translated by Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward. New York: Routledge, 2004. P. 66-67.

⁸⁵ Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 207-209.

⁸⁶ Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 207-209.

which he disagreed with, or from his many letters written throughout his life. Yet the lack of a single great work by Severus does not mean that his theology cannot be reconstructed.

Central to Severus's theology was the concept of a Hypostatic union, his own term for the Union of Jesus Christ's Humanity and divinity in one nature.⁸⁷ When discussing this 'Hypostasis' in his own words Severus seems to equate it with the Anti-Chalcedonian concept of one nature.⁸⁸ As in Severus's view the 'Hypostasis' is the union of Christ's humanity and divinity, such that he says 'in conjunction with hypostasis division is driven out'.⁸⁹ In effect, Severus, like most Anti-Chalcedonians, believed that Christ had one nature, but his preferred term for discussing this one nature was 'Hypostasis'.⁹⁰ For Severus, Christ's one nature, or 'Hypostasis', was the result of the union between Christ's divinity and humanity, which he understood as being like the union between a human soul and a human body.⁹¹ Together they made one whole or one 'Hypostasis' but the body could not exist without the soul, like Christ's humanity could not exist without his divinity.⁹² This is central to Severus's understanding of Christ. He viewed Christ as being of one nature or 'Hypostasis', resulting from the union of Christ's humanity and Divinity, which like the union between the soul and the body in a regular human creates one whole, but the body or flesh in that union is in a sense lesser than the soul in that union.

Severus contrasts this understanding of Christ, with what he calls the 'Prosopic union' which in his view was the understanding of Christ that the Pro-Chalcedonians championed, the word 'Prosopa' from which the 'Prosopic union' gains its name was applied by Severus to things which could exist and act independently from one another.⁹³ To Severus a 'Prosopic union' was the union of two separate beings

⁸⁷ Roberta C. Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabug, and Jacob of Sarug*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976. P. 9.

⁸⁸ Severus of Antioch. "Letter I of Severus." *Christology After Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite*. Translated by Iain R. Torrance. Norwich: The Canterbury Press Norwich, 1988. P. 149-150.

⁸⁹ Severus of Antioch. "Letter I of Severus." P. 149-150.

⁹⁰ Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 9-10.

⁹¹ Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 9-11.

⁹² Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 9-11.

⁹³ Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 11-14.

which could act independently of one another.⁹⁴ For Severus the ‘Prosopic union’ represented everything he believed was wrong with Pro-Chalcedonian theology. In his view it promoted a view of Christ wherein he could be divided into two fully separate beings: a human and a divine Christ who could act independently of one another. So for Severus this was the problem of the ‘Prosopic union’; which created a vision of a human and a divine Christ who were really fully separate beings and who could survive and exist separate from one another if the ‘Prosopic union’ was broken.⁹⁵ So the ‘Prosopic union’ served for Severus as a vision of everything that was wrong with Pro-Chalcedonian theology. That leaves only one major area left to discuss when considering Severus’s theology, the areas of difference which remained even after the ‘hypostatic union’.

These areas of difference are perhaps the most complicated part of Severus’s theology, and certainly the one which his own contemporaries had the most trouble understanding.⁹⁶ One particular example of the confusion that these areas of difference within the Hypostatic union raised among Severus’s fellow Anti-Chalcedonians, comes from Sergius the Grammarian, who initiated a dialogue with Severus. That dialogue began with Sergius expressing his confusion over Severus’s willingness to use the term ‘proprieties’ to discuss aspects of the ‘Hypostatic union’, it quickly becomes clear in the first letter that Sergius felt the use of the term ‘Proprieties’ was just a different way of speaking of two natures of Christ.⁹⁷ Severus in his response is quick to make clear to Sergius that in his view, the usage of the term ‘propriety’ referenced not a separateness of the one nature of Christ, but was a term to distinguish the ‘difference’ between the humanity and the divinity which had been brought into ‘Hypostatic union’ in Christ.⁹⁸ The idea of ‘proprieties’ or ‘differences’ gets at the heart of Severus’ understanding of the ‘Hypostatic union’ as establishing the one nature of Christ. The one nature of Christ does not make Christ

⁹⁴ Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 11-14.

⁹⁵ Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 13-15.

⁹⁶ Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 17-18.

⁹⁷ Sergius the Grammarian. “Letter I of Sergius.” *Christology After Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite*. Translated by Iain R. Torrance. Norwich: The Canterbury Press Norwich, 1988. Page 143-145.

⁹⁸ Severus of Antioch. “Letter I of Severus.” P. 148-149.

after the union either purely human or purely divine, as the ‘difference’ or ‘propriety’ of both Christ’s humanity and his divinity remain even as they are bound into one nature in which they possess ‘difference’ but not ‘separateness’.⁹⁹ In other words while Severus’s theology viewed Christ as being of One nature, through the union of his humanity and divinity, it still recognized this did not mean Christ’s humanity and divinity were one and the same.

The questions raised by Sergius are also important when considering another aspect of Severus’s thought, how his fellow Anti-Chalcedonians reacted to and dealt with his teachings. While Severus’s works were highly regarded and embraced by most of his contemporaries, the case of Sergius the Grammarian already referenced, shows that some of his contemporaries struggled with the particulars of Severus’s theology and disagreed with at least part of it or reinterpreted it in ways that would have upset Severus, none more so than Julian of Halicarnassus. Julian of Halicarnassus was much like Severus a firm Anti-Chalcedonian, and two were even friends for a time.¹⁰⁰ But a dispute over a point of doctrine by Julian in which he attempted to use Severus’s own early work *Philalethes* to defend his views enraged Severus and led to Severus spending most of his later years writing against Julian and his followers.¹⁰¹

This led Severus to write his work *Adversus apologiam Juliani* in which one area that seems to have particularly rankled him was Julian’s use of the phrase ‘let us say concerning Christ that the difference is not different’, which clearly contradicts Severus’s own conception of ‘difference’ but not ‘Separateness’.¹⁰² Severus pulls no punches in his attack on Julian’s writings here with him calling Julian ‘blind’, and saying that he laughs at Julian’s writings because he viewed Julian as misunderstanding and mixing up the divinity and humanity in Christ.¹⁰³ When considering the whole of Severus’s writings against Julian, it becomes clear that Severus does not hesitate in his attacks against Julian of

⁹⁹ Chesnut. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. P. 15-17.

¹⁰⁰ Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 253-254.

¹⁰¹ Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward. “Severus’s Works”. *Severus of Antioch, the Early Church Fathers*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Pages 46-49.

¹⁰² Severus of Antioch. “Text 13: Adversus apologiam Julian Ch.19”. *Severus of Antioch, the Early Church Fathers*. Translated by Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward. New York: Routledge, 2004. P. 102-106.

¹⁰³ Severus of Antioch. “Text 13: Adversus apologiam Julian Ch.19”. P. 102-106.

Halicarnassus. Whether by insulting Julian's intelligence or by making clear his own views on how Julian failed to understand the relationship between the humanity and divinity in Christ.¹⁰⁴ Severus's writings against Julian also show the growth of Severus's prominence within the Anti-Chalcedonian movement, as Julian at least early on attempted to interpret Severus's own writings in the light of Julian's own theology. Julian of Halicarnassus also gets at the key importance of Severus's Theology as by the later years of Severus's career his theology served as the backbone of the Anti-Chalcedonian movement, and this helped push small movements like Julian's out of Anti-Chalcedonian orthodoxy.

In all, Severus's theology was at its core fairly simple, moderate in its Christology and based heavily in the writings of Saint Cyril, which perhaps aided in its popularity with Severus's fellow 'Anti-Chalcedonians'. As did something of Severus's natural charisma which managed to win him support and aid from a wide swath of figures across the Eastern Roman Empire. However, Severus's writings and thought left a diverse legacy, as it influenced 'Anti-Chalcedonian' theologians and even the Emperor Anastasius, but unlike many of his contemporaries or near contemporaries, Severus did not leave a unified legacy. In large part because Severus produced no single great work laying out his theology but instead produced a myriad of letters, hymns, homilies, and polemical works, which meant that Severus's theology could only be reconstructed from these sources. This coupled with some of Severus's more complicated theological concepts, such as the concept of 'proprieties', meant that many of Severus's contemporaries and successors were left to piece together his theology on their own. This in turn meant that interpretations of Severus's theology that he would not have agreed with arose, such as the ones espoused by Julian of Halicarnassus and his followers. Nonetheless, by the end of his career Severus's work had really helped create and solidify an Anti-Chalcedonian orthodoxy, which was able to resist smaller movements like Julian of Halicarnassus's. The work of creating this Anti-Chalcedonian orthodoxy in competition with a Pro-Chalcedonian orthodoxy, was in many respects the great work of Severus's life and brief political career. Severus's role in creating an Anti-Chalcedonian orthodoxy would

¹⁰⁴ Severus of Antioch. "Text 13: Adversus apologiam Julian Ch.19". P. 102-106.

have many consequences from providing the theology behind the modern Miaphysite churches of the Middle east, to its effect on the politics of the Eastern Roman empire.

Severus and the Empire: The Political Career of Severus

The events that propelled Severus out of the monastic life and into his future dominance of the Anti-Chalcedonian movement began with a man known as Nephalius. This Nephalius was a Syriac Monk who rose to infamy originally as a prominent and violent agitator for the Anti-Chalcedonians, but many years later he abandoned the Anti-Chalcedonians and became a prominent supporter of the Pro-Chalcedonian movement.¹⁰⁵ As such Nephalius soon led a push by the ‘Pro-Chalcedonians’ of Jerusalem to drive the Anti-Chalcedonian monks out of Palestinian monasteries.¹⁰⁶ While Nephalius and his fellow Pro-Chalcedonians did drive the better part of the Anti-Chalcedonian monks out of their monasteries their successes did not stop the Anti-Chalcedonian monks from seeking out support to restore them to their former monasteries.¹⁰⁷ It did not take these exiled monks long to find that support in Severus of Antioch, who eventually decided to take the case of these monks all the way to the Emperor in Constantinople.¹⁰⁸

In Constantinople, Severus wasted no time in gaining an audience with the Emperor. Severus found the Emperor to be deeply sympathetic to the Anti-Chalcedonian monks victimized by Nephalius’s campaign.¹⁰⁹ The Emperor Anastasius I, had initially been a keen supporter of the *Henotikon*, but by the time of Severus’s arrival in Constantinople, his Anti-Chalcedonian tendencies had begun to shape and effect his church policies.¹¹⁰ So Severus found Anastasius I not only willing but eager to help him restore the monks who had been exiled by Nephalius.¹¹¹ Severus’s time in Constantinople allowed him to win the Emperor’s trust and support.¹¹² The Emperor swiftly made Severus his chief advisor in both spiritual

¹⁰⁵ Zacharias. “Life of Severos”. P. 90-92

¹⁰⁶ Zacharias. “Life of Severos”. P. 91-92

¹⁰⁷ Zacharias. “Life of Severos”. P. 91-93

¹⁰⁸ Zacharias. “Life of Severos”. P. 91-93

¹⁰⁹ Zacharias. “Life of Severos”. P. 91-93

¹¹⁰ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 139-145.

¹¹¹ Zacharias. “Life of Severos”. P. 92-93

¹¹² Zacharias. “Life of Severos”. P. 92-97.

matters and in church policy.¹¹³ A sign of the high favor in which Severus was held can be seen in his role in arbitrating a conflict which in a short time he himself would become part of, the struggle between the Pro-Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch, Flavian, and the firmly Anti-Chalcedonian Philoxenus of Mabbug.¹¹⁴ Another sign of the high esteem with which the Emperor held Severus can be seen, at least according to Zacharias Scholasticus, when Severus was briefly considered a candidate for the Patriarchate of Constantinople itself.¹¹⁵ Instead, Severus went to Syria where he swiftly found himself embroiled in the conflict between Flavian and Philoxenus that he had once tried to arbitrate.

The Conflict between Philoxenus and Flavian was long in the making, but by the time of Severus's arrival in Syria, the conflict had reached a new high point, when Philoxenus participated in synod of fellow Anti-Chalcedonians which found Flavian to be a heretic.¹¹⁶ This culminated in an attempt by Philoxenus to force Flavian to anathematize the Council of Chalcedon, which resulted in an outbreak of violence and civil disorder in Antioch as Philoxenus and his supporters clashed with Flavian's supporters.¹¹⁷ As a result of this open conflict in the streets of Antioch, Flavian was forced into exile in Petra.¹¹⁸ This led the Emperor Anastasius to allow the Synod, who had initially called for Flavian's deposition, to elect his successor and, in very little time at all Severus was elected to the position of Patriarch of Antioch.¹¹⁹ This was the pinnacle of Severus's career he was on one hand an influential advisor to the Emperor, and on the other he now occupied one of the most important bishoprics in the late Roman Church. His newfound power and influence served to give him a new base from which he could

¹¹³ F.K. Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 143-146.

¹¹⁴ F.K. Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 145-147.

¹¹⁵ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 96-97

¹¹⁶ *The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV A.D. 488-775*. Translated by Amir Harrak. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1999. Pages 46-47

¹¹⁷ Evagrius Scholasticus. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. Translated by Michael Whitby. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000. Pages 174-175.

¹¹⁸ Evagrius. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. P. 174-175

¹¹⁹ *The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV A.D. 488-775*. P. 46-47

spread his interpretation of the Anti-Chalcedonian position, which in time would come to serve as the rallying cry of the entire movement.¹²⁰

Severus's role in the politics of the late Roman empire, was a complicated one ranging from his time as Anastasius's unofficial chief advisor on religious affairs, to being seen as a threat to the orthodoxy of the late Roman Church and the unity under the rule of the Emperors Justin and Justinian. Throughout his time in a position of power and after, Severus used his political influence almost exclusively in support of the Anti-Chalcedonian cause. For the most part Severus used his influence to try and establish his understanding of Anti-Chalcedonian theology as part of the orthodoxy of the East Roman Church, in opposition to the Pro-Chalcedonian attempt to establish their theology as part of the East Roman Church's orthodoxy. In the political struggle between the Pro-Chalcedonians and the Anti-Chalcedonians, Severus was a central figure, especially as Imperial support shifted from one faction to the other. To understand the importance of Severus in the politics of this period, and also to understand his complicated relationship with the Emperors of his time, it is necessary to look at the effect that Severus's political influence had on the Imperial government and how it played into Severus's later political career and his eventual exile.

It was under Severus's influence that Anastasius first began the shift in his religious policy that saw the abandonment of the *Henotikon*, and the move toward an explicitly Anti-Chalcedonian position in the Imperial Church. A serious example of this can be seen in Anastasius's attempt to establish an explicitly Anti-Chalcedonian liturgy in the Imperial Church.¹²¹ This culminated in a series of violent riots against his rule in Constantinople, which Anastasius was only able to bring to an end when he offered to resign from his office if it was the will of the rioters, this offer placated most of them and brought the riot to an end.¹²² This episode's primary importance rest on the growing resistance to Anastasius's new religious policies. One of the more interesting events during this episode, even though it's historicity is

¹²⁰ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 216-217.

¹²¹ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 156-157.

¹²² Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 156-157.

questionable, is mentioned in the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* which was written several centuries after the events of the riot. Regardless, according to John of Nikiu, in the course of this riot the rioters, seized a monk that they believed to be Severus and killed him.¹²³ Whether or not that claim is true it does nonetheless point to the truth that the riot was almost entirely about the general unhappiness most of the populace felt about the growing influence of the Anti-Chalcedonians in the Imperial government and Church, of which Severus was most certainly the most visible figure.

Indeed, the unpopularity of the Anti-Chalcedonian turn of the Church during the later years of Anastasius's reign even affected Severus's reign as Patriarch of Antioch. There were more than a few clergy and Bishops especially in Isauria, who resisted Severus's authority even though they should have fallen under his jurisdiction.¹²⁴ There was also resistance from monastic communities in the region of Palestine to Severus's authority, and more than a few bishops such as Epiphanius of Tyre, joined these monks in their rejection of Severus.¹²⁵ This may have contributed to the subsequent calling of a Church Council to try and bring to heel resistance to Severus's leadership as Patriarch, and also to more firmly establish Anti-Chalcedonianism as orthodox and Pro-Chalcedonianism as heresy. One important thing to understand about this Council, which is commonly called the Council of Tyre, is that its historicity has been called into question. In spite of the *Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah* providing an in-depth discussion and explanation of the Council, as having been called by the Emperor Anastasius at the request of Severus and Philoxenus.¹²⁶ On the other hand the *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, records a Council of Tyre called by Anastasius and presided over by Severus which ended with a reinterpretation of the *Henotikon* as a firm rejection of Chalcedon.¹²⁷

¹²³ John of Nikiu. *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*. Translated by R.H. Charles. London: Williams & Norgate. P. 29.

¹²⁴ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 157-159.

¹²⁵ Evagrius. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. P. 176-178.

¹²⁶ Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor*. Edited by Geoffrey Greatrex, and Translated by Robert R. Phenix, Cornelia B. Horn, Sebastian P. Brock, and Witold Witakowski. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011. P. 272-275.

¹²⁷ *The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV A.D. 488-775*. P. 47-48.

Nonetheless, the questions around the historicity of this Council of Tyre, stem more from the fact of the improbability of a few features of the Council, such as that it took place in Tyre.¹²⁸ Tyre was a widely known center of ‘Pro-Chalcedonian’ resistance to Severus as is shown by the fact that Epiphanius was listed among those Bishops who rejected Severus’s leadership.¹²⁹ Another reason to question the Council is its timing, as during the year the Council of Tyre is supposed to have occurred, 513, the Emperor Anastasius would have been unlikely to involve himself very deeply in a Church dispute as at that time he was dealing with the rebellion of Vitalian, a figure who will be discussed more depth later.¹³⁰ Even those who question the historicity of the Council of Tyre admit that some equivalent must have occurred, with the general aim of rejecting the Council of Chalcedon and reinforcing Severus’s own position against the active resistance to his leadership as Patriarch of Antioch.¹³¹

In short, the Emperor Anastasius faced resistance to his attempts to establish Anti-Chalcedonian theology as the orthodox position of the Imperial Church, the resistance spread across the Empire, and became a serious problem for Severus. The latter, by virtue of his role as the architect of Anastasius’s new Anti-Chalcedonian push in the Imperial Church, came under attack both from within his own Patriarchate and also outside of it. In fact, one of the most dramatic episodes of resistance to Severus’s influence came from the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. During the enthronement of the new Patriarch of Jerusalem a group of Pro-Chalcedonian monks called on him to condemn the opponents of Chalcedon including Severus.¹³² The new Patriarch did as the monks asked with little hesitation.¹³³ In all, Severus found himself to be at the center of the Pro-Chalcedonians attacks on the Anti-Chalcedonians. Whether from within his own Patriarchate or outside it, yet Severus was merely the target of religious resistance within the Church and so he had no active role to play in Vitalian’s rebellion.

¹²⁸ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 158-161.

¹²⁹ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 158-161.

¹³⁰ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 158-161.

¹³¹ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 158-161.

¹³² Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 204-205.

¹³³ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 204-205.

The unpopularity of Anastasius's Anti-Chalcedonian program set in motion many waves of resistance by the Pro-Chalcedonians. Much of the resistance to these new programs played out either in the rejection of the 'Anti-Chalcedonian' Church leaders, or in civil disorder and rioting. The Rebellion of Vitalian was perhaps the most dramatic episode of resistance to Anastasius's new religious policies, which depending on the source, was either the sole reason for the rebellion or was one of the major reasons alongside a rejection of Anastasius's fiscal policies in his later years.¹³⁴ The chronicler John Malalas, states that Vitalian at least claimed the deposition of Pro-Chalcedonian bishops as the reason for his rebellion, and he subsequently seized much of the Roman Balkans; the provinces of Thrace, Moesia, and Scythia.¹³⁵ According to Evagrius, Anastasius's first choice to deal with this rebellion was his nephew Hypatius who found himself betrayed by his own soldiers, the second general Anastasius sent to deal with Vitalian was known as Cyril and though initially successful against Vitalian, Cyril swiftly found himself betrayed by his own men when they elected to surrender to Vitalian.¹³⁶

Following this series of successes Vitalian found himself within sight of Constantinople itself, and so to combat him Anastasius sent out his naval commander Marinus the Syrian.¹³⁷ Marinus made considerable use of 'elemental sulphur' or Greek fire and upon seeing its destructive capacity in action Vitalian and most of his men fled, and Marinus was able to use the ensuing confusion to destroy the better part of Vitalian's forces.¹³⁸ Vitalian himself however managed to survive the loss of the better part of his own army, and fell back to the city of Anchialus which had been one of his earliest conquests and there he remained until Anastasius's death.¹³⁹ Vitalian's rebellion provides some insight into the political state of the late Roman empire during Anastasius's final years in power. It shows, that Anastasius's new religious policies were so disliked in certain parts of the Empire that they provided a powerful

¹³⁴ Haarer. *Anastasius I*. P. 164-167.

¹³⁵ John Malalas. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. Translated by Elizabeth Jeffreys et al. Canberra: Central Printing, Australian National University, 1986. P. 225-226.

¹³⁶ Evagrius. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. P. 193-194.

¹³⁷ John Malalas. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. P. 225-227.

¹³⁸ John Malalas. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. P. 225-227.

¹³⁹ Evagrius. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. P. 193-194.

justification for rebellion, which allowed Vitalian to tap into resentment against the Emperor and use it to strengthen his forces.

The struggles of Anastasius and Severus to establish the latter's 'Anti-Chalcedonian' theology as part and parcel of late Roman Church orthodoxy, had caused considerable political and religious unrest as it set off both riots and rebellions against Anastasius. Severus's importance in this shift in Anastasius's Church policy also did not go unnoticed by the Pro-Chalcedonians, with many of them actively targeting Severus's thought and teachings. Consequently, upon the Emperor Anastasius's death Severus was forced into exile.¹⁴⁰ One important point worth discussing is the role of Vitalian in Severus's exile, Evagrius reports that Vitalian requested that Severus have his tongue cut out along with being exiled.¹⁴¹ This is supported by John Malalas, who records that Severus fled Antioch in fear Vitalian.¹⁴² While Pseudo-Zachariah agreed that it was Vitalian who desired Severus's exile and threatened Severus with violence, Pseudo-Zachariah suggests that Vitalian had a more personal motive for forcing Severus into exile.¹⁴³ According to Pseudo-Zachariah, Vitalian had been the 'spiritual child' of Flavian the Pro-Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch that Severus had replaced.¹⁴⁴ Whatever his reason, Vitalian seems to have been Severus's fiercest political opponent during the early part of the Emperor Justin's reign. Which is perhaps unsurprising as Vitalian during his brief rebellion had set himself up as the great martial opponent of Anti-Chalcedonianism, and so it's unsurprising that Vitalian played a major role in deposing Severus of Antioch.

Whether Vitalian would have pursued the destruction of Severus with more vigor than the Emperor Justin and his nephew Justinian did, becomes a moot point fairly early on in Justin's reign once Vitalian found himself outmaneuvered and murdered by Justinian.¹⁴⁵ In all the death of the Emperor

¹⁴⁰ *The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV A.D. 488-775*. P. 49-50.

¹⁴¹ Evagrius. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. P. 202-203.

¹⁴² John Malalas. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. P. 231-232.

¹⁴³ Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor*. P. 282-283.

¹⁴⁴ Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor*. P. 282-283.

¹⁴⁵ Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor*. P. 283.

Anastasius removed the political bulwark that had supported Severus and his fellow Anti-Chalcedonian clergymen, and the political vacuum it created allowed the more sternly Pro-Chalcedonian figures like Vitalian, and the Emperor Justin to take power and begin dismantling Anastasius's and Severus's project to establish Anti-Chalcedonian theology as an orthodox part of the East Roman Church. This brought an abrupt end to Severus's political career, but it did not bring an end to his religious and cultural influence among the Anti-Chalcedonians.

Severus in Exile: The Legacy of Severus

Severus's flight from Antioch brought him to Egypt, which had long been the great stronghold of the Anti-Chalcedonians, where he settled into his exile.¹⁴⁶ Even in exile Severus continued to have considerable influence over Anti-Chalcedonians both in Syria and throughout the Empire. As even in exile Severus continued to produce a prodigious number of letters, and literature in support of the Anti-Chalcedonians. Severus's influence continued to grow even during his exile, such that Severus's theology became firmly fixed as part of Anti-Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Severus's growing importance even lead to a mythologization of his life as a figure to whom the Anti-Chalcedonians could turn to and see as not just justifying their theological and religious positions but living them out. All of which points to Severus's importance as a figure, and how even during his later life his importance began to change from being the great theologian of the Anti-Chalcedonians to a figure most important for justifying the Anti-Chalcedonians and their separation from the Imperial Church.

Even after his exile in 518 Severus continued to produce a multitude of works, while also continuing to act as Patriarch of Antioch to those Priests and monks who remained in support of him even after his exile.¹⁴⁷ One of the most important works produced during his exile was *Contra Impium Grammaticum*, which was written in response to John the Grammarian, who had written a very spirited defense of the Council of Chalcedon which prompted Severus to write a response as swiftly as he was

¹⁴⁶ *The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV A.D. 488-775*. P. 49-51.

¹⁴⁷ Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 252-253.

able.¹⁴⁸ What seems to have aroused Severus's especial anger about John the Grammarian's defense of the Council of Chalcedon was the latter's attempt to co-opt St. Cyril's writings into a Pro-Chalcedonian theology.¹⁴⁹ To Severus, John the Grammarian's attempts to reconcile St. Cyril's writings with a Pro-Chalcedonian teachings was muddled and chaotic as he considered everything John wrote on the subject to be missing the point of Cyril's works and theology entirely.¹⁵⁰ A point which comes up even within the anonymous *Life of Severus*, which when discussing John the Grammarian's works describes it as absurd and showing John the Grammarian's ignorance.¹⁵¹ The importance of *Contra Impium Grammaticum* can perhaps best be seen as a rejection of a new tendency among Pro-Chalcedonians of the time to try and reconcile their movement with the writings of St. Cyril. It is also important as one of the last works Severus wrote to directly attack the supporters of Chalcedon, most of his later works would instead be focused on dealing with Anti-Chalcedonians who in Severus's view had strayed from orthodoxy.

For Severus this struggle with his fellow Anti-Chalcedonians seems to have been one of the more important struggles of his later years, alongside his support for those who continued to recognize him as Patriarch of Antioch. Julian of Halicarnassus seems to have presented the most irksome problem for Severus in his later years for a variety of reasons but perhaps the most important reason for Severus was that Julian divided the Anti-Chalcedonian movement, and challenged the Anti-Chalcedonian orthodoxy that Severus had spent his life building.¹⁵² Perhaps the most infuriating thing for Severus about Julian and Julian's followers was that they had initially tried to make use of Severus's own works in defending Julian's new ideas.¹⁵³ For Severus that was certainly an undesirable position to find his own works being used against him in an argument, but Severus's conflict with Julian has other importance besides showing

¹⁴⁸ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". *Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch*. Translated by Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013. P. 129-131.

¹⁴⁹ Severus of Antioch. "Text 6: Contra Impium Grammaticum, Or. III.12". *Severus of Antioch, the Early Church Fathers*. Translated by Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward. New York: Routledge, 2004. P. 76-82.

¹⁵⁰ Severus of Antioch. "Text 6: Contra Impium Grammaticum, Or. III.12". P. 76-82.

¹⁵¹ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 129-131

¹⁵² Frend. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. P. 252-254.

¹⁵³ Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward. "Severus's Works". *Severus of Antioch, the Early Church Fathers*. New York: Routledge, 2004. P. 46-49.

the degree to which Severus's thought had influenced the broader 'Anti-Chalcedonian' movement, as it also provides some insight into how Severus's more devoted followers saw him during his life and after his death. The anonymous *Life of Severus* provides very little detail on Julian of Halicarnassus or his teachings beyond castigating him as a heretic like 'Valentinus, Marcion, Mani and Eutyches', on Severus however the text assures us that he was able to overcome and utterly disprove Julian's teachings.¹⁵⁴ In considering the anonymous *Life of Severus* and what it has to say on Severus's struggle with Julian and Julian's supporters, it ultimately says very little, except for providing a clear understanding of how Severus's supporters came to view the struggle.

While the anonymous *Life of Severus* is not fully trustworthy in describing Severus's life and works, it does provide a very useful look at the way Severus's fellow Anti-Chalcedonians came to view him after his death. One of the first things that the anonymous *Life of Severus* does to establish Severus's credentials is it claims that Severus was descended from an earlier Severus who had been the Bishop of Sozopolis and had participated in the Council that condemned Nestorius.¹⁵⁵ This was a claim about Severus that seems to have become especially popular within Anti-Chalcedonian circles after his death. For example the *Chronicle of Zuqnin* claims that Severus of Antioch was the grandson of this earlier Severus who had condemned Nestorius.¹⁵⁶ There are of course hints of this even in Zacharias's *Life of Severus* where he says that 'some say' that Severus's parents were descended from this earlier Severus of Sozopolis.¹⁵⁷ The reality of this claim is doubtful, due to the fact that Severus himself admits that he was a Pagan when young.¹⁵⁸ Severus and his family's paganism would make it highly unlikely that they had any ancestors or relatives who had entered into high Church offices before Severus of Antioch. These claims almost certainly arose early on as way to bolster Severus's reputation and protect him from criticism by

¹⁵⁴ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 131-132.

¹⁵⁵ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 103-104.

¹⁵⁶ *The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV A.D. 488-775*. P. 46.

¹⁵⁷ Zacharias. "Life of Severos". P. 35.

¹⁵⁸ Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward. "Severus's Life". *Severus of Antioch, the Early Church Fathers*. New York: Routledge, 2004. P. 5-6.

providing him with a respectable family lineage that establish Severus as member of the Christian elite. As such these claims served a vital role in protecting Severus's posthumous legacy from his more vicious opponents by shoring up Severus's standing and removing what might have otherwise been a great threat to his reputation.

There are many other ways that the anonymous *Life of Severus* shows the common attitudes of Severus's supporters. In almost every discussion of every important event in Severus's life, it is quick to paint Severus in an extremely positive light. In describing Severus's entrance into the city of Antioch and his ascension to the office of the Patriarch it compares his decision to expel the kitchen staff, and his destruction of a bathhouse associated with the Patriarch's residence to the biblical Hezekiah and Josiah as a sign of Severus's piety.¹⁵⁹ It also describes Severus's opponents John the Grammarian and Julian of Halicarnassus as heretics, and in several places the text insults the intelligence and knowledge of both of Severus's opponents.¹⁶⁰ These are examples of the general content of the anonymous *Life of Severus*, and they paint a very rosy picture of Severus as the pinnacle of what an Anti-Chalcedonian Christian should be. Which perhaps explains why the text portrays him as coming from a purely Christian lineage and completely ignores Severus's youthful paganism, as it becomes easier to justify his high standing within the 'Anti-Chalcedonian' community and to protect him and his teachings from 'Pro-Chalcedonian' criticism. Further under the rule of Justin and Justinian, the 'Anti-Chalcedonians' faced brutal persecution and expulsion from their bishoprics and monasteries, as they pursued policies aimed at garnering 'pro-Chalcedonian' support.¹⁶¹ So for those who remained firmly 'Anti-Chalcedonian' they needed someone to idolize, someone to look to as they dealt with the persecution and the struggle to hold onto their beliefs under the pressure of Imperial scrutiny.

¹⁵⁹ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 126.

¹⁶⁰ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 129-132.

¹⁶¹ Volker L. Menze. *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. P. 43-55.

One of the last major events described in the anonymous *Life of Severus*, is Severus's brief return to Constantinople during the reign of Justinian. According to the anonymous *Life of Severus* departed for Constantinople under the invitation of the Emperor Justinian to discuss the 'peace of the churches', or in other words discuss the possibility of tolerance for the Anti-Chalcedonian position.¹⁶² This situation came about largely due to the influence of Justinian's wife, the Empress Theodora, who was a thorough supporter of the Anti-Chalcedonian cause and used her influence to persuade her husband to attempt to pursue a compromise with the Anti-Chalcedonians.¹⁶³ The result of this was that Severus traveled to Constantinople intending to speak with the Emperor Justinian, but according to the anonymous *Life of Severus* he was never able to do so, instead finding himself more or less a prisoner in the Imperial court.¹⁶⁴ Severus's final visit to Constantinople was not entirely without success however, as he was able, according to the anonymous *Life of Severus*, to convert the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimius to the 'Anti-Chalcedonian' cause.¹⁶⁵ Here it would seem that the anonymous *Life of Severus* was stretching the truth, though Anthimius was inclined to tolerate the moderate Anti-Chalcedonianism of Severus and even welcome it back into the Imperial Church.¹⁶⁶ The political tides of the day turned against Anthimius and Severus however, when Justinian met with representatives of the Pope and was convinced to embrace a more fervently Pro-Chalcedonian stance, which saw the conciliatory Anthimius swept from power.¹⁶⁷ Severus himself was able to flee Constantinople with the aid of the Empress Theodora, and returned once more to his exile in Egypt.¹⁶⁸ As with most of the anonymous *Life of Severus*, this particular episode is described in a manner that presents Severus in fairly positive light as the epitome of piety, with his ability to convert Anthimius who praised as 'venerable' taking center stage and being given considerable importance.¹⁶⁹ But this episode also highlights one of the often overlooked aspects of Justinian's reign

¹⁶² Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 132-133.

¹⁶³ J.A.S. Evans. *The Age of Justinian: Circumstances of Imperial Power*. New York: Routledge, 1996. P. 110-112.

¹⁶⁴ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 132-135.

¹⁶⁵ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 132-135.

¹⁶⁶ J.A.S. Evans. *The Age of Justinian*. P. 110-112.

¹⁶⁷ J.A.S. Evans. *The Age of Justinian: Circumstances of Imperial Power*. P. 110-112.

¹⁶⁸ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 132-135

¹⁶⁹ Anonymous. "Life of Severos". P. 132-135

and that is the complicated relationship he had with the Anti-Chalcedonians. On one hand he was their greatest persecutor and the most powerful supporter of their Pro-Chalcedonian rivals, and on the other hand he regularly tried to achieve some kind of reconciliation between the Anti-Chalcedonians and the Pro-Chalcedonians, perhaps because his own wife was an Anti-Chalcedonian. This episode was also Severus's last real foray into politics before his death. It was also certainly Severus's last chance to see his theology enforced in the state church.

Severus left a powerful legacy, as can easily be seen in the anonymous *Life of Severus* which show off Severus's continued influence and importance among the Anti-Chalcedonians of the Empire even after his death. Even his opponents were forced to recognize and deal with this legacy. Perhaps the most dramatic example among Severus's contemporary opponents who had to deal with his legacy was the Emperor Justinian. This is perhaps unsurprising given how important matters of religion most especially the conflict over Chalcedon were to Justinian's personal ambitions, as the conflict over Chalcedon had not just divided the Church within the Empire but it had sundered the Western Church from the Eastern Church in the Acacian Schism.¹⁷⁰ Resolving this schism was of vital importance to Justinian who saw it as a vital part of his effort to restore Roman control of the West.¹⁷¹ The greatest threat to his chances of resolving this schism however lay with the Anti-Chalcedonians especially Severus's followers who firmly refused to embrace Chalcedon.¹⁷²

The continued issue of the Anti-Chalcedonians is doubtless what inspired Justinian to dip his hand into theological waters with his *Letter Against the Monophysites*. The letter itself sets out to refute nearly every point of Anti-Chalcedonian theology, with an especial focus on Severus's own ideas of which one key example that Justinian attacks is the concept of the Hypostatic union which Justinian refers to as a 'union of two hypostases' which Justinian argues is more or less the same as the Nestorian

¹⁷⁰ Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 174-184.

¹⁷¹ Warren Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 174-184.

¹⁷² Warren Treadgold. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. P. 174-184.

understanding of Christ.¹⁷³ Justinian later names Severus explicitly in his attack on Anti-Chalcedonian theology. One of his key points in this area is to argue that Severus was in disagreement with earlier Church leaders, in particular St. Cyril whose thought had so deeply influenced Severus.¹⁷⁴ Justinian argued that Severus had misused St. Cyril's writings and had twisted them to fit with Severus's concept of the one nature of Christ, when Cyril's writings even by Severus's own admission described Christ as having two natures.¹⁷⁵ From there Justinian uses Severus's admission that Cyril had used a two nature formula in describing Christ to attack Severus's theology, and argue that Severus was in disagreement not only with the other great theologians of the Church but also with St. Cyril.¹⁷⁶ After that Justinian quotes from a number of Cyril's writings to defend his claim that Cyril followed a two nature formula, and then ends with a condemnation of Severus as 'hostile to the truth', and says that in essence Severus's thought and writings are blatantly hostile both to preceding church tradition and to the scriptures.¹⁷⁷

Justinian strove to achieve two things throughout his letter: first, he sought to tear apart Severus's teachings from the ground up by attacking Severus's claims to have based his teachings in Cyril's writings, he also argued that St. Cyril's teachings were not in line with Anti-Chalcedonian teachings, which was part of a new trend that became dominant among the Pro-Chalcedonians known as Neo-Chalcedonianism which strove to reconcile Cyril's writings and thought to the Pro-Chalcedonian cause.¹⁷⁸ Nonetheless the fact that the Emperor Justinian felt the need to attack Severus's theology in such a direct way, even after Severus's death, shows if nothing else the continuing influence that Severus had on the Anti-Chalcedonian movement. Though perhaps an even better example of Severus's lasting impact can be found in the writings of Leontius of Jerusalem.

¹⁷³ Justinian. "Justinian's Letter to the Monks of Alexandria Against the Monophysites". *On the Person of Christ: The Christology of Emperor Justinian*. Translated by Kenneth P. Wesche. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Press, 1991. P. 78-81.

¹⁷⁴ Justinian. "Justinian's Letter to the Monks of Alexandria Against the Monophysites". P. 81-82.

¹⁷⁵ Justinian. "Justinian's Letter to the Monks of Alexandria Against the Monophysites". P. 81-82.

¹⁷⁶ Justinian. "Justinian's Letter to the Monks of Alexandria Against the Monophysites". P. 82-91.

¹⁷⁷ Justinian. "Justinian's Letter to the Monks of Alexandria Against the Monophysites". P. 91.

¹⁷⁸ Meyendorff. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*. P. 218-221.

Traditionally most scholars believe Leontius of Jerusalem to have been a contemporary of Severus of Antioch, but more recent scholarship has called this into question, asserting instead that Leontius lived almost a full century after Severus.¹⁷⁹ The argument for this later dating of Leontius centers in part on the many holes and problems with the traditional dating. Not least of them that the traditional dating of the text to Severus's time requires the rejection of a passage that is clearly of later date as not part of the original text in spite of the fact that it seems to fit in with the themes of the passage preceding it.¹⁸⁰ In general, the argument for a later date seems to be better supported by the original text, and this later dating of Leontius's writing is also interesting, as it seems that even a century after Severus's death, Pro-Chalcedonian writers like Leontius still felt the need to wrestle with Severus's thought.

Leontius starts by using Severus's own arguments against him, arguing that Severus contradicts himself when describing the usage of the 'two-nature' formula for Christ by early church theologians as 'blameless', and then describing it as 'blameworthy' even though many early theologians had described Christ in that way.¹⁸¹ Leontius's criticisms all seem to boil down to this one point, that Severus's writings and teachings were confused, and self-contradictory¹⁸² This can be seen in Leontius's summation of Severus's writings as 'consistent...only in ... inconsistency'.¹⁸³ After this Leontius ends his discussion of Severus with a barb at another Anti-Chalcedonian, who argued that Severus was sent to clear up the confusion around Cyril's writings.¹⁸⁴ This all indicates that later Pro-Chalcedonian writers like Leontius

¹⁷⁹ Dirk Krausmüller. "Leontius of Jerusalem, A Theologian of the Seventh Century." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NEW SERIES, 52, no. 2 (2001): P. 637-657. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/stable/23970006>.

¹⁸⁰ Krausmüller. "Leontius of Jerusalem, A Theologian of the Seventh Century." P. 637-657. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/stable/23970006>.

¹⁸¹ Leontius of Jerusalem. "Testimonies of the Saints." *Leontius of Jerusalem, Against the Monophysites: Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae*. Edited and Translated by Patrick T.R. Gray. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. P. 95-97.

¹⁸² Leontius of Jerusalem. "Testimonies of the Saints." P. 97-99

¹⁸³ Leontius of Jerusalem. "Testimonies of the Saints." P. 95-103

¹⁸⁴ Leontius of Jerusalem. "Testimonies of the Saints." P. 103.

still felt the need to engage with Severus's writings and attack them, in large part it would seem because Severus continued to be a central figure in Anti-Chalcedonian circles even long after his death.

The centrality of Severus of Antioch in the Anti-Chalcedonian movement is something few historians would challenge, but at the same time it is something that is usually passed over in most discussions of the Anti-Chalcedonians. Which means that all too often the depth of Severus's political and religious influence over the Anti-Chalcedonian movement is glossed over. This does a disservice to any consideration not just of Severus's life but of the Anti-Chalcedonian movement during the early Sixth century, as both the depth and lastingness of his influence helped reshape the Anti-Chalcedonians from a disparate collection of groups into a relatively unified movement. As Severus's writings provided both a new base for the Anti-Chalcedonian movement to build itself. Further Severus himself, in the course of his life could by glossing over some facts and telling a few lies, be presented as an ideal Anti-Chalcedonian to serve as an example to his fellow Anti-Chalcedonians amidst the persecutions they suffered under the Emperors Justin, Justinian and their successors.

Severus's legacy was not without confusion and uncertainty, even during his own life time he was a controversial figure, and more than a few of his fellow Anti-Chalcedonians such as Julian of Halicarnassus or Sergius the Grammarian challenged and questioned his ideas. But all of these points underline one very important truth, that Severus was a vital figure in the Anti-Chalcedonian movement. He redefined the Anti-Chalcedonian movement providing it with a new theological core to build itself around, and his actions in redefining the Anti-Chalcedonians also had a significant impact on the politics of the late Roman world. The depth of Severus's influence is perhaps best demonstrated in the lastingness of his influence, that writers like Leontius of Jerusalem and others still felt the need to wrestle with Severus's legacy even so long after his death. It can also be seen in the fact that even to this day there are Christians still following his theology. The ability of Severus's legacy to survive in spite of the forces arrayed against it during his own life and after that proves the importance of his influence.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Documents of the Christian Church. Edited by Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999

Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century. Edited, Translated and Annotated by Albert Van Roey and Pauline Allen. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Department Oriëntalistiek Leuven, 1994.

Moran Etho 6 *Bride of Light: Hymns on Mary from Syriac Churches.* Sebastian Brock Translated and compiled. Baker Hill, Kottayam: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute, 1994.

Readings in Church History: Volume One, from Pentecost to the Protestant Revolt. Edited by Colman J. Barry. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1960.

The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Translated by Richard Price and Michael Gaddis. 3 Vols. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.

The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV A.D. 488-775. Translated by Amir Harrak. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1999.

The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles: including two seventh century Syriac apocalyptic. Translated by Andrew Palmer, and Sebastian Brock. Melksham: Liverpool University Press, 1993.

The Wisdom of the Pearlers: An Anthology of Syriac Christian Mysticism. Translated with an introduction by Brian E. Colless Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications Inc., 2008.

Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch. Translated by Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013.

When Christians first met Muslims: a sourcebook of the earliest Syriac writings on Islam. Translated by Michael Philip Penn. Oakland: University of California Press, 2015.

St. Cyril of Alexandria. *Three Christological Treatises.* Translated by Daniel King. Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 2014.

Evagrius Scholasticus. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus.* Translated by Michael Whitby. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.

John of Nikiu. *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu.* Translated by R.H. Charles. (Oxford: Williams and Norgate, 1916)

Justinian. *On the Person of Christ: The Christology of Emperor Justinian.* Translated by Kenneth Paul Wesche. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991.

Leontius. *Leontius of Jerusalem: Against the Monophysites : Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae*. Edited and Translated by Patrick T.R. Gray. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006

Malalas, John. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. Translated by Elizabeth Jeffreys, Michael Jeffreys, Roger Scott, Brian Coke, Jenny Ferber, Simon Franklin, Alan James, Douglas Kelly, Ann Moffatt, and Ann Nixon. (Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986)

Prokopios. *The Wars of Justinian*. Translated by H.B. Dewing, and Anthony Kaldellis, Maps and Genealogies by Ian Mladjov. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 2014.

Procopius. *The Secret History of Procopius*. Translated by Richard Atwater. New York: Dorset Press, 1992.

Pseudo-Joshua. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite*. Translated by Frank R. Trombley and John H. Watt. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.

Pseudo-Zachariah .*The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor*. Edited by Geoffrey Greatrex, Translated by Robert R. Phenix, Cornelia B. Horn, Sebastian P. Brock and Witold Witakowski. Chicago: Liverpool University Press, 2011.

Rufus, John. John Rufus: The Lives of Peter the Iberian and Theodosius of Jerusalem, and the Monk Romanus. Translated and edited by Cornelia B. Horn, and Robert R. Phenix. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uiowa/detail.action?docID=3118192#>

Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Grammarian. *Christology After Chalcedon*. Translated by Iain R. Torrance. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988.

Severus of Antioch. The Sixth Book of the Selected Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch. Translated by E.W. Brooks Oxford: Williams and Norgate, 1903. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044095071528&view=1up&seq=9>

Severus of Antioch. *Severus of Antioch, the Early Church Fathers*. Translated by Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward. (New York: Routledge, 2004)

Secondary Sources

Bell, Peter N. *Social Conflict in the Age of Justinian: Its Nature, Management and Mediation*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Brock, Sebastian. *Moran Etho 2 Spirituality in the Syriac Tradition*. (Baker Hill, Kottayam: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute, 1989)

- Brown, Peter. *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*. (Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Publication, 2013)
- Bury, J.B. *History of the Later Roman Empire: From the death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian*. 2 Vols. (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1958)
- Butcher, Kevin. *Roman Syria and the Near East*. (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003)
- Cain, Andrew and Noel Lenski Ed. *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*. (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2009)
- Chesnut, Roberta. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976)
- Christophilopoulou, Aikatarina. *Byzantine History I: 324-610*. Translated by W.W. Phelps. (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert Publisher, 1986)
- Evans, J.A.S. *The Age of Justinian: Circumstances of Imperial Power*. (New York: Routledge, 1996)
- Frend, W.H.C. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972)
- Haarer, F.K. *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*. (Cambridge: Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd, 2006)
- Herrin, Judith. *The Formation of Christendom*. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1987)
- Hitti, Philip K. *The History of Syria*. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1951)
- Horn, Cornelia B. "The Life and Career of Peter the Iberian." In *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Oxford Scholarship Online, 2006. <https://www-oxfordscholarship-com.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/view/10.1093/0199277532.001.0001/acprof-9780199277537>
- Kaegi, W.E. Jr. *Army, Society, and Religion in Byzantium*. (London: Variorum Reprints, 1982)
- Klingshirn, William E. and Mark Vessey, Ed. *The Limits of Ancient Christianity: Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R.A. Markus*. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999)
- Kofsky, Aryeh, Serge Ruzer, and Reuven Kipperwasser. *Reshaping Identities in Late Antique Syria-Mesopotamia: Christian and Jewish Hermeneutics and Narrative Strategies*. (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2016)

- Krausmüller, Dirk. "Leontius of Jerusalem, A Theologian of the Seventh Century." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NEW SERIES, 52, no. 2 (2001): 637-657.
<http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/stable/23970006>.
- Maas, Michael, ed. *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Markus, Robert. *The End of Ancient Christianity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Menze, Volker L. *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.)
- Meyendorff, John. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church Ad 450-680*. (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989)
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971)
- Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Sellers, R.V. *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*. (London: S.P.C.K., 1953)
- Széll, Gábor. "Justinian and Theodora's Peculiar struggle with the Monophysites" *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* Vol. 52 (March 1st, 2012): 1-8
- Treadgold, Warren. *A History of Byzantine State and Society*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997)
- Veyne, Paul, Ed. *A History of Private Life I: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Wigram, William Ainger. *The Separation of the Monophysites*. (New York: AMS Press, 1978)
- Witakowski, Witold. "Severus of Antioch in the Ethiopian Tradition" In *Studia Aethiopica*, edited by Verena Böll, Denis Nosnitsin, Thomas Rave, Wolbert Smidt, and Evgenia Sokolinskaia. Pages 115-125. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2004.
https://books.google.co.uk/books?redir_esc=y&id=mUppV49qw6AC&q=severus+of+antioch#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Young, Frances M. and Andrew Teal. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*, 2nd Edition. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010)

