

KARL HINZ  
HENRICH

Criminal  
history of  
Christianity

VOLUME 2  
THE LATE ANTIQUE





The first part of the book is devoted to a general introduction to the theory of the firm. It starts with a discussion of the basic concepts of the firm, such as the production function, the cost function, and the profit function. The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed analysis of the firm's behavior in a competitive market. It starts with a discussion of the firm's short-run behavior, and then moves on to a discussion of the firm's long-run behavior. The third part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the firm's behavior in an imperfectly competitive market. It starts with a discussion of the firm's behavior in a monopoly, and then moves on to a discussion of the firm's behavior in an oligopoly. The fourth part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the firm's behavior in a market with externalities. It starts with a discussion of the firm's behavior in a market with a positive externality, and then moves on to a discussion of the firm's behavior in a market with a negative externality.

This book is intended for students of economics who are interested in the theory of the firm. It is also suitable for students of business administration who are interested in the economic aspects of the firm. The book is written in a clear and concise style, and it includes many examples and exercises to help students understand the theory. The book is divided into four parts, each of which covers a different aspect of the theory of the firm. The first part is an introduction to the theory, the second part is a detailed analysis of the firm's behavior in a competitive market, the third part is a discussion of the firm's behavior in an imperfectly competitive market, and the fourth part is a discussion of the firm's behavior in a market with externalities.

## About this book

The proverbial - conditions as in ancient Rome - are, as Deschner points out in this book, characteristic of the conditions in the Roman church. The cruelties and villainies of Christian shepherds and flocks in late antiquity are often glossed over and concealed by church historians to this day. Most - **laymen** - consider such an accumulation of crimes in the early Christian centuries to be simply impossible at first, then as the misdeeds of individuals. The shock of this book will convince every reader that these crimes were not forgivable mistakes of an otherwise holy church, but the very essence of a distorted religion.

## The author

THE AUTHOR Karlheinz Deschner, born in 1924 in Bamberg, a soldier during the war, studied law, theology, philosophy, literature and history. Since 1958, Deschner has published his revealing and provocative historical works criticizing religion and the church. The researching writer lives in the Franconian town of Haßfurt am Main, **which is** very much a Catholic town. He has been awarded numerous prizes for his research.

**Other** volumes published by Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag in the • Kriminalgeschichte des Christentums - : Band 1 - Die Frühzeit " (rororo 1996q), Band 2 " Die Spätantike " (rororo\*••4•1, Band 3 "The Early Church - (rororo 60zød), Volume - Early Middle Ages - (rororo 60 441. vol. 5 - q. and 10. Jahrhundert" (rororo 605 6}, vol. 6 - 11. and 12. Jahrhundert - (rororo 61 i ji), vol. 7 - 13. and 14. Jahrhundert - (rororo 61 i r), vol. 8 - 15. and 16. Jahrhunderte - (rororo 7 1 m Buchverlag have published: " Opus Diaboli -, Reinbek 1981 - Die Politik der Päpste im 20. Jahrhundert -, Reinbek 1981, - Oben ohne -, Reinbek 1981; - Mernen- to! ", Reinbek 1981

KARLHEINZ DESCHNER

# Criminal history of Christianity

Second volume

DIESPATENTICE

From the kstholiechcn -Kinderkaisern-  
until the eradication of the Arian '\X/anüalen and Osegoen  
**unter Justinian I. (527-565)**

Rowohlt Paperback Publisher

y. Edition May soij

Published by Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, Reinbek  
bei Hamburg, October 1966 Unveränderr,  
formmechanischer Nachdruck Copyright & 1988 b'y  
Rowohlt Verlag GmbH,  
Reinbek near  
Hamburg alle Rights  
reserved

Cover design: any.way, Barbara Hanke  
The pictured goldmedaille shows Emperor Justinian I, the  
exalted realizer of Caesaropapism  
(& The Fitiwilliam Museum Bridgemnn Ari Library)  
Complete production CPI - Claumn & Bosse, Lock

Printed in Germany

**ISBN 978 3 499 60142 2**

# CONTENTS

## I. KnPrsL: Catholic children's emperors 9

The division of the empire - two Catholic coercive states arise in Arcadius, Rufinus, Eutropius - The hot summer of 395 - Ocr hl. Ocr johannes

**Orystomus** and the Constantinopolitan massacre of the Goths 16-  
Headjacking, persecution of pagans and eKerzer 29 - Honorius, Stilicho,  
Ariaricus and the first raids of Germanic Christians 22- Ocr invasion of  
Radagais, Stilicho's murder and further Roman Catholic massacres of the  
Goths 31- The fall of Rome (410) and **Augustine's** evasions 34- Honorius'  
struggle **gegen**

"Heretics, pagans and Judaizers" - Theodosius 16th - Eriiller - 81er **Vorschrift**  
of the Christennims 36 . **Aggressive** Judenfeindsch 33 Christian East 38 .  
Murder upon murder in the Catholic West 39

## II. WPITEL: The papal primacy or the -petra scandali-. Triumph of fraud and greed for power 95

Before Jesus established the papacy, Peter was bishop of Rome 16 - Peter's  
stay and death in Rome are unbcwisen 8- The mats of the tomb of Peter 62  
. The "Enutment of the ecclesiastical offices, the Meero- polity, the  
Patriarchate and the Papatnims 62 The gefslichte Roman  
Bischelislire 6p ' Aufqmmende Pritoacsansprüche y-j The gsnzc old Kizcke  
know e kcinen by Jesus gestifret Ettren- und Rechtsprimat des aischofs on  
Itom 7 vic Biseék und Kirchnväter canren auch die allen Konzi- lien keinen  
Re1tsprimac koms Bo - Die Apriarius-Aff6rc 8t - Die Bestrcitung des Papstlichen  
Primat lasct bis **in die Neuzcit** fort 8y

## CHAPTER 3: First rivalries and turmoil around the Roman episcopal see 99

Ksmf of St. Hippolyt against the hl. Kallixt 9- Cornelius contra Novarian  
Eoo - Der -MarwkalT Gottes- und -Patzon des I-Imvicha- Fay - Aufnlh¥, Mord und  
Liiigenkänzc. ThePfpstc Marctllinus, Marcnilus, Militiades, Silve- ster and  
others 106 - Of all kinds of bloodshed and other bloodshed. Des Fclizianis1e  
S1isma 208 - Murderpap6r Damasus *bakamph* antipope Ursinus and ended  
devil 23 - &ach6cndcPrimatsznsprüchc under Damasus  
230 - tnozent t., -the 'Spicze des bischällichen Aa s - , oder lauter Lügen?  
1x# - Eulalius gegen Boniface, -dm apostolic summit cpx

q. PItEL: The battle for the bishoprics of the East  
in the 5th century until the Council of Chalcedon i3y

Kandalicrcttdc Mönche und Theopkils Frontwccfssel zjp - Kirchenlehrer Hieronymus und Konsorten leisten Theophil -Schergendicnsrc- gçgen KirchnfeArorjohannes zgj - Von der Demur eines KirchgOfünlen,47 Kirchnvarer Epiphanius, die Synode ad Quercum, Murder and Manslaughter in the Pacriar- chen Palace iy\$ - The Defeat of Hegia Sophia, the End of Johannes and the -Johanniter- ry-i Patriarch Cyril compete against Parrisrch Nestorios

sn zj6- The antiochenicckc and alexandrinc tkeologcn schoolc zyp- The battle for the -Mother of God- begins i6i- The coazil of Epheeus qjr odet a oogma by bribery rya- The -Union-, an almost unbelievable faith handcl, and Kyritli Gaunerstick with dtm monk Viktor i89 . St. Cyril ale - Ketzcr- persecutor and initiator of the first -end soliiion- iq3 . Schenute of Atripe tca. 3ç8-q66!) as Mosrervorstcher top- St. Schenurc as Heidtnbekämpfer - Rauben. Ruin and murder aoy- The Eutyichis- **nian controversy** t zj - **The -ftaubersynod- of Ephesus** Qp zzo - **The Xoncil of Chalcedon** or: -We cry out for the sake of piety it9 - The z8. Can z3q

5. KAPITEL: Papst Leo I. (440-461) 243

Leo I preaches his primacy - and humility to the laity zi}- Who was this keo? z48 - St. Leo against St. Hilarius z o- Pope **Leo** grants the Kaiier infallibility in faith and himself the duty to proclaim the imperial faith zJq For this: -War service now under Chtisrui ...- z36 Collaboration to annihilate the -Kerzer- while -emphasizing the Menschenwürde- ij2 . Leo I ali persecution of Pelagians, Manichaeans and Priscillianists and as a preacher of the love of the enemy i8j - 1-co -dtr Gro8e- demonizes the Jews z7i' The -Starsiunde of MenschhCit- ^74

6. KxPiTEL: The war in and around the churches  
up to Emperor Justin ( i 8) z8i

The East is in hclien flames or: -... the devil, you and Lco- x8z - Pope Leo hecit against the Christian -Tcufel- of the East z88- Also uncer Emperor Leo I. Pope Lee demands violence **against** -the criminals and rejects any negotiation z9o - Faith-sluts between Christians z9q- **Pope** Hilarus, **Emperor** Anthemius and Christian robber-regents- Grotcsken t9y- Papet Simplicieue courts Thrnnräuber Basiliskos and Emperor **Zennn 3oi** - Des Henotikon - a reli{jjöser fiinigungsversuch, by Rome, divides empire and Christendom even more deeply joy' The Akakianixchc schism begins - and ecclesiastical high verrar jc'9 Thecrderich conquer



Italy or -Where is God?- 316 - Collaboration rrii of the -cttinric-  
 Besatungsmachc 3ii - Emperor Anastasiox and Pope Eielasius enter the  
 ffinB3\*4 - The two-Gcwsltcn doctrine or the state as a büttej of the popes  
 lz9 Pspet Cclssius combats the -Ptstilent- of schisaatiirem, -Harcti- kern -  
 and pagans 3jz- A peace pope does not reign long 336- The  
 Laurentian Shiana, Street Fighting and Church Battles 3jy- The  
 Symmachian Falsehoods 3§I - Battlefront Position: Gothic Empire and  
 Rome against Byzantines 34s

y. KnPITEx: Justinian I (527-565). The theologian on the imperial throne 355

Revolt under Justin I (527-528) or from swineherd to hstholi- cctten emperor  
 jy4 - Vcrfölgung of the **Monophysites under Justin I.** yj8 - The libcllus  
 Hormisdæ 360- Rome passes from Rvvenna tu Bjrz nz j6q - Frülie  
 Kreuziügç oder allerlei arabisch-äthiopische Heilsgeschichten 36d \* Kaiser  
 Justinien - Btherrscher der Kirche j6q - Justinian eifcrr der Ocmut Christi  
 after, arranges -the cricgc well and the gcisdichen angelegcnhcites . . - i7'-  
 Privileging the bishops and fleecing the l.aien jy3- Theodora - mistress of  
 houseboys, patriarchs (?) and mistress of the emperor 3y8- The Nika revolt  
 j8j - Emperor Juetfnian persecuted Christians of other faiths,  
 -on de0 cie in misery .....- 38y- For Heiden -a kind of Inquisition-  
 procedure- j8q- For Jews -a fate of shame.....- 39i - Justinians  
 extermination of the Sanjaritans j9- The Vandals or -Gegea the. whom Gori  
 bridles ...- Oer Arian Geiserich persecutes the Catholics o-3 Hunerich  
 jg-8  
 and the Arian clergy tnicigntn, banish and massacre o9- The Catholic  
 clergy wants -a kind of crusade- against the Vandal Fry  
 • . we bring you peace and freedom!- qry Papal Glückwiinsche für die -  
 Auxbreitung **des** Ciotteirciches- oder -Sic alle **waren** &rtler- ya - Von der -  
 grnRen Treibjagd auf die Goten- und msncherlei am Rsndt-Oer groß  
 Profiteur des Infernos: die römische Kirche 38 - West-örtliche  
 Schmierentstücke oder Mörderpapst Vigilius I jy- yy) fy)

**ANHANG**

Notes on: Kriminis)geschichre des Christentums. First volume. Die Früh- zcir;  
 rororo sachbuch yp6p §/p - AnmerLungcn zum zwciticn Bsnd jyy ' Bcnuczle  
 Sckundärliteratur y88 - Abbreviations 6p ' RcgIS^\*\*49

*I would especially like to thank my friends Al/ad Schwarz  
and H "rbart Sta(fen and all their selfless support after the  
death of my parents:*

Wilhelm Adler  
Prof. Dr. Hans Albert  
Lore Alberr  
Klaus Antes  
Else Arnold  
josef Becker  
Karl Beerscht  
Or. Wolfgang Bcutin  
Dr. OnoBick\*1  
Prof. Dr. Dieier Birnbacher  
Dr. Eleonore Kottje-Birnbacher  
**KutBv**  
Dr. Otmar Einwag  
Dr. Karl Finke  
Franz Fischer  
Kläre Fischer-Vogel  
Henry Gelhausen  
Dr. Helmut HäuSler  
Prof. Dr. Dr. Norbert Hoerster  
Prof. Dr. Walter Hofmann  
Dr. Stefan Kager and his wife  
Lena  
Hans Kalveram  
Karl Kaminski and Dr.  
Hedwig Katzenberger Dr.  
Klaus Katzenberger Hilde  
and Lothar Kayser Prof.  
Dr. Christof Kellmann Prof.  
Dr. Hartmut Klicmt Dr.  
Fritz Köble  
Hans Koch  
Hans K reil  
me tind Ernst Kreuder  
Eduard Kusters  
Robert Mächler  
Jtirgen Mack

Volker ktack Dr.  
jfirg Mager  
Prof. Dr. H. M.  
Nelly Moia  
Fritz Moser  
Regine Paulus  
Arthur and Gisela Reeg  
Hildegunde Rehle  
M. Renard  
German Rudel  
Dr. K. Rugheimcr and Mrs. Johanna  
Heinz Ruppel and Mrs. Renatt  
Martha Sachse  
Hedwig and Willy Schaaf  
Friedlich Scheibe  
Else and Scpp Schmidt  
Dr. Werner Schmitz  
Norbert Schneider  
Alfred Schwarz  
Dr. Gustav Seehuber  
Dr. Michael Stahl-Baumeister  
Prof. Dr. Dr. Dr. h. c.  
Wnl[ganB Stegmüller  
Almuc and A/alter Stumpf  
**Artur** Uecker  
Dr. Bernd Umlauf  
Helmut Wetland  
Klaus Wessels  
Richard Wild  
Lothar Willies  
Dr. Elsberh Wolffheim  
Prof. Dr. Hans Wolffheim  
Franz Zitzlspenger  
Dr. Ludwig Kollitsch

nKAWTYL

## CATHOLIC CHILD EMPERORS

-These rulers followed the example of the great Theodosius.  
Kirchcnhis\$oriker Cardinal Hergmratfic'

-Au1the Xaieer waccn fromrnc Katholikm-. Pmt Brown'

-The world is coming to an end-. St. Hieronymius'

## THE DIVISION OF THE EMPIRE - TWO CATHOLIC OVERSEAS STATES E'4T STANDING

In the year of Augustine's appointment as bishop (396), Emperor Theodosius I had died in Milan. Leading clerics had continued to stir him up against pagans, Jews, heretics and external enemies of the empire, and St. Ambrose and St. Augustine had praised him highly. And already in the 4th century, ecclesiastical circles gave the man, who could shed blood like water, the pen name  
-the great-.

After his death, the Roman Empire was divided between his two sons. The Western Roman Empire ended in 476, while the Eastern Roman Empire existed as the Byzantine Empire until 1453.

However, the unity continued. Some laws were issued in the name of both rulers, and those passed single-handedly often took legal effect here and there. Gradually, however, a growing estrangement developed. Politically, each half of the empire led a separate existence, and the early emergence of competition contributed to a mutual reduction in power. Culturally, too, there were increasing differences. In the west, Greek was soon hardly spoken at all, while in the **east** Latin, which continued to be the official language, was increasingly lagging behind Greek. Conflicts began under Theodosius' sons, with Germanic tribes already playing a significant role. In the east, the de facto rulers changed rapidly. In the west, Stilicho, who was married to Serena, Theodosius' niece, was in charge of state affairs for over a decade.

Never since this division has a single monarch united

the empire among themselves. In Constantinople, the seventeen-year-old Arcadius (393-408) ruled over the East - still a vast territory: the whole of what would later become Romania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Greece, Asia Minor with the Crimean peninsula, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Libya and the Pentapolis. In Milan, the eleven-year-old Honorius (400-423) ruled over the even taller, richer, but politically not equally important west.

Both "Kinderkaiser", who had been subjugated by the church and praised for their piety, continued their father's religious policy. While he alone had fought heresy - one of his main targets - with more than twenty decrees, his sons and their successors supported Catholicism with a plethora of further laws. They promoted it religiously, legally, financially, they increased its property status, they exempted the clergy from certain offices, some taxes, from military service. In short, the identification of the ruler with the cause of orthodoxy, which had already existed under Theodosius, now became an almost common repertoire" (Anton).

At the same time, the Catholic confessional state terrorized more and more people of other faiths, even if there were still pagans even in top positions; five pagans, as far as we know, under Arcadius, fourteen under Honorius - not a real act of tolerance: the old believers, who had long been in high office, were still needed. Only during the

5th century. This changed in the second half of the fifth century, especially under Theodosius II. For the time being, however, it was not so much the individual dissenters who were suppressed - even Arians were still leaders (four, as far as is known, under Arcadius, one under Honorius) - as the institution, and in general they pursued less a pro-Christian personal policy than a very pro-Christian regional policy, in short a policy of tolerance for the persons, intolerance for the ideas (Chastagnol). The Roman Imperial Church, however, which emerged in the course of the 5th century, sided even more resolutely with the state that promoted it. It prays for it, proclaims that its power is

of God, it secures him metaphysically, so to speak: the old trade of throne and altar'.

It is true that hatred of the world was particularly widespread in the earliest Christianity, that the state was called a "perfidious harlot" and "greek of the earth" in the New Testament, and that the Kai8ei was regarded early on as a servant of the devil. But since Paul there has also been a state-friendly, consciously adapting and increasingly assertive direction; wrote Irenäus: - Not the devil distributed the kingdoms of this world, but God"; bcteuere Tertullian:

-Christians are nobody's enemies, least of all the emperor's-; after the recognition of Christianity by Constantinian church historian Bishop Euseb asserted -what an affectionate reception the leaders of the individual churches received from all civil and military officials-; St. John Chrysostom, for his part, said that God had first established -only one dominion-, that of man over woman, but then also other powers", namely princes and authorities. St. John Chrysostom said that God had first established -only one dominion-, that of man over woman-, but then also other powers", namely princes and authorities-, whereby God wanted -one part to rule, the other to obey; that the dominion was monarchical and not democratic", also that one had to face princes and subjects, rich and poor, quite differently in each case, that one had to be -comfortable- with the one and not with the other! In short, one went to the rulers with flying colors. And only when they resisted the church did and still does the following apply: You should obey God more than men ... - God--, as must always be repeated, they were, they are - not theoretically of course, but in praxi.

In the **East** and West, the Christian centers of government presented a pale picture: incessant court cabals, power struggles, ministerial crises and moths. The Catholic -child emperors- - Arcadius, Honorius, then Valentinian III and Theodosius II - were dependent crowned mulls, incapable of making decisions, surrounded by greedy court henchmen, dignitaries, Germanic generals and, last but not least, eunuchs. Entrusted with the personal welfare of their Majesties, the castrators constantly

surrounded them; indeed, their chief, the palace treasurer, *although* bought on the slave market, often competed with the highest-ranking courtiers.

The magister officiorum was the most important imperial official and often even set the political tone among insignificant potentates. Occasionally, however, some magister officiorum also acted as the actual regent of the realm, in the west Olympius, in the east HeJio, Nomus and Euphemitis, the -big- politics also lay in the hands of the magistri mili- turn, the imperial field rulers fighting on all fronts, sometimes even against each other; partly Germanic, gradually indispensable in the defense of the borders: Stilicho in the west, Aspar in the east; partly Romans: Aëtius, Boniface. Bonifatitis falls against Aëtius; Aërius, Aspar, Stilicho are murdered. Not to be underestimated - as so often in times of "decay": as if not all! - some women of the imperial house: Pulcheria, Eudocia, Eudoxia in the east, Galla Placidia in the west.

Behind the women, however (but not only winter them and not only behind if'øen) was a scheming clergy, from whom high officials, fearing for their position, gladly sought support through new heretical heresies. The bishops were already intervening in the a. and even more so in the y. They usurped the powers of the imperial officials and, above all, understood how to limit the scope of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the episcopalis audientia, the episcopal iudicium, the supreme

-The clergy's function as arbitrators was extended more and more, without, of course, being able to displace the state courts, as the episcopal courts were usually ignored and, tellingly enough, another court was preferred. In the Germanic countries, the office of clerical arbitrator did not become established at all. In principle, since Constantine I, anyone could go to the bishop in a civil case, even if it is disputed whether the episcopal procedure was equivalent to the secular one. All this, however, further disrupted the already neglected administration. The result was a coercive Christian state, which was ultimately destroyed in the West not so much by the collapsing barbarians as by itself, not so much defended by the Church as - certainly not the only reason for the debacle - progressively undermined, ruined and ultimately inherited.



## ARCZNIUS, RUSINUS, EUTROP

Arcadius as early as 383, as a child, Augustus, 8J independent regent of the East, was first educated by his mother Aelia Flaccilla, a strict Catholic, and then by the deacon Arsenius from Rome. Although not uneducated - even a pagan, Themistios, prefect of Constantinople, had taught him - the monarch always depended on advisors, including his wife Aelia Eudoxia (mother of St. Pulcheria and Theodosius II), a staunch anti-German, who also drove Arcadius against Old Believers and "heretics" and generally directed his domestic policy to a large extent. As early as August 2, 393, the seventeen-year-old emperor reprimanded the authorities' negligence in the persecution of the Götter cults. <sup>11</sup>

Above all, however, the young prince was  
fell into the hands of the Gaul Flavius Rufinus, his foreman.

The Praefectus praetorio Orientis, not even mentioned by most church histories, is said to have advised Theodosius, the promoter of his career, to commit the Thessalonica massacre, one of the most atrocious massacres of antiquity, disgustingly clarified by Augustine (I 99 ff). Rufin of Aquitaine, brother of St. Silvia, was "a fanatical Christian" (Claus). He broke off contact with the pagans Symmachus and Libanius. He built the Church of the Apostles in Chalcedon and enriched it with (alleged) relics of Peter and Paul from Rome. He founded a monastery for Egyptian monks in the immediate vicinity. He shone through donations for the church as well as his fierce advocacy of "orthodoxy" against pagans and heretics. The bishops embraced him. None other than Ambrose, saint and church teacher, called him a friend, but also admitted how much Rufin was hated and feared.

First, he ousted his rival at court, the Heermeister and former consul Promotus, a pagan, by transferring him to his troop unit, whereupon he was murdered.

which was generally attributed to Rufin. 5qz he saw to the overthrow of the praefectus praetorio Tatian, a highly educated saint, and took his place himself. On December 6, 3q3, he had Tatian's son Proeulus, city prefect of Constantinople, beheaded so quickly (in front of his father) that the emperor's embassy could no longer reach him. He robbed TaDan himself of his fortune and chased him into exile as a beggar. He was also responsible for the murder of Lucian, probably 3q5, a Christian and surprisingly righteous man whose goods Rufin had confiscated. After the complaint of an imperial relative, he had Lucian arrested in the middle of the night in Antiochitn, his official residence, and whipped to death with lead cu- mons before his eyes without any accusation. In every way, the friend of the clergy enriched himself with rich and poor. He gave away offices to the highest bidder, sold state slaves, favored denunciators and false accusations, took bribes at trials and hoarded such incredible treasures that Symmachus, the most important representative of traditional Romanism at the time, spoke of a world robbery. In addition to his greed, also particularly castigated by the poet Claudian, the ancient historians call Rufin arrogant, cruel, corrupt and cowardly. He is also said to have founded the enmity between eastern and western Rome. And finally, he sought to seize the entire empire by marrying his daughter to Arcadius."

But just as Rufin was hoping for the co-regentschah, the He himself took the rap. All his plans were thwarted by his most ardent enemy, the eunuch and minister Eutrop, a Syrian who had been bought on the slave market, castrated at an early age and was the de facto ruler of the Eastern Empire, and who was said to direct the dull-witted emperor like a piece of cattle (Zosimus). Perhaps conspiring with Stilicho, Eutrop allowed Gothic troops to destroy Rufin to a shapeless lump on Constantinople's parade ground in November 3p§ under the eyes of the ruler: tearing off his face, ripping off his arms, dismembering his body; then his head wandered through the city on a lance. Finally, Eutrop robbed most of Rufin himself.

robbed fortune. In almost every other respect, too, he inherited his legacy, through immense greed, lust for power, arbitrary banishments, confiscations, blackmail, and intrigues, without, of course, generally being cruel.\*.

Gradually, however, Eutrop fell out with everyone, with the Grund- herm, the strictly Catholic empress and the church, whose privileges he curtailed in favor of the state. He restricted their right of asylum and the episcopal jurisdiction. Appointed patriciuS in 3q8, consul in 3QQ (as the first eunuch), he fell from grace in the same year. And none other than St. Chrysostom, who gave Eutrop the patriarchal title (p. z38), now declared to the man who had fled to the cathedral in an ambiguous but famous sermon that he had "wronged the clergy". -You are fighting against the clergy and throwing yourself into the abyss" - although the saint did not want to "insult" or "mock" the eunuch or make fun of his misfortune. Shortly afterwards, Arcadius scolded the man he had just showered with honors in a punitive edict, calling him the "stain of the century", a "filthy monster". He banished Eutrop to Cyprus and had him liquidated in Chalcedon under the unjust accusation of having usurped the emperor's insignia. (The usual form of execution was beheading or strangulation.)"

THE HOT SUMMER- 400 -  
 DERHL . JOHANNES  
 CHRYSOSTOMOS AND THE CON STANTINOPELER  
 GOMASSAKER

In the meantime, the Roman army's rapidly rising General Gainas, a Goth and Arian, played his way to the top. He  
 -\* 394 \* <-eg against Eugenius, 3q5 involved in Stilicho's  
 campaign against Alarieh, then in the murder of Rufinus  
 and voft 3& to 3qq, so to speak, under Eutrop, comcs et  
 magister utriusque militiae. One day Gainas became the leaders  
 of the

Aurelian the consul, Saturnius the consular and John the secret scribe were handed over to his greatest opponents, the anti-Germanic party. But the god only touched them with his sword, apparently to imply that they deserved to die, and then sent them into exile."

However, after an unfortunate operation 3s against a rebellious fellow tribesman, the Goth Tribigild, Gainas fell into obscurity. In Constantinople, as a reaction to Gothic raids, pillaging, all kinds of

Demagogy, a rigorous national direction developed, a pronounced anti-Germanism, "primarily supported by devout Christians" (Heinzberger). The people, incited by rumors, hated the Germanic tribes anyway, the barbarians and Arian "heretics", who even claimed their own church in the capital. Gainas therefore had a sharp disptit uiit of Patriarch Chrysostomos, who eagerly sought to -convert- the Goths, assigned Catholic Goths their own house of prayer, the Church of St. Paul, and thus became the -founder of a 'German' national church in Constantinople" (Catholic Baur).

However, the bishop strictly forbade Arian church services. He protested to the emperor against Gainas' demand for his own church. He railed against the Arians and other -ketchers-. He conjured up the church founded by Eudoxia, the fanatical antigerma-

min - - - 4 Augusta -, ruled ruler, but not to tolerate throwing the sacred to the dogs. It was better to lose the throne than to betray the house of God - compare the similar advice of his colleague Ambrose (I Mio ff, çzx f, gab f)! The bishop's intervention reaffirmed the

Citizens with whom there had already been conflicts before. They rebel- Bretten in the "hot summer of the year 4s, no doubt partly due to the foreigner's house, the ethnic difference. -The decisive factor, however, was the religious opposition; the bloodbath broke

when Gainas demanded the release of a church for his Arian Goths" (Aland).

Diç national party had armed the citizens and, together with the Roman garrison and palace guard, attacked the

Gothic minority. Gainas saved himself and some of his troops in the night of July 20 by storming a city gate. However, many of his soldiers, along with their wives and children, were either massacred the same day or were killed in the "Gothic Church", where they sought refuge, were associated with the church and

burned: all in all allegedly over 7000 people. It happened

at the instigation of Bishop Chrysostomos (Ludwig), but perhaps even more so of the later bishop Synesios. His outbursts as an envoy are typical of anti-Germanism in Constantinople. The reputation of St. Chrysostom would have been

strengthened in this turmoil; not, of course, because he was above the party, as the Catholic Stockmeier believes, but because he was on the side of the victors. The Catholics, who saw the open battle, removed the church roof and massacred the "barbarians" through stone hunts and burning beams to the last man. (30 years earlier, this method had already proved its worth in Rome in the battle between two popes: S. ZU.) After the battle, prayers of thanksgiving were sent to heaven, and Chrysostom once again praised the one who guides everything without man."

The addicted Gainas, now officially an enemy of the state, made his way through Thrace to join his compatriots on the other side of the lower Danube. However, after the destruction of his army while crossing the Hellespont, he was captured by the Hunnic Hun on December 3. December, he was slain by the Hun chieftain Uldin, whom the government had bought, and his head was sent to Constantinople, where in winter 400/1 Aurelianus again acted as Praefectus praetorio Orientis.<sup>1</sup>

Korrla'snnn, heroin now -KENmn-vEarorcunc \_\_\_\_\_ iq

## CorrjxGDEN, HEIDEN- tIND -KxrzER "VERFOLGUNG

Christendom loved to see the heads of fallen foes; the rulers and governments built themselves on them. It was customary to send the heads of punished celebrities around the empire as trophies of victory. -Mark Twain calls the

-The main ambition of the human race and the earliest event in its history - but only Christian culture has achieved a triumph of which it can be proud. In two or three centuries it will be recognized that the skilled head-hunters are all Christians ..."

Constantine, the first Christian ruler, had the severed head of Emperor Maxentius thrown with stones, covered in excrement and carried as far as Africa during the triumphal march through Rome after the Battle of the Milvian Bridge (1 az3). The head of the usurper Iulius Nepotianus, who presumably rebelled on behalf of Constantinople, was also carried through Rome in 350, on the 8th day of his reign. day of his reign, was led through Rome. Three years later, the head of the usurper Magnentius (I 309 ff) could be admired in many provinces of the empire. The heads of Procopius, a relative of Emperor Juliane, in the year 3 ( 349), of Magnus Maximus in 388, of the Eugenius 3q6 (I q58). Displayed at the end of the §. or

In the early y. Century the heads of Rufin, Constantine III, Jovinus, Sebastianus, occasionally even the heads of relatives of disliked people."

In addition to their anti-Gothic policies, the reigns of Arcadius and Honorius were characterized by the persecution of pagans and heretics, and the corresponding measures were even more severe than those of their father, who had still been greeted by pagan priests in vestments in Einona, which belonged to Italy at the time, in 1988."

In the very year they came to power, the new masters threatened to

Christians who have relapsed, a stricter application of the previous decrees, and officials who disregard them, the death penalty ^- 39\* all privileges and revenues which temple priests still

and pagan festivals were banned - in 399 the order was given to demolish rural temples - the first law for their destruction. The ruined material disappears during the construction of

Paths, bridges, water pipes, walls. Urban adoratories were left to the public. Although works of art were protected, bishops and monks rarely respected them. All altars had to be destroyed and any remaining statues of gods removed. They were not only forbidden in worship, but even their installation in baths: by Arcadius 399, by Honorius 400 and 401 after a law had been passed for the definitive removal of statues.

Confiscation of all images of the gods apparently remained so ineffective.

was like some earlier ones.<sup>10</sup>

The decrees, issued in the name of both emperors, were valid for both halves of the kingdom, but thean was milder in its enforcement in the west and limited itself mainly to earlier decrees."

Of course, both rulers fought against heterodox Christians all the more, whether by re-imposing old laws or enacting new ones.

Around the turn of the 5th century, they threatened heretics with confiscation of their property, expulsion or exile. Even children who resisted instruction lost their possessions. Non-Catholic Christians had to give their churches to the "orthodox believers". They were not allowed to build new ones, use private houses for worship, organize meetings and services, either publicly or secretly, or appoint clergy. Heretics were deprived of their civic legal capacity, forbidden to call themselves Christians, to make wills or to inherit on the basis of wills. And "heresy" was punishable by death, initially reserved only for the Manichaeans, who were always the most persecuted. However, all these attempts at suppression and extermination were usually initiated by the "Great Church".

**HoxORIOUS, STILICHO, ALARICH**  
AND FIRST EXODUS OF GERMAN CHRISTIANS

The Western Roman emperor Honorius (395- 3), who was only eleven years old when his father died, was initially succeeded by the half-wandal and imperial ruler (magister militum) Flavius Stilicho, who was appointed by Theodosius on his deathbed.

The son of a Vandal officer who commanded an equestrian regiment under Valens, he was a Catholic, but his religious policy was subject to fluctuations. He had the gold decorations torn from the doors of the Capitoline temple of Jupiter, the ancient Sibylline books burned, the -heretics, especially the Donatists, punished by law after the intervention of Augustine and the priesthood of the church renewed. Andrcrséts Stilicho allowed the statue of Victoria (I zi ff) again or, for reasons of sraatsraison, favored individual pagans, favoring them for the city prefecture of Rönn, for example. There were still believers in the gods who were granted concessions in order to associate them with the Christian imperial house, which also needed the Senate as a counterweight to the authority of Constantinople. In this way, the ambition of prominent pagans was cleverly satisfied through the traditional office of Roman city prefect, but at the same time they were kept away from politically decisive positions.

From 384, Stilicho was married to Theodosius' niece Serena, a zealous and energetic woman of faith who had gained considerable influence at the court of Honorius, whom she had looked after as a child. Stilicho married his daughter Maria to the emperor in 398, and her younger sister Thermantia after her death in 408, which strengthened his influence on the ruler, who was dependent on others for the rest of his life."

It was at the time of Stilicho that the Visigoths ( 40s ff), a Germanic tribe that succumbed to Christianity at a particularly early stage, invaded Italy. After a 11, the Goths were the most important missionaries of the Germanic peoples. But the meisten of those who have entered the Donati provinces\* since the middle of the 4th century.



especially in Pannonia and Moesia (where they had already occupied bishoprics), were soon no longer pagans, but Arians. According to the church historian Socrates, the Goths, under the impression of their defeat by Constantine, i.e. by the sword, "first believed in the religion of Christianity". Again and again - they were fought over by this power-hungry despot and were always

were defeated anew ( \*47 β. particularly heavy 33z, with their dead, many women apparently among them, children, estimated at one hundred thousand. The most recent research also assumes Constantine's successes in battle and the political ties of the Greeks to the Roman Empire gave their Christianity a boost. The memorable dictum of Theodoret, the bishop and father of the church, has proven true time and again ever since: "The facts of history teach us that war brings us greater benefits than peace."

After their destruction of the father '7g at Adrianople 14-i 0, the Goths, reinforced by Huns and Alans, had flooded the Eastern Roman Empire. But then Alaric I, the founder of Visigothic kingship, allied himself with Emperor Theodosius, and 3q, in the Battle of Frigidus against Eugenius i 45 ff), the strong contingent of Visigoths paid the highest tribute, allegedly 10,000 gold pieces, which aroused the suspicion that Theodosius had deliberately sacrificed them.

Immediately after his death, Stilicho sent his dangerous comrades-in-arms back to the east. There, however, Arcadius now refused further payments to those settling in the Danube region, whereupon they invaded the empire under Alaric - "almost without exception Christians ... even convinced Christians" (Alaric); with their own church order already established by the Homoean bishop Sigis Hari and probably also with monks. They overran the Balkans and, as far as the southern tip, almost defenceless Greece. According to Eunapios of Sardis (c.345—w ), an admittedly one- c- fleshy enemy of Christians, had also monks dutch high treason at Thermopylae made Alaric's attack possible. In any case, Greece has never been more devastated: Macedo

nia, Thessaly, Boeotia and Attica. Theben was saved by its strong walls. Athens was horribly plundered (that Athena and Achilles protected it: a pagan fairy tale). The rest of the country, its villas, temples, works of art, was horribly ravaged, Corinth burned to the ground. Boeotia is said to have been desolate for decades. In general, the Christian Goths completely devastated the cities, according to a repeatedly confirmed contemporary testimony, -by slaughtering the men throughout, but dragging children and women away with them as booty along with their possessions (Zosimus). This may be an exaggeration, but the catastrophe was terrible. At the same time, it also affected the sacred, but was used wisely by the Church's mission, even if St. Jerome could now see and write that the whole of Greece was under the rule of the barbarians: -The soul shudders at the sight of the ruins of our time-."

However, Emperor Arcadius appointed Alaric *magister militum per Illyricum* and Stilicho stopped fighting him. The Ciote leader kept his peace for five years. Then the -perfidia Graeeorum", Byzantium, conspiring with the barbarians, fueled by fear of Western Rome and Rufin's zeal, seeks Stilicho for the first time by a method that is still making a name for itself: the diversion of Alaric into the Western Roman Empire.\*'

5Since the days of the Cimbri and Teutons - wiped out by Marius at Aquae Sextiae and Vercellae (zoz/xoi BC) except for small remnants - digs was the first "barbarian" invasion in Italy."

Coming from the already badly battered Danube countries, the Visigoths advanced towards Italy in NOVember qoI. They used the passes of the Julian Alps, the Birnbaum Forest {northeast of Trieste), which were familiar to them from military campaigns under Theodosius. The timing was good. Stilicho had withdrawn all available military forces from Italy to fend off a Vandal invasion of Raetia, all borders had been stripped bare, the imperial court - Honorius was already preparing to flee to the west - had sought protection in Milan on Stilicho's advice, where he himself hurried with units from Gaul and Britannia to the Entsarz. The

Goths, who in the meantime had conquered Venericn, were also defeated by the strong massing of troops in front of Milan. A battle at Pollentia (Pollenzo), begun by Stilicho on April 6, Doz, Easter Sunday (on which his Arian opponents did not fight)) and lasting into the night, was full of losses and remained undecided. However, their camp, Alaric's family and all the spoils of war fell into Stilicho's hands and an armistice was concluded. At Verona, however, which the Goths attacked in the same or the following year, they succumbed to the Imperial generalissimo after being surrounded. Of course, he did not allow the Scissors, who had also been severely weakened by famine, plague and desertion, to be destroyed again, but after their futile attempt to break through to the Brenner Strait, they escaped over the Julian Alps."

Claudius Clzudianus, the last important Roman poet, sang about the battle before Verona: -When the (Roman) soldier is exhausted and leaves the battle line, he (Stilicho) deploys the (barbarian) auxiliaries to repair the damage. By this cunning stratagem he weakens the savage Danubians through the strength of blood relatives and turns the battle to a double gain for us, with barbarians falling on both sides" (Et duplici lucro committens proelia vertit/In se barbariem nobis utriunque cadentem).'-.

The Romans' aversion to the "barbarians", the desire to eliminate Germanic tribes through Germanic tribes, through their own discord, which Tacitus already dreamed of, became particularly clear during the Migration Period - what a trivializing word! - was made clear again and again, usually exacerbated by the religious opposition, as the Catholics identified more and more with the Roman imperial ideal. Terms such as "Rome" and

For them, too, the -Roman- reflect the God-ordained -order- of the world. And alongside aristocratic circles, the Kirehen Fathers in particular, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Orosiis, Pro- sper Tiro, often paint a gruesome picture of -barbarian- brutality, often pure "abomination propaganda" (Diesner)."

According to Prudentius b4\*-after Joy), the greatest early Catholic, most admired and read in the Middle Ages

Christian poet, Romans and "barbarians" differed like man and beast! He did not owe his victories to the Hcidnian gods, as he wrote to Honorius, no, the Christian faith had strengthened the legions. Prudentius, who wants to glorify the church and ultimately "live entirely for Christ" (Altaner/Sruiber), also praises the fact that Christianity strengthens patriotism and militarism.<sup>3</sup> ' (And in word and deed it does this to this day!)

In the East, the envoy Synesios (d. @I3/qZJ) agitated in the anti-Germanic Sinn. This large landowner from the old provincial nobility bluntly incited the emperor to become more active - and later became bishop of Ptolemais and metropolitan of the Pentapolis despite open criticism of his eschatology!

In the year 4-o Synesios allowed himself to be consecrated by Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria (p. z)ä ff) on condition that he also

as a bishop was allowed to keep his unchristian beliefs and continue his marriage - he expressly wished for "many well-born children". For although God had given him the law, the patriarch had given him his wife. The inventor of a new weapon for the fight against the "barbarians" organized the war against the desert tribes, made fiery appeals and was no exception (cf. 301 f). Bishops were already widely organizing the campaign against Germanic tribes and Persians. (An attack by the latter on a city in Thrace, for example, was defeated by the

The local chief shepherd was able to repel the enemy by scoring a direct hit on the enemy leader with a powerful launcher fired by himself. There are also reports of truly heroic deeds by a bishop in Toulouse who was in command during a siege).

But Synesios, the unbelieving prelate, who probably fell in battle against desert tribes, also took strong action against any emerging heresy. He called for opposing Christians to be cut off from us like an incurable limb, so that the healthy would not also be corrupted by association with them. For the infection is transmitted, and whoever

Anyone who touches an unclean person shares in the guilt ... Therefore the Church of Ptolemais decrees the following to her sisters everywhere on earth" - and now comes the most frivolous example of a bull of excommunication against Christians who have become disliked: -Every holy space and district is to be closed to them. The devil has no part in paradise; if he has secretly slipped in, he will be expelled. I therefore exhort every citizen and official not to share the same roof and the same table with him, especially the priests not to welcome them as living and not to escort them as dead ..."\*.

The devil, that is for the proclaimers of the threatening message, of love of neighbor and enemy: the Christ of another faith!

The unbelieving church prince Synesios preached sermons of "unadulterated dogmatic correctness"! And how many of his sermons there may have been! Does it bother the church? The disputes with it "always begin where theologians want to take their profession seriously and make the peculiarities of the Christian faith binding for themselves and their church" (v. Campenhausen).

Honorius hurried across the Milvian Bridge to Rome on his victorious chariot Stilicho, carrying the glorious spolia of victory in the company of Christ, as Prudentius sings. A Christian Gernian had fought against Christian Teutons and once again saved Italy from the Teutons.

THE ONE CASE OF THE RxDAGAIS, PTI LICHOS'  
MURDER AND OTHER ROMAN CATHOLIC GODS'  
MEETINGS

At the end of 405, a new, powerful, mostly pagan Eastern Germanic confederation under the wandering king Radagais from Pannonia and invaded Italy at the beginning of 406 - according to Orosius also, according to Zosimus even doo ooo people, which is pure nonsense. After all, the whole of Italy panicked. The Goth besieged Florence, but had to flee from Stilicho to the mountains of Faesulae (Fiesole). There Stilicho, an experienced enveloping stratagem, "by divine providence" (Orosius) starved his troops to death - according to Augustine, who attributes this to God's mercy, "never evil to one man, without a single Roman being killed, or even wounded.

Radagais was apprehended on 3 August 406 while trying to sneak through the Roman lines and was beheaded soon afterwards. The prisoners went into slavery in such numbers that they depressed market prices. One by one they were killed off an aureus loose. God has helped, Augustine rejoices, -miraculous and merciful".

Stilicho, the ruler of Italy, was given a statue on the Forum with the inscription: -His Excellency (inlustrissimo viro) Flavius Stilicho, twice consul, master of both arms, commander-in-chief, chief equerry, and from his youth raised through the ranks of a brilliant military career to the rank of prince, companion of the eternal emperor Theodosius in all his campaigns and victories, and father-in-law of our Lord the Emperor Honorius, the Roman people decided to erect a statue of ore and silver near the speaker's platform in memory of his immortal fame because of his unrivaled popularity and care. . . .

But at the end of 406 the Vandals, Alans and Suebi fell in Gal-

lia and conquered ts. And around the same time - so often lamented as mala tempora - one usurpation after another took place.

First, the usurper Marcus rose up in Britain at the end of the year 4< and was defeated shortly afterwards. Four months later, his successor Gratianus was killed. In the same year, the Britannian troops under Flavius Claudius Constantine III (4W-dZI) rebelled. He had become emperor as a common soldier; he was also a Christian, like most usurpers since Constantine I, as the literary sources show.

or the coinage proves this. Constantine III crossed over to Gaul with an army and finally sent his son Constans - a monk before his Caesarean ascension - to Spain, where he defeated an army of Honorius' relatives and Constantine had two of the commanders, Didynius and Verenianus, executed. The other leaders of the conquered fled to Italy, where Constans also set off after his father had made him Augustus. However, his own magister militum Gerontius, who was threatened with deposition, rebelled against Constantine III. Gerontius appointed his son Maximum emperor against Constans, defeated Constans, pursued him to Gaul, where he beheaded him in Vienne at the beginning of 4--. before he himself was forced to commit suicide in Spain.

Constantine III, however, was defeated by Honorius' army commander, was ordained a priest and surrendered in Arles, his city of residence, in exchange for a promise of life, whereupon the Catholic emperor had him and his younger son Jularius beheaded in August ii I Ami Mincio. Decimus Rusticus and Agroetius, two high officials of Constantine III and the Gallic emperor J--inus, were also **cruelly** killed with their leading followers in Clermont. - In the meantime, however, we are a few years ahead of developments, Alaric threatened a new invasion of Italy. Stilicho got into trouble. He advised them to give in. But the Catholics opposed this. They had the descendant of a Sandal and a Roman provincial, had a man who, despite all the -heretic-bashing, had the temple

even had the statue of Victoria in the Senate chamber restored, albeit not as a cult image but as an ornament."

In general, anti-Germanism from the East was now penetrating more and more into the West.

The Doctor of the Church Jerome attacked Stilicho's policies during the Barbarian invasion of Italy. He saw in the Germanic tribes signs of the Antichrist or even the Antichrist himself. In the middle of a letter to the young widow Geruchia (oh, how many young women the saint wrote to, and how insinuatingly he sometimes wrote), whom he was trying to talk out of a new marriage, he broke off in the middle of the letter and turned to world history: -But what am I doing? While the ship is sinking, I'm getting rid of the ship's cargo. He who stopped the doom is taken out of the way, and still we do not realize that the Antichrist is coming ... Countless wild peoples have poured over Gaul. The entire area between the Alps and the Pyrenees, between the ocean and the Rhine has been devastated by Quads and Vandals, Sarmatians and Alans, Gepids and Heruls, Saxons, Burgundians, Alemanni and - unfortunate empire - by our Pannonian enemies, *Assur comes with them*. Mainz, once a famous city, was conquered and destroyed by them; several thousand people were massacred in the church. Worms also fell after a long siege. The fifth city of Reims, Amiens, Arras, the coastal region of Morin, Tournay, Speier and Strasbourg are now all under Germanic occupation. Aquitaine, the Neingaulsnd, the area around Lyon ... - Jerome finds no end to his eloquence. The tears come and dry up for him. Who would think this possible? What work of history will report it in dignified language! That Rome is fighting within its borders, not to increase its glory, but for its existence! No, not even fighting, but fighting for life with God and all her possessions! We cannot blame our God-fearing emperors for our misery. We owe it to the



The nefariousness of a semi-barbarian traitor who used his own resources to supply our enemies with weapons."

No, according to Jerome, it was not the pious Catholic rulers who were to blame, but Stilicho, whom the inscription on his statue in the Roman forum immortalized as having participated in all the emperor's wars and victories. (Stilicho's name was, of course, now omitted.) A semi-barbarian traitor had led the enemies against the empire with Roman money. However, the Roman pagans believed something similar, all anti-Germanic opponents of Stilichos - from the civil administration and the Catholic Church" (Elbern). Again and again he was suspected of seeking the crown for his son Eucherius, either the rule over the Eastern Empire or that in the West, where Honorius was supposed to give way to him. It was also claimed that Euchetiis, presumably a Christian, was planning to persecute Christians. Of course, Stilicho himself was also accused of greed for power and usurping the throne, and rumors spread that he had already had coins minted for himself and that his wife Serena had prevented her daughters, the emperor's wives, from becoming pregnant in order to support her husband's usurpatory intentions. However, there could hardly be any doubt about his loyalty to the regent, who was now in love with Stilicho's daughter Thermantia, even if he, along with Alaric, who had already rushed ahead to Epirus, had wanted to move against Ostrom, with whom the conflict had not ended since the days of Rufinus.

But it was the Catholic Olympius, the head of the Stilicho's enemy party in Italy, the ruler against him. And when Honorius held a parade of troops in Ticinum (Pavia) on August 13, 408, Olympius, a Catholic zealot

-The most strict observant (Clauss), who owed much to Stilicho, his friends in the imperial army: the Praefectus praetorio of Gaul, Limesius; the Magister militum per Gallias, Chariobaudes; the Magister equitum, Vincentius; the former Praefectus praetorio of Italy, Longinianus; the Comes domesticorum, Salvius; the Magister officiorum, Naemorius, who was succeeded by Olympius. The Quaestor sacri

palatii was killed while embracing the emperor's knees. In the city, the soldiers murdered all the officials they could get their hands on.'

After Stilicho's partisans had been eliminated and his loyal Hunnic bodyguard had been attacked and massacred in his sleep, he was deposed and sought asylum in a Ravennatian church on 21 August, he sought asylum in a Ravenna church under the cover of night. Due to its sheltered location on a promontory between the Adriatic Sea and the lagoons, Ravenna had been the new main western residence since in place of Milan, which lay openly in the open. Treachery and assassination were rampant here. On the morning of 22 August soldiers lured Stilicho from the church. They had sworn to him and in the presence of the

Bishop asserts that the emperor - Stilicho's son-in-law - had not ordered them to murder him, but to guard him. A letter from the Catholic Majesty also assured him of his safety. But as soon as Stilicho had left the church, a second imperial letter informed him of his death sentence for high treason; the next day his head fell.

However, after the bloodbath at Ticinum, which he instigated, Olympius was promoted to Magister officiorum (a title that modern historians translate as "Oberhofmarschall", "Reichshofmeister", "head of the entire court") in August, - Minister of the Interior-, Minister of Foreign Affairs-, "ministre de la police générale-). It was an office which, among the four high court offices, had been at the top since the second half of the 5th century. Among many other things, it was also responsible for (mainly) ecclesiastical affairs and (entirely) for the "agents in rebus", a disreputable, arrestable organization that conveyed imperial letters and orders, provided spying and espionage services, and occasionally also carried out "special orders", such as the liquidation of high-ranking personalities.

So Olympius became the leading man. He had Stilicho's friends tortured and beaten to death, had others of his comrades robbed of their property. On his initiative, with effect from 15 November - 408 enemies of the Catholic

Church (-catholicae sectae") from court dignities and banned them from serving in the palace. It is disputed whether the exclusion applied "only" to "heretics" or also to believers in the gods, as is likely. This was followed by severe punitive measures against

the Donatists on zd. November 4 , on xy. JßftU8\*4M- Further laws threatened apostate Catholics and strengthened the bishop's power. With Olymпиus, the anti-Germanic party received

Throughout the Western Empire, Stilicho's followers and all Germanic tribes were hunted down. His only son with Serena, Eiiicherius (in the year 4-- still betrothed to the emperor's sister Galla Placidia),

could Bie hen, but was removed from a church north of Rome and killed by Honorius' eunuchs. But while they, writes Ferdinand Gregorovius, displayed the bloody head to the Romans, "the Romans themselves already suspected their own fate. (Orosius, a student of Augustine, insinuates that Stilicho's son had plans for a pagan restatiation). Stilicho's widow Serena, the niece of Emperor Theodosius, also died in Rome by order of the Senate; she was strangled. Stilicho's sister's husband, the Comes Africae Bathanarius, was also murdered and his office transferred to Heraclianus, who was of course killed himself (p. Jz). At the same time, Italian troops massacred numerous women and children of Germanic mercenaries in the cities of the country. And finally, the state confiscated the assets of all those who owed Stilicho an office.

Clan imprisonment was not a matter of course among the Christian rulers who were so fondly celebrated as -mild-. But very often the sons of the condemned shared the fate of their fathers. Other family members were also included, as in the case of Stilicho, who was apparently particularly restrained. And it was not uncommon for cruel revenge to be taken on the followers of the liquidated opponents.

When, after the Battle of the Milvian Bridge, a celebratory speaker celebrated Constantine's -gracious victory- and his mildness, the entire house of Emperor Maxentius was exterminated and his leading partisans were hunted down.

cheers of the Church Fathers, ordered the imperial Families to be slaughtered (I zz3, --9 . -3\*1. After the massacre of relatives following Constantine's death, the most Christian Constantius II, the

"bishop of bishops", killed most of the male relatives of the imperial family, his two uncles, six cousins and numerous inconvenient persons of the Holes (I 3o6 f). Even after the suicide of Magneritius, the first Germanic emperor, 3y3 in Lyon, many of Constantius' enemies' heads rolled. Likewise, two years later, when he eliminated the Frank Silvanus, whose officials were killed by bribed soldiers,<sup>4</sup> he allowed them to die. During the liquidation of the usurper Procopius, who was beheaded by his own officers, and of Marcellus, who was mauled in agony, their relatives were also executed in 366 (I 3dp). Just under a decade later, the army commander Theodosius, the father of the next emperor, massacred the followers of the counter-emperor Firmus in Africa in an unusually gruesome manner. When one selber, victim of a court intrigue, was beheaded in Carthage, several of his frenemies shared his fate. And even after the fiasco of the Berber prince strangled at the end of July 398

Gildo - a brother of Firmiis - some of his officials were executed by the executioner or killed themselves; the Donetist bishop Optatus of Thamugadi, who was allied to him, died in prison

(I 344, 473).<sup>39</sup>

The wives of the fallen were usually spared. But there were exceptions. For example, the wife of Magister peditum Barbatio was executed together with the army commander 35Qilt SirmIUrri (hei Belgrade) after his conspiracy was uncovered. As a rule, the women affected in this way and

The next of kin in poverty. A law of Arcadius of 3qy pardoned the sons of traitors, but deprived them of their inheritance and excluded them from government service; daughters received a quarter of their mother's inheritance.

But one was the paper, the other the reality. Thus, not only his son, his weak husband, but also his wife were dragged into Stilicho's fall.

Behind the weak Honorius stood the national Roman and Catholic court clique of Ravenna, Christians of the strictest convictions, especially, as the head of the conspiracy, the Asian and Magister officiorum Olympius, from whose prayers Emperor Honorius expected much, Olympius, first a favorite, then an opponent of Stilicho, had obtained an important court office from the emperor through him, but in the end he was the most virulent against Stilicho and brutally persecuted his followers even after his death. St. Augustine, of course, held the *late* emperor in such high esteem that he congratulated him twice, once in response to the mere rumor and then after the official announcement. The promotion, Augustin writes, was based on merit. Immediately afterwards, he urged Olympius to get serious about implementing the anti-pagan laws. It was time to show the enemies of the Church what these laws meant! Augustine's attitude proves how the Christians were now expecting Olympius to finally implement the measures against pagans and heretics that Stilicho, following Christian pressure, had issued himself in the decrees of 29. February and

30. November 410 - "a kind of general reckoning with the opponents of the Catholic faith and, in the political field, with those of the Christian state" (Heinzberger). On the Catholic side, it was believed that a defeat of the  
-barbarians- presuppose the destruction of paganism.\*

#### THE ROMAN CASE (410) AND AUGUSTIN'S AUSFLÜCHTE

Outraged by the Roman Catholic massacres, the German soldiers, allegedly 30 000 men, went over to Alaric. They followed from Italy into the political sphere of influence of the king of the Goths, who had expected Stilicho's army in Epirus in vain. The western Roman payroll payments also failed to materialize. Alaric therefore advanced to Italy via Pannonia. On the way, he sent messengers to Stilicho demanding those pounds of gold for his march

to Epirus; a very considerable sum, which the Senate only reluctantly decided to pay after Stilicho's intervention, but which was not paid as a result of the upheaval in the Western Roman government. Alaric, who in the meantime had invaded Jcia via the unprotected Julian Alps, crossed the Po at Cremona, devastated the country and exhausted 4 8 Rome, which he enclosed; famine and plague broke out there. In return for the promise of a huge tribute (allegedly 5000 pounds of gold, to which liquefied images of the gods also contributed, 30 000 pounds of silver, 4<sup>0000</sup> Silk he moved to Tuscia after his home had been augmented by 4 slaves who had fled the city.

Olympius, however, attempted to undermine Alaric's demands. The magister officiorum therefore lost his office in January 409, returned to it after a success against the **Goths** at Pisa, but was fired again and for good by Honorius in the spring. He fled to Dalmatia, where the magister militum Constantius seized him, robbed him of his ears and had him beaten to death. After another failed negotiation, Alaric was • 409 For the second time

marched to Rome once. And this time he created his own willful princes. He forced the Romans to accept their sixty-year-old city prefect Priscus Attalus as opposing emperor, who was baptized in Alaric's camp by the Gothic bishop Sigesariis.

mufite. The newly crowned Christian and emperor ( -4 4 io) sent a small contingent of troops to Africa to secure Rome's grain supply and moved against Ravenna himself in order to secure Honorius to abdicate. There, the Praefectus praetorio Jovius, the ruler's chief negotiator and the most important man at court, went over to Attalus and suggested that Honorius be mutilated. But dooo soldiers arriving from Constantinople saved him. And Alaric dethroned Attalus again because he refused to allow Africa to be conquered by Goths, whose settlement he feared. The king now tried again, and once more in vain, to reach a reinforcement agreement with Honorius.

After which he advanced on Rome a third time. And jent, on \*4 August bio, after hunger had already driven the citizens to cannibalism, the city fell. Through the Porta Salaria, which is said to have been opened from the inside, the Visigoths invaded in triumph, while a stream of refugees spread across southern Italy to Africa and Palestine."

Rome, still one of the richest cities in the world, was thoroughly plundered for three days, but probably not much devastated, indeed, katim touched its matrons and maidens. Most of them, Gibbon blasphemous, were saved from rape by their lack of youth, beauty and virtue. Of course, atrocities were committed. Thus, "zealous Arians" or "idolaters" blew up women's convents in order to forcibly free the nuns from the vow of virginity (Gregorovius). Christian voices even claim that part of the town was burnt down. But whatever the case, nothing bothered a man of Augustine's stature. For, he notes, the devastation, murder, robbery, fire and other atrocities committed during the Roman catastrophe must be blamed on the customs of war. But the novelty that took place, the unexpected fact that barbaric cruelty proved so mild that spacious churches were chosen as gathering places and refuges for the people, where no one was killed, from where no one was dragged away ..., that is to be attributed to the name of Christ and the Christian age ... No, their bloodthirsty and cruel mind has been repulsed by one, only one, and now by the very one who spoke so long before through the prophet: -I will punish their sin with the rithe hcim and their iniquities with plagues. But I will not turn away my mercy from them' ".

In fact, by Alaric's express order, churches remained and church property were spared, as was the case with the destruction of St. Peter and St. Paul outside the walls. Until well into the modern era, however, people in Rome, where it was no coincidence that ignorance was rampant, believed that the city and its monuments had been destroyed by the Goths. In fact, however, jme,

far more than the -barbarians-, the decay, Christians of the Middle Ages, yes, some Piipste ruined."

Rome had not been conquered for 800 years - the city where, it was believed, Peter and Paul rested along with countless martyrs. And now it fell in Christian times! The pagans saw the reason for this in the contempt of the gods. -Look," they said, "Rome fell in Christian times. As long as we offered sacrifices to our gods, Rome stood, Rome flourished". the city by law on ig. NOVember qo8 the exclusive validity of Christianity. The old believers were almost as angry as before, when they cried out -Christianos ad leones- at the onset of all kinds of disaster.

The world was shaken, *first* rrtte; especially the Catholic one. Ambrose, who had already sensed the general downfall after Adrianople (I ii 3 f), was no longer alive. But now his colleague Hieronymius, far away in Bethlehem, commenting on the prophet Ezekiel, saw the end looming, the fall into eternal night, he saw the fall of Troy and Jerusalem before him: the world is coming to an end, orbis terrarum ruit."

-If Rome can perish, what could be safe? -Why did Himel allow this? Why did Christ not protect Rome? -Where is God?" (Ubi est deus tuus?) Augustine ventilated Mio and 4-i the world-shaking question in several sermons (the first delivered three **days** after the Goths left Rome); his wisdom ranging from -Quia voluit Deus" to

-Deo gratias- is enough. Whereby he claims that the existence of the earthly state is only of secondary importance - and today the preservation of even the whole world no longer concerns nuclear bomb theologians: theology is also progressing! Augustine did not notice any catastrophe at all: "Only God, the loving, just, a strict father, of course, he **-strah** every son he accepts (Heb. iz,6)". And although the bishop cries out: "Massacres, fires, plundering, human murder and torture-, he comforts us in the well-known parson's phrase (cf. I 68o ff, yzz ff): compared to the torments of hell, this home-stitching is



not so bad! Many had been saved, but the dead had gone to eternal peace! So we should actually rejoice, we should thank God that he had not completely destroyed Rome: -manet civitas, quae nos carnaliter genuit. Deo gratias!''

Priests are shameless, never embarrassed (cf. I fg.S\*4

Furthermore, Augustine takes up the question, the scornful reproach of the pagans - "Where is your God now?", the mockery of those who should first see for themselves - "Where are their gods?", in no less than zz books on the theocracy, his -opus ingens-, his, according to himself, extremely great work, but increasingly losing sight of the starting point through historical-theological fantasies about the civitas dei and civitas terrena.\*'

With what rhetorical effort the saint defends God in the face of Rome's fall! The philosopher of the Orbis univcrsus christianus (Bernhard), who here becomes the "first universal historian and historical theologian of the West" (v. Campenhausen), did not know what people thought about the destruction, how many Christians were tortured, killed, abducted, how many died by their own hand, how many starved to death, how many women were ravished, how oh

-barbarian lust has "gone awry". No, no. Oh, even the rape had its good side! For if so many had not otherwise exalted themselves because of their chastity, had not once

"vain pride" see the light of day? Yes, -so their integrity was snatched from them by force, so that happy &choice would not pervert their modesty'-. Yes, according to "the philosopher of the Orbis universus christianus", the -giant of the spirit-, the -genius in all fields ...- (1ç6q ff), whom all this could not shake, since God wanted it! And what did God want with it? Glittering with many biblical quotations, Augustin reports that God did not want to destroy Rome, but merely to "willingly test and purify" the citizens, his -entire household, through the evils, so that he could addict them, purify them, awaken their evil spirit and thus appease his own wrath, give the Romans back his

wanted to bestow favors - higher, highest educational purposes. The human race needs discipline. -They will not perish if they praise God, they will perish if they blaspheme him. -The providence of the Creator and Governor of the world is sublime, 'his judgments are incomprehensible and his ways inexplicable'.

This makes the ways of his servants all the easier to understand - priests are shameless, never embarrassed.

The conquest basically had little or nothing to do with Alaric, the conqueror of Rome - whom Augustine's complete works only mention in two places (once by omitting his actual name) - but with the just and merciful providence of God, whose teaching is always the best, whose riddles will become clear on Judgment Day, who showed mercy during the destruction, who mitigated hardships because he did not want the downfall of the Romans, but their instruction and their new life! -Shortly, as a hand aiisholt to strike, but pauses out of pity, because the punishable person has already fallen beforehand, so it happened to that city ... So God, without a doubt, also spared the city of Rome, since large parts of the population had migrated before the enemy set fire to it. The refugees had migrated, the dead had migrated ... By the hand of the improving God, therefore, the city was restored rather than destroyed\*'.

Philosopher of the Orbis universus ehristianus!

Even the presbyter Orosius, who set out to prove the far more beautiful conditions of the world in Christian times (I 50q ff), finds the matter, like the Master\*, actually quite peaceful. But it certainly does not speak against the Christians. Orosius can compare the Alaric invasion of Rome, the center of his entire Histories, with a much longer and worse one from pagan times, the Gaulish invasion under Brennus, the prince of the Senones. Back then (38y BC) six months of -miseriae-, bloody looting8 of the city, now almost the finest honey lick, at least a miraculum: three

Days of occupation only, allegedly hardly any deaths, although the streets lay full of corpses, charred ruins still towered into the sky for years, houses and palaces were ruthlessly plundered and refugees all over the world once again proclaimed their downfall. Yet it was precisely the Christians who sought help and protection in the churches that Alaric, his first command, granted protection: further proof of the leniency of the tempora Christiana, the time of grace."

However, the Bishop of Rome, Innocent I (ROI-my), behaved significantly at the time. o8, when the city was first threatened, he tolerated pagan sacrifices in private homes to appease the wrath of the gods, at least according to the ancient historian Zosimus. He also allegedly gave the city prefect Pompeianus his consent to the conscription of the -haruspices-, the pasture-showers, which Zosimus, certainly neither the most reliable nor the most astute historian of his time, praises as evidence of patriotism that "placed the salvation of the city higher than his own faith". And at the capture itself, the high lord was conspicuous by his absence; as other shepherds had also left their flocks in good time. Augustine's disciple Orosius reports that the Holy Father -removed from Sodom like a righteous loth, by God's inscrutable counsel, was in Ravenna at the time and did not see the downfall of the sinful people. In fact, he had entrusted the Prince of the Apostles with the protection of his basilica and had been safi himself since the previous year as a member of a senate commission in the marshy, almost impregnable city - either on business or for his own safety. In any case, Rome's plundering did not bother him. He would have liked, according to Jesuit Grisar, to consecrate himself "in the midst of those affected" in order to help and comfort them. In fact, however, Innocent only mentions this once in his numerous letters, in an extremely cold and brief aside."

It was the greatest, the most shocking catastrophe of the time. The Pope, however, did not bat an eyelid. Orosius apparently sought to whitewash him, presumably in the face of derogatory refugees.

ling speeches. Jerome praises the predecessor Anastasius 1, saying that Rome was only allowed to keep him for a short time because the head of the world should not sink into stagnation under such a bishop. But he passes over Innocent I with a meaningful silence. Papal historian Caspar sees this as a "harsh criticism" and claims that Innocent's impending fall of the Roman Empire

-left untouched at the core. If one immerses oneself in his letters as the primary and almost only documents on the history of his pontificate, one feels -taken out of an expensive world, in which thrones burst and empires splintered, into the patriarchal world of a world focused solely on the preservation of papal claims and universal administration ... world of thought."

Hardly any Christian chronicler of the time defended the Roman's Ravenna liitermenzo. No wreath of legends entwined itself around him,' as later around Leo I, when he confronted Atrila (p. \*74 f\$. And this must have its reasons.

Emperor Honorius is said to have been completely covered with cows during the plundering.

ner breeding may have been involved. After three days, however, the victors withdrew again, carrying an immeasurable amount of treasure and many prisoners - including, a politically valuable treasure, the monarch's sister, Galla Placidia, the daughter of Theodosius I, a twenty-one-year-old girl and soon one of the most influential women of the time that we still sometimes encounter.

The Goths marched through Campania, where they besieged and plundered Nola and captured the bishop, who was voluntarily very poor but all the richer in holiness (Augustiniis). They headed for Calabria, Sicily and Africa, the granary of Italy. But a storm in the Strait of Messina engulfed their fleet. On the way back, Alaric died unexpectedly near Cosenza on the Busento, where he was buried. The Christian raiders under his brother-in-law Athaulf (Mio-Fry) scoured Italy for another year, grazing "like locusts on what was left" (Iordanes). Then they turned westwards. In Narbonne, Athaulf §-4 married Galla Placidia, the former betrothed of the murdered son of Stilicho, and founded the southern French-Spanish Visigothic kingdom

with its northern

capital Toulouse, before he himself was forced to withdraw across the Pyrenees and murdered in Barcelona just one year later."

CAMPr nes HoxoaiUS AGAINST "KET2ER",  
HEIDEN AND JUDBN

A few years after Stilicho's elimination, that of his family, officers, soldiers, Honorius had also cruelly executed Stilicho's successor and beneficiary Olympius as a fugitive in Dalmatiai as well as, we remember, the usurper Constantine III on the Mincio, whom Britain and Gaul recognized and, temporarily, the emperor himself; he had promised him protection on oath. Also liquidated was Constantine's younger son Julianus, as well as - with several of his followers - the Comes Africae Heraclianis, who had once led Stilicho's arrest and beheading, even killing him with his own hand, but then, in his year of consulship, with a huge fleet of allegedly

37 ships had attacked Italy; furthermore the magister militum Allobich in Ravenna, Augustus; likewise (through the Visigoth Athaulf) the Gallic usurper Sebastianus; ditto his

Jovinius's brother, who also extended his rule to Britain before the praefectus praetorio Dardanus finished him off by his own hand in Narbonne in the spring of 4-3. The heads of both were sent to Constantinople, as was the head of Constantine III (p. 28). His former opponent Maximus also fell by the wayside, after CM mattj \* 4-2. on the occasion of the Triceii-

rials of Honorius had performed in triumph. And Attalus, who fled with the Visigoths to southern Gaul, §14 - newly made emperor by Athaulf, was finally caught at sea, mutilated by the hand and banished to the Aeolian Islands."

The young Emperor Honorius, however, was pious and particularly susceptible to clerical whisperings. He lived - dcn both

Ideen to which he owed his ascension to the throne: hereditary legitimacy and unwavering adherence to the Christian Church (Ranke). He further increased its protection and rights, and even gave the prelates almost unlimited influence over the execution of the laws. And his religious edicts in particular - in contrast to those of Emperor Valentinian I or Gratian - are no longer attempts to define "heresy" and "heresy".

-The monarch no longer claimed the right to punish dissenters, but also to change their beliefs' (Anton). The monarch now claimed not only the right to punish dissenters, but also to change their faith.\*

As early as z3. March 3qş he confirms all the privileges granted to the Klertis by his predecessors. He ordered the so-called mathematicians to burn their books in front of the bishops and to join the Catholic Church. Dissenters are to be expelled, the particularly hard-headed banished.'-

Olympius had probably already initiated an imperial decree that made the Catholic faith permissible. The decree of Iz. febru-- 4 ş threatens the Donatists; the decree issued by the

zz. Februftß 407 \*İscillianists rind Manichaeans, an edict that may have inspired or influenced Pope Innocent I. It identifies -heretical- behavior with a -public crime" {crimen publicum) and the -general welfare- (sa- lus communis) with the -benefit of the Catholic Church- - mutatis mutandis the principle on which the persecution of Christians by pagan rulers was already based. On i ş. November 407, the destruction of all pagan altars and cult images is decreed, as well as the confiscation of temples that have not yet been confiscated, along with their goods and revenues. A> \*4 November 408, shortly after

Stilicho's murder, all non-Catholics, aİİe -enemies of the Catholic religion (catholica secta), are excluded from court service and the harshest regulations are issued against the Donatists. At the same time, a law withdrew all income from the temples in order to protect the -faithful-

The soldiers, of course the native ones, through whom the anti-Germanic government had recently had the families of the Germanic mercenaries stabbed in the cities of Italy. Furthermore, the removal of the images of the gods that are "still" in the temples is ordered, as we know that this has been repeatedly ordered by imperial decree. Furthermore, pagan festivals must cease and private owners of pagan chapels must destroy them. A complete decree

gungsfur against pagans and -heretics- followed on zJ. and -7. November 4o8, aifl IJ. January 4oq, on February I, April i and

The Ravenna government issued a particularly serious decree against the "wicked superstitious" in the year 4\*5. The state now confiscated all of the temples' properties. All income that once belonged to the justly condemned "superstition" now belonged to "our house". All pagan ceremonies were also abolished, certain pagan associations, perhaps created for the protection of the temples, were banned and their leaders, the chiliarchs and Centonarians, threatened with death. Finally, on December 7, 4i, for the first time ever, the hiring of AItglians into the civil service is prohibited by law. No offices of any kind in the administration, courts and military are more accessible to them. In fact, there were already 47 >Christian leaders compared to only three pagan ones. And in Germany In the last years of Honorius' reign, -- 4-3, no senior official of pagan confession is attested."

Apparently at the instigation of the African bishops, Honorius di8 had also demanded the expulsion of the heretics Pelagius and Caelestius by means of an unusually rigorous rescript, their detection and deportation together with their followers (cf. I yq8 ff). And in the same year, the Church enforced the exclusion of the Jews, whom the emperor equated with pagans and "heretics", from all dignities and offices. They were also removed from the army. There were even forced baptisms of Jews on the island of Menorca. Hundreds are forcibly converted to Catholicism; uncensored



Thousands later raped in the same way, especially in Spain. But the action in the year 4 was probably the first of its kind."

In the meantime, Honorius had appointed Constantius (III), an em-

He repeatedly made him consul, also magister militum, for his services against the usurper Constantine III (p. 28), the Visigoths q17 and probably also against pagans and heretics, whose fight he relentlessly pursued, and elected him with his sister Galla Placidia, against her will. Constantius, a Christian who liked to decide ecclesiastical matters, had brought his friend and confidant Patroclus to the bishopric of Arles, c18 Boniface I to that of Rome (p. 13), had thrown Galla Placidia's (first) husband, Alaric's brother-in-law and successor Athaulf, over the Pyrenees just one year after the wedding, whereupon the king was murdered in Barcelona and Placidia was handed over to Ravenna by his successor, King Wallia, i6. On February 8th, Honorius elevated Constantius III to co-regent. However, the East did not recognize him and Constantius made preparations for war, including the papal claim to the prefecture of Illyricum, which belonged politically to Eastern Rome and was now also to be ecclesiastically subordinated to the See of Constantinople. But Constantius III had already died on September 21 in Ravenna, where Honorius also died on August 15. August 3. Now Constantius' son Valentinian III became emperor in the west, a four-year-old.

Thus his pious mother Galla Placidia ruled for him until 437 (until his marriage to Theodosius II's daughter Eudoxia). She had been Augusta since 411 Augusta, but then, divided with Honorius, fled to Constantius at the beginning of 433, together with her children Honoria and Valentinian, where Theodosius II elevated Valentinian to Augustus and she herself to Augustus again."

THEODOSIUS II - FULFILLER OF "ALL REQUIREMENTS  
OF THE CtiRISTE19TUMS-

Arcadius' son Theodosius II (-to8-Ryo) was a seven-year-old child at the beginning of his reign. For this reason, the praetorian prefect Anthemius, an anti-Germanic military officer who had already led Arcadius, was initially in charge of the government. And 4\*4 he was replaced by the emperor's sister, who was as bigoted as she was domineering.<sup>10</sup>

St. Pulcheria, who vowed lifelong virginity - 5o but married the warhorse Marcian with a "Joseph marriage" - was subject to the whispers of bishops and monks and gained great power over Theodosius. His beautiful wife Eudocia (Athenais), the daughter of a pagan professor of rhetoric from Athens, who after her baptism by Bishop Atticus of Constantinople became an active proselyte and Pulcheria's rival with the emperor, had a similarly strong influence on him, at least for a time. She left the court, perhaps expelled, and lived in Jerusalem for the two decades she spent learning, building churches, writing pious works and fomenting rebellion; the later Byzantines at least regarded this as an exile. The pious ruler had their spiritual advisors, the priest Severus and the deacon John, murdered by Saturninus, his comes domesticorum who had been ordered to Palestine, whereupon he was killed by the pious Eudocia, perhaps with his own hand."

Infringed by ambitious praying sisters and zealot priests, Theodosius II observed all the rules of Christianity. -exactly all the precepts of Christianity-, as church historian Socrates praises, and

-surpassed all in mildness and humanity-. Highly praised for his faith, he attacked heretics, pagans and Jews to such an extent that he even legally certified himself in April 433 : -Be-known and widespread everywhere are our and our ancestors' Decrees, in which we suppressed the way of thinking and the boldness of the abominable pagans, Jews and also heretics. But now the trend to suppress Catholicism with coercion and

The emperor's first duty was now to care for the -vera religio-, the true faith being a prerequisite for the common good. His first duty was now to care for the -vera religio-, the true faith a prerequisite for the general welfare. For him, -heretics- were "una perfidia-."

As far as the herds were concerned, Theodosius assumed in the year 424 that there were no more. A pious wish. In reality, he had only 424 excluded them from higher positions and from military service. 425 he threw all non-Christians out of state offices, 426 he punished participation in sacrifices with banishment and confiscation of goods, 427 and 428 the practice of pagan worship with the death penalty - even referring to the sacrifices made by the pagans.

the pestilences and plagues caused by the worship of the gods. - We forbid all cursed animal sacrifices and condemnable sacrificial acts of the criminal pagan way of thinking and everything else that is forbidden by the authority of older ordinances. We order all their sanctuaries, temples and places of worship, even if some of them still remain intact, to be destroyed by official decree and atoned for by erecting the sign of our venerable Christian religion. In addition, all should know: if anyone can be convicted before the competent judge with suitable evidence of having violated this law, he shall be punished with death.

The Catholic emperor, who ordered the destruction of temples and exorcism with the cross with such brutality, is said to have been a "good-hearted monarch, completely absorbed in family life" who -knowingly never signed a death sentence- (ThieS). In any case, it is a fact that the Imperial Code published before him in 438 - after its publication the Eastern Roman rulers hardly ever sent their decrees to the West, the Western Roman ones no longer sent theirs to the East - contains no less than 62 decrees against -heretics- between 381 and 435; before 381 only five.

As early as 381, the Prince, who was only seventeen years old, had already done everything anti-Christian.

The Catholic Church had its writings burned. After all, almost all non-Catholic literature was systematically destroyed in the later 4 and 5th centuries, and the possession of heretical tracts was forbidden.

Theodosius had already threatened Porphyrios with death in 398. In 408 the probably lent copies of Porphyrios' fifteen books "Against the Christians" also flew into the fire, after Constantine had already ordered the burning of Porphyrios' work at the Council of Nicaea (325) (cf. I BIO ff).<sup>^</sup>

### AGGRESSIVE HOSTILITY TOWARDS JEWS IN THE CHRISTIAN EAST

The Jews fared particularly badly under the second Theodosius.

As early as 408, the Puriin festival, a festival of joy, was banned, as Jews had allegedly burned an imitation of the Holy Cross. Theodosius applied a brutal law to the Jewish patriarch Gamaliel VI, behind which stood St. Pulcheria, the pious sister of the fourteen-year-old emperor, then regent. Gamaliel lost his honorary title and every right associated with it. He was no longer allowed to build synagogues, or even grind millstone, the summit of arrogant impudence! He was not only forbidden to mediate between quarrelling Christians, but also between them and Jews. The latter were again forbidden to circumcise non-Jews and to keep Christian slaves. Rather, Christian slaves of Jews were to belong to the church. They were therefore not given freedom, but the church was given legal succession! Although one inherited

In the next few years, as in earlier years (cf. 439 ff), legal protective measures against the ever more brazenly oppressed Jews were also introduced. But it speaks for itself when it says: - Your

Synagogues and homes should not be burned everywhere [!] or damaged blindly [!] and without any [!] reason ...- How little the imperial protection laws

This is evident from the fact that they had to be renovated ten times in around thirty years. And once a synagogue had been converted into a church, like the synagogues of Sardis (Asia Minor) or Gerasa (East Bank), it could be kept

R3 the ruler threatened the circumcision of Christians with confiscation of goods and eternal banishment. He deprived the Jewish patriarchs of the important patriarchal tax as well as his honorary titles and forbade the appointment of a successor after his death (u 4\*J). On April 8, 6, a law passed by Theodosius also encouraged the conversion of Jews to Christianity through inheritance law, forbidding a Jew or Samaritan who became a Christian. Even if (converting) children or grandchildren - a serious offense against next of kin, mother, father, grandfather, great-grandfather,

-can be proven ... the parents must nevertheless ... leave them the share of the inheritance owed - a quarter of the obligatory share - since they must have earned at least that in honor of the chosen religion! ~~çz~~even the institution of the Jewish patriarchate, for centuries the guarantor of the unity of the increasingly persecuted people, is finally abolished. **Afterwards**, the heads of the Jews in both syn- edria of Palestine or in other provinces had to pay back everything they had received under the title of a tax after the departure of the patriarchs. Also, more and more Jewish farmers in Palestine are being ruined and displaced, more synagogues are being destroyed, more Jewish property is being stolen, more murderers of Jews are not being punished. And all this, profit and manslaughter, is usually justified theologically! Theodosius II, following the example of Honorius, again equated the Jews with pagans and heretics."

When the relics of the highly revered anti-Semite and church scholar John Chrysostom were collected in 38, the moment seemed to have come for the emperor to issue another harsh law against the "deluded Jews, Samaritans, pagans and the other kinds of misbelieving abominations". In the always wa-

In his endeavors for the true religion, the main concern of his reign<sup>8</sup>, as he confessed at the beginning, his constitution decreed before 3Z. January q38 - a f t e r the passage of even more anti-Jewish laws in the West - the exclusion of Jews from all offices and dignities, from civil administration and the alnt of the ddensor civitatis, in order to deprive them of any possibility of condemning a Christian. He further forbade the ban of synagogues or their expansion. -Whoever builds a synagogue should know that he has worked for the benefit of the Catholic Church ... And whoever has begun the building of a synagogue and does not merely want to repair an existing one will pay a fine of fifty pounds of gold for his boldness". And he imposed the death penalty on anyone who tempted a Christian to apostasy."

It is not wrong to see the Christian church and theology behind all these highly aggressive, often already ruinous decrees of the Christian ruler. To summarize, Franz Tinnefeld writes about the state's Jiidenpolirik in the three hundred year frñhbyzantinisrhenn epoch, i.e. in the time between The emperors, who took Christianity particularly seriously, caused the greatest difficulties for the Jews. The enemy image of the Jew as the obdurate adversary of Christ is stronger than the The idea of spiritual love and reconciliation. Christian theologians have developed this image of the enemy and have thus provided the basis for the attacks and overgrowth of Christians."

## MURDER UPON MURDER IN THE CATHOLIC WEST

After the death of Horiorius, Theodosius JJ subsequently sought sole rule over the entire empire. Galla Placidia and her children Honoria and Valentinian were therefore not exactly warmly received when they fled to the court in Constantinople at the beginning of Jz3. But when in December Primicerius notariorum Johannes rose to become emperor of the West in Rome, Galla Placidia and her son were restored to the already revoked dignity of Augusta, a nobilissimiiis, in order to save the West, at least of the dynasty. But the usurper John, a Christian who was said to have governed in a mild, just and - strangely enough at the time - anti-clerical manner (as he curtailed the Church's privileges and apparently granted full toleration to all denominations), fell into the hands of his enemies through treachery in Ravenna. Placidia had his right hand cut off, led him on a donkey through the circus of Aquileia, 'martyred and beheaded in May/June - a barbaric aggravation of the death penalty, which had been spared to earlier usurpers and which speaks of an already quite medieval pleasure in torture (Stein)."

After the prostration of John, Flavius Placidus

Valentinianus III. on z3. Octo <° 4\*i TO THE AUgUGEuG, ZUITI (western) Roman emperor. However, his mother Galla P,lacidia ruled exclusively for the next twelve years, advised by the three authoritative figures of the Holes, Felix, Boniface and Aëtius.

Flavius Constantius Felix. "- 4-y Magister utriusque militiae, was an imperial general and Christian. Together with his wife he founded

On the basis of a vow he made, the apse mosaic in the Lateran basilica, which did not prevent him from murdering the Roman deacon Titus; he is also said to have ordered the assassination of the Bishop of Arles, Patroclus

(p. zyo f). In the MEI43 , however, Felix himself was killed in Ravenna during a soldier's revolt, possibly because of an intrigue against Aëtius. Galla Placidia took Felix's place.

the Comes Africae and Augustine's friend Boniface (I 5z6 f).

Two years later, however, a civil war broke out between them and Aëtius. Boniface was victorious at Rimini, but died of a wound that Aëtius had allegedly inflicted on him during the duel.

Flavius Aëtius, first a hostage of the Visigoths for three years, then of the Huns (like his son later), finally forced the Germanic tribes under the Roman "yoke" (lordanes) in mighty battles as the supreme commander, indeed, the greatest Roman general of the first half of the century. After victories over Visigoths and Franks, he destroyed the kingdom of the Burgundians on the Rhine in 437 with Hinnish mercenaries and, with the decisive support of the Visigoths, fought Attila's Huns at Troyes on the Catalaunian Fields with enormous losses on both sides.

The Germanic tribes, especially the Ostrogoths, fought with the Huns, and the Burgundians and Franks with Aëtius.<sup>9</sup>

Valentinian and Galla Placidia began to increasingly fear the overpowering military, which was largely in charge of military policy. It was suggested to the ruler that Aëtius wanted to dethrone him and sit on his throne. Having worked for Ravenna since the seventeenth century and now at least sixty, the general had often fought with Hun support and had some cover. But when the Hun Empire collapsed, the **emperor** took heart. On 29 Sep-

tembe<sup>o</sup> 454, Catholic and pious like his church-building mother, he made the first move against Aëtius at an audience on the Palatine in Rome, and the daggers of the court eunuchs did the rest. The praetorian eunuch who had befriended and accompanied him also

ner Prefect Boëthius was stabbed to death; the bodies were displayed in the Forum. And as early as 16. March of the following year, Valentinian III, the last legitimate monarch of the West, himself succumbed to an officer's plot from Aëtius' former entourage while visiting the guards on the Field of Mars. The Theodosian dynasty, which had already ended in the East with Theodosius' 11th death, thus also came to an end in the West. The presumed author of the atientate, the patrician Petronius Maximus, immediately became daratif emperor, forced the empress's widow Eudoxia into marriage, but himself died three years later.



months later while fleeing from the Sandals, presumably at the hands of a bodyguardfi ' - \*7 ) "

At the court of Valentinian III, the Christian functions of the The third pagan, Litorius, *was the* master of the court, while Volusianus and Theodosius held the high position of Italian imperial prefect. But even at the beginning of this reign, laws appeared with strict sanctions against all dissenters. Against pagans, Jews, Pelagians and Caelcstians, against the Manichaeans, even against schismatics who evaded communion with the venerable papacy - a term used here for the first time in the Codex Theodosianus, where the aspect of terror ... is elevated to the ultima ratio of imperial religious policy in a quasi prograntmatic manner- (Anton). This was to have far-reaching consequences, but already finds an equivalent in a letter from Pope Leo I, the first truly important Roman bishop, who cooperated closely with the emperor, who had frequently resided in Rome since J3q and, like his mother, was generous towards the Church."

However, before we turn to Leo I and the never ending the power struggle between the prelates in the West and the East during the period just outlined, a look back at ecclesiastical Rome is essential, first of all at its origins and the usurpation of papal primacy.



# THE PAPAL PRIMACY OR THE "PETRA SCANDALI" TRIUMPH OF FRAUD AND GREED FOR POWER

-But when Cephas [Pemis] came to Aniiochia, I withstood him in the face. The -YölkrapoatI- Paulu6'

"We do not have a bishop of bishops. St. Cyprian'

-We are Christiancr, not Perrian. St. Augustine'

-For those who retain the sobriety of judgment that is the first commandment of research everywhere, the legend of Peter, the founder and first bishop of the Roman Church, remains what it is: a legend without a historical core, fiction without truth.

Johannes Haller-

-The Petnia prophesy Mt i6,i iq forms a subsequent insertion. This insertion ... in its present form is not a **word** of the -earthly Jcsus-, but a creation of the evangelist-. -The New Testament texts, which were used until the Gcgenwan to justify this primacy, do not provide any evidence for the special primacy of the bishops of Rome. This traditional line of argument can no longer be upheld, both historically and in terms of excgct".

The Catholic theologian **Josef Blank\***

-Despite the attempt of the last council to integrate the pope into the Church, the 11th century speaks of the pope more often than the 1st Yaticanum. The -Nota Praevia-, which was attached to the church constitudon on the basis of a -highest authority', expressed the papal authority with a sharpness that, at least in terms of formulation, went far beyond the t. Yatikanunt. It states:

The Pope, as the supreme shepherd of the Church, can exercise his authority at any time according to good will (ad placitum), as required by his anne.

The Catholic theologian Walter Kseper-

-We are completely btwug that the rapSt is the greatest obstacle on the road to ecumenism-. Pope Paul VI (i9dy)

-@'i¥ 6ind Pccrus-. Pope Paul VI (tp6p)-

EVERYONE HAS BUILT UP THE SUPERSTITION  
NOCFI            wxnPsznus BiSCHOF VON VOM

The Catholic Church justifies the foundation of the papacy and of itself with the passage in Matthew: -You are Peter, and on this rock [Petra] I will build my church ..." (Mt. i6,i8).

This word, probably the most controversial in the Bible, shines from Michelangelo's dome in St. Peter's in giant gold mosaic letters. However, it is missing in three of the four gospels; above all, it is also missing in Mark, the oldest evangelist. This is because Jesus never spoke it; today - a certain result of biblical exegesis

{Brox). There are a number of convincing reasons for this, which I have already summarized elsewhere.\*

The Catholic Church, of course, holds fast to its divine institution. She must; she has maintained it for two thousand years. But quite a few of its theologians are now capitulating. Some of them - as belated successors to more conservative Protestants - are developing a tongue-in-cheek approach that perhaps still allows them to "scientifically" save face to some extent and yet not lose everything with their superiors. They paraphrase the inauthenticity of the -church founding word- for example: Matthew did not refer to it historically, but composed it theologically. Or they call the "rock passage" a commissioning only by the -Risen One-. Those who are less windy, however, explain the -Pe- misverheißung- as a later insertion, as a mere creation of the evangelist.<sup>o</sup>

But perhaps Peter even had a kind of priory, a certain

leading function. But perhaps only temporarily, only in certain areas, and no longer after the Council of the Apostles. Paul, who resists Peter in Antiochia in one view, calling him a hypocrite, evidently also often polemicizes secretly against Peter's claim to leadership. In other parts of the

-There are anti-Petrine tendencies in the "holy step". And that Peter retained his primacy, if he had it, possibly only as a creation of the -Petrine party-, is nowhere to be found in the New Testament. It is silent on the subject."

But even if - in many respects ruled out - the -The Church could never demonstrate how it passes from Peter to the "popes", nor could it ever establish that it applies not only to the apostle, but also to all his "successors in office". Neither the Bible nor (any other) historical source ever refers to the appointment of a successor by Peter, to a "Petrine succession".

Thus, some Catholics find the exegetical discussion highly differentiated and, in view of the findings, come to the following conclusions

-He is somewhat embarrassed when he attempts to illuminate the viability of the biblical basis for the papacy from a historical-critical perspective" (Stockmeier). Somewhat more courageous theologians of this camp, however, concede that there is no talk of a succession of Peter (de Vries); that it "cannot be found anywhere in the New Testament" (Schnackenburg). Indeed, Josef Blank finds Peter's rock-foundation function not only unique, not only untransferable, *irreplaceable*, unrepeatable, but also *sees an* inner impossibility in the idea of a constantly growing foundation, even purely metaphorically. In this respect, the papacy cannot be understood as the rock of Peter. Rather, this Catholic asserts flatly: -Looking back on church history, one could rather say: even the papacy ... has not been able to destroy the Church." And finally, the theologian asks how early Christians understood the saying? Did they refer to Rome or the primacy of the Roman bishop as the successor to the Apostle Peter?

-The answer here is quite simply: No!""

Apologetics refers to further words or sayings of Jesus to Peter: that he would catch people, that he would receive the keys of heaven; that everything he bound or loosed on earth would also be bound or loosed in heaven; finally: -Strengthen thy brethren-, -Pasture my lambs-. But there are other evangelical or New Testament passages that show all this: Jesus' five injunctions were not in principle bound to Peter. And above all, once again: there is no mention in any early Christian text of a successor, even a leader of the Roman congregation as the head of an overall church.<sup>10</sup>

#### STAY AND ToD ÖETRI IN ROME ARE UNPROVEN<sup>14</sup>

Peter was also never a bishop in Rome - an absurd idea, but the basis of the whole Petrus doctrine, which is literally played to the skies by the Pipsts and their theologians; it is not even certain that he was ever in Rome.

The Roman Christian community was not established by Peter or Paul, the -blessed founding apostles-: Irenaeus (in the 2nd century), Archbishop Dorotheus of Thessalonica even said that they had a double bishopric! There were already such serious ties between these Christians and the Jews that Emperor Claiidius was able to establish a bishopric in the middle of the 6th century.

I. In the second half of the fifteenth century, Jews and Christians, between whom no distinction had yet been made, were expelled: -Jiidaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit- (Suetonius). The then expelled couple Aquila and Priscilla met Paul on his second missionary journey in Corinth, - According to Tacitus, the Roman Christians were criminals from Judea."

Peter's stay in Rome has never been proven, even if many Protestant scholars today, in the era of ecumenism, the mutual rapprochement of the Christian churches, assume it - assumptions are not evidence; even if

Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome in imaginative legends: dramatically on the cross, like his Lord and Savior, but, at *his own* request, out of sheer humility, *with his head down* ... And even if a certain Gaius - almost a century and a half later! - "already" thought he knew the place, namely at the Vatican, that is, in the Neronian Gardens, which moreover was first reported by Bishop Eusebius in the 4th century.

Even those who, like Daniel O'Connor, can achieve a Petri's visit to Rome, indeed, the title definitively claims, "Peter in Rome: the Literary, Liturgical and Archaeological Evidence", comes to the somewhat meagre conclusion that his stay was "more plausible than not."

In reality, there is not a single piece of solid evidence for this. Paul in particular - who is said to have founded the Roman church together with Peter, who writes his last letters from Rome, but never mentions Peter, his opponent, in them - knows nothing about it. Nor do we read anything about it in the Acts of the Apostles, the synoptic Gospels. Even the important 1st Epistle to the Christians, probably from the end of the 1st century, knows neither the story of Peter's death nor any other appointment of Peter by Jesus, nor any decisive role of this apostle at all. It merely reports his martyrdom in vague terms. In short, the entire 1st century is silent on how long the stay was.

The oldest certain witness for Peter's stay in Rome, Dionysius of Corinth, is however suspect. Firstly, because his testimony only dates from around 170. Secondly, because this bishop was a long way from Rome. And thirdly, because he doesn't just claim,

Peter and Paul would have founded the Church of Rome together, but at least that of Corinth, which refutes Paul's own testimony for Corinth. Will such a guarantor deserve more trust with regard to the Roman tradition?" But he who doubts here, even denies, sets "only a dishonoring monument to his ignorance and fanaticism" (Catholics Gröner). But isn't it the other way around? Isn't fanaticism more common among believers than skeptics? And ignorance

Isn't it just the religions, Catholicism and papalism in particular<sup>3</sup>, that are usually 'also' in the lives of both? Don't their dogmas amount to the contrarational and supranatural, to logical absurdities? Do they not shy away from real enlightenment, real criticism more than anything else? Have they not brought about harsh censorship, the index, the ecclesiastical printing license, the anti-modernist censure and the stake?"

Catholics need the visit of St. Peter, they need this man to be active in Rome, as he is the leader of the -founding apostle- t h e Roman list of bishops, the chain of his -successor-. The "apostolic" supremacy and the primacy of the pope are based to a considerable extent on this doctrine. Ergo they claim, especially in popular writings, that Peter's presence in Rome -is proven by historical research to be beyond proven beyond all doubt- (- J Koch); -is a generally assured result of research- (Kösters SJ); is -unquestionably established" (Franzen); testifies to -the whole early Christian world" (Schuck); "never- is there news from ancient times that is so certain" (Kuhn) - which does not make the vivid picture any more certain that Peter had "given up his episcopal see in Rome" (Specht/Bauer).

iq8a it is also "no longer doubtful" for the Catholic Pesch that Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero. (But the martyr bishop Ignatius in the 2. century says nothing about it!) Even for all of today's "research" Pesch (who loves the phrase, -if I see correctly- } claims this indubitability. He - or anyone! - does not. It is only, as he says in the previous sentence, "an appealing idea to assume that Peter set off for Rome ...". For many Catholics, it i s also an attractive idea to possess the tomb of St. Peter. However, what about the

Bcweisability?



## THE \) CHAIR OF THE GfiFU1'4DI'4EN ÜETRUSG RAB

According to an old tradition, the **crab** of the Apostle Saint is located on the Via Appia, according to another version under St. Peter's Church."

After this tomb had apparently already been sought around the middle of the z century, the arehsologist Enrico Josi, the architect Bruno Apolloni-Ghetti, the Jesuir Antonio Ferrua and the Jesuit Engelbert Kirschbaum recently excavated between iq6o and iqqq under St. Peter's dome. The director was Prelate Kaas, the former chairman of the Center. He had left the present to Hitler in Berlin and was similarly successful in t r a c i n g the past in Rome ..."

The world war came and went. And on the eve of the feast of Christmas Iq o, Pius XII announced to an attentive (Catholic) humanity that "the researches which We had in mind from the first months of Our Pontificate" had come to a "happy conclusion, at least as far as they concern the tomb of the Apostle, in the course of the Jubilee Year". The Pope called the result of the research, "the very precise research", "of the greatest richness and importance", and "to the essential question, the question of whether the tomb of St. Peter has really been found again, the final result of the work and studies answers with a very clear yes. The tomb of the Prince of the Apostles has been found again".^

The following year, however, the Catholic -Herder-correspondence Orbis Catholicus- wrote rather meekly: the place where Peter was buried had been "rediscovered free of two", the "tomb of the apostle itself has not *been found*" - a word that betrays the art of formation and Catholic school. After all, one did not want to contradict the Pope directly.

However, according to the Herder correspondence, -certain circumstantial evidence<sup>8</sup> was provided for the fact that Peter's tomb was located under the center of St. Peter's Basilica. As "circumstantial evidence" one reported -at the presumed place ... a number of human bones that have been carefully raised"; furthermore, Christian

and pagan tombs, the latter in several layers. According to the commission's report, the apostle's tomb, the one that was no longer found, is said to have been destroyed over time and Peter's bones moved to other places in the

-security, until finally Constantine

-Herder has built a house of God above the venerable city.

in the foreseeable future- from -the venerable St3tte". Reasons: the Narrowness of access; the endangerment of archaeological memorabilia in the immediate vicinity; then the actual Gtund, revealingly small: -when I finally got archaeologically untrained eye would see little or nothing worthy of thought there.-"

So it's the same as with all big secrets of this religion: nothing *worth thinking about*.

Around ann , the Roman presbyter Gaius believed to know the tomb of Peter, "want the Vatican"; and the tomb of Paul at the "Penalty to Ostia-. And since Constantine I, Peter's tomb in St. Peter's has supposedly been venerated - and searched for. But its historical authenticity was and is not proven; at most the belief of Constantine's time to possess the tomb of St. Peter. But this belief proves no more than the same belief today."

In contrast, a large number of pagan graves were found under St. Peter's Church (near which stood the Phrygianum, a sanctuary of the goddess Cybele): in the latest excavations, no fewer than 22 mausoleums and two open grave yards."

However, as insignificant as the result is with regard to the Vatican's object of investigation, the literature is proliferating around it. iq64 8\*b There are already around 100 publications about it with the most diverse views - from the most naive enthusiasm to the harshest denial of the excavation results. Engelbert Kirschbaum's SJ, who first of all had to dismiss older research that was too benevolent. Those of his religious colleague Grisar were carried out -with inadequate resources-; and those of the -meritorious- Silesian archaeologist Joseph Wil-

perr was passed over in silence by the experts as a "regrettable *critical* lapse on the part of the elderly scholar."

For his part, Jesuit Kirschbaum now compiles a whole "chain of evidence" for the authenticity of Peter's tomb. But then he has to admit that "individual parts could also be interpreted differently"; -that we only have the site, the burial place of the apostle, and no longer the material components of this tomb;- that we can never tell from an old tomb - what luck for him! - can n e v e r see who was buried in it. Nor can he "say anything definite about the appearance of the famous tomb ... .. It must have been a poor grave ..... - In short, what was actually found! The Jesuit almost says it: -a grave that consisted only of a few cover bricks. When these were removed, nothing remained of the tomb - "

All this speaks for the fact that this is not the tomb of Peter under the so-called tropaion, but that this itself is only a cenotaph, a monument. According to Kirschbaum, however, the excavation report interprets the tropaion as the apostle's tomb, albeit in a further stage of its development.

The results of critical researchers - Adriano Prandi, Armin von Gerkan, Theodor Klausur, A. M. Schneider and others - at least forced the Jesuit to concede that the (Catholic) excavation report was not "free of errors". He admits "incompleteness of the description", speaks of "minor or major contradictions", calls the *errare humanum est*

-so unfortunately still true-. But the decisive factor, he would like to -believe- that the criticism "has in no way er-shaken". But in the end, even Engelbert Kirschbaum can only state: -Was the tomb of St. Peter found? We answer: The tropaion from the middle of the second century was found, but the associated apostle's tomb was not 'found' in the same *sense*, but proven, i.e. its existence was established through a chain of circumstantial evidence, although material parts of this original tomb were found.

are no longer there." Ergo: the grave was there, but is no longer there!"

-The imagination would like to imagine how the body of the first pope was laid in the ground, writes Kirschbaum SJ and assumes the removal of Peter's remains from his tomb in the year 58. Of course, without any trace of proof. He can also only believe ... that only the head was removed". For the rest would have been found in the grave, which (likewise) was not found! However, the alleged head of Peter (and Paul) in the Lateran can only be proven since the end of the ninth century! Century! But in the place where Peter's tomb is thought to be, a heap of bones was found, and they all belong to the same person, as the "etching test showed. Ja, it is certain -that they are indeed the bones of an old man. And Peter was an old man when he died (Kirschbaum SJ). Such astonishing "proof" that even Engelbert Kirshbauin does not dare to say a final word about it.<sup>3</sup>'

But in an eye-catching book, Margherita Guarducci, a professor of archaeology at the University of Rome, claimed to have discovered the relics of St. Peter beyond doubt. However, as they did not even have the tomb of St. Peter, at least the experts reacted to the new "discovery" in a suitably sparse manner and then "often dismissively and un(re)ly" (Dassmann). Ernst Dassmann himself analyzed the circumstantial evidence of the Guarducci writings published by the Vatican and concluded his anything but unfriendly reflections with the claim of the old master of hagiography,

H. Delehayc, that all religions which are not beyond all doubt must be regarded as false. -The only thing that is beyond doubt, however, must be the doubts that must continue to follow M. Guarducci's argument in the current state of affairs."

When Venerando Gorrenti, a renowned anthropologist, examined the bones of the -vecchio robusto-, the alleged bones of St. Peter, he identified them as the remains of three

individuals, including almost certainly (quasi certai rente) that of an old woman of about seventy."

However, Pope Patil VI announced on z6. June iq68 during his address at the general audience: -The relics of St. Peter have been identified in a way that We can accept as convincing. ""

In reality, of course, any identification among the heap of people buried all around would be impossible from the outset after almost two thousand years, even if Peter were lying there. Erich Caspar has *already* rightly emphasized, *vozsichcig* gentig, the *doubts* about it

-will never be remedied. In this context, Johannes Haller rightly recalled the skepticism regarding the authenticity of Schiller's and Bach's skulls, even though the time gap is smaller and the conditions are so much better. Armin von Gerkan rightly writes that even if Peter's tomb were uncovered, even if there were *evidence* to support it - but this is not the case - even then nothing would be gained, because this burial would also only date from the Constantinian period, and it would remain questionable, even possible, that it was a fiction. There is simply no archaeological material, but we will always have to stick to tradition, which, however, already existed in the time of Constantine.

What the rotten story of the tomb of St. Peter is really about, writes Catholic Fuchs (to whom we also owe the following report: -An inscription PETR ... was found several meters below today's papal altar. w a s found next to it, as well as an old tomb ...-): "Above all, however, these excavations are suitable for bringing the idea of St. Peter's tomb more strongly to the people. That is indeed the crux of the matter. For the primacy of the Pope is not based on the fact that Peter is buried in Rome. But this belief, the pilgrimage; -Terra santa!": the joy of donating."

Monsignor Rathgeber also emphasizes that the site - known as Peter's tomb - has been a much-visited place since the earliest Christian times.

Wallfahrtsort- had been. The prelate mentions a stone discovered there not only with the inscription: -Peter, pray to Jesus Christ for the holy Christians who are buried next to your body-, but also with a likeness that is considered an apostle's portrait: a bald head, large nose, beard and fleshy lips ... Oh, if only miracles still existed, Peter (and Patil) had not long since been pulled out of the depths as fresh and crispy as once Ambrose his martyrs † 431 ff)? But the times are no longer after that ... "Miracles must be seen in the distance", says Lichtenberg, -if they are to be seen as true, as Clouds, if they are to be taken for solid bodies'.

Now Peter may have been alone in Rome, perhaps even died there, but not as a bishop, as the holder of the -Holy See- named after him. -There can be no question of that," writes Kurt Aland iq8i. And Norbert Brox, who iq8i "wants to know with great certainty that Peter was in Roiri, admits that nothing is known about his role in the congregation there. "That he was their bishop is impossible ..." In any case, the author of the First Epistle of Peter did not imagine the "Apostle1 of Jesus Christ" in Babylon, i.e. Rome, as a bishop, but, according to the Protestant theologian Felix Christ, "as a preacher and above all a 'co-tester'. Even for the Catholic Blank, Peter was - most probably - not the 'first bishop of Rome' - (and of course - not the founder of the Roman congregations either). Even for the very loyal Rudolf Pesch, there is no episcopate in Rome -too-close (!). Both Peter and Paul, both apostles, had no direct 'successor' in a Roman bishopric. But at the end of the study of this Catholic is the papal primacy -the Catholic primacy of Peter in the service of the faith of the one, holy churches, integrated into the apostolic succession of the apostles in the episcopate, is this -factum theologicum-, in German: eine Erschleichung. Or, again with Pesch, -an appealing idea to assume that . . .-.\*'

But before we look at the origins and development of the Roman

primacy, the question naturally arises: How did Christian priests, bishops and popes come to be in the first place?

Dix Ex STEHUNG DER KIRCH LICHENMTER ,  
DER METROPOLITEN-, PATRIARCHSITZE UND  
DES PAPSTTUMS

According to everything that historical-critical biblical exegesis teaches, Jesus - the apocalypticist who stands entirely in the tradition of Jewish prophets, who expects the *immediate* end, the "reign of God", and is therefore completely mistaken (one of the most certain research results) - naturally did not want to found a church at all, no priests, bishops, patriarchs, popes. The church theologian and feminist theologian Magdalena Bussmann wrote to John Paul II in 1977, not without scorn: -Jesus also did not entrust anyone, neither women nor men, with the priesthood, as you and your colleagues do

understand it. All people who have been given a charism by God should use it for the benefit of the whole church. This is probably the common opinion of all theologians, and in Rome at least a minimum of basic exegetical knowledge of serious Bible interpretation should be assumed."°

In the earliest Christian congregations, apostles, prophets and teachers set the tone. The bishops, deacons and presbyters took a back seat to them. At first, they were merely technical administrators, entrusted with administrative, organizational, economic and social functions. Then the bishop took the helm: first in relation to the presbyters, to whom he was responsible for the whole of the church.

i. He was equal in rank to the apostles, prophets and teachers. From the end of the tenth century, he united all offices in his person."

However, just as the bishop went from being a subordinate to an equal and then a superior, differences in rank also developed among the bishops themselves. As a rule, they depended on the importance of the place where they resided. A bishop with his seat in the provincial capital, the metropolis, usually also became metropolis (metropolitans, whereby some, for example in Illyricum, also called themselves enbishop, archiepiscopus) and superior of the other bishops in his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, whose boundaries usually coincided with those of the corresponding civilian bishop; a development that was to continue in the East in the early Roman period.

The 3rd century more or less came to a conclusion, of course not without rivalries. And by Zoo at the latest, every province had a metropolitan.\*'

But there were also bishops with greater authority among the metropolitans, such as the bishop of Milan in northern Italy, which had been the imperial residence since Diocletian; this was probably the main reason why the Milanese episcopus commanded several civil provinces. And finally, there were still ecclesiastical federations that considerably outstripped even a metropolitan federation, a kind of supreme bishopric.

In the 3rd century - again, by the way, in terms of the church's organizational structure - administrative units gained in importance.

The patriarch of Alexandria in particular had special privileges over the hundred or so bishops of Egypt. Or, somewhat later, the Patriarch of Antiochia (with a politically and culturally less uniform background) over a large part of the Syrian episcopate. Analogous special rights were granted at the Council of Nicaea 13\*J): the less important later patriarchate of Jerusalem (with three Palestinian provinces, albeit er-t 4yi achieved by the unscrupulous opportunist and forger Archbishop Juvenal) as well as the exarchates of Ephesus, Caesarea in Cappadocia and Heraclea; finally, at the Council of Constantinople (381), the capital of the East Cn. The title of Patriarch (forefather), initially also given to ordinary bishops, was defti . In the 13th century, the title was reserved for only five senior bishops, called "exarchs" in the Chalcedonense, the



church

of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Jerusalem and Rome.

Now the *office* of a ruling bishop came into being particularly late in Rome, only in the fourth or fifth Christian generation, much later than in Syria or Asia Minor. Even in the middle of the 4th century, when the Roman Christian community had around 30 000 members and many clergy, no one there knew of Peter's appointment! Nobody knew anything about his stay and martyrdom in Rome."

### THE FORGED ROMAN BISHOP'S LETTER

The oldest Roman list of bishops was first provided by the church father Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyon, in his writing "Adversus haereses", around between 180 and 185. It is not available in the original Greek text, but rather in a Latin rendering from the 3rd or 4th century, if not 5th century. The literature on this text alone can hardly be overlooked, it is obviously "spoiled". However, we are completely in the dark as to the origin of the list. Irenaeus does not mention much more than names. And nowhere is there any mention of the primacy of Peter! Peter was still not counted as a bishop in Rome at the end of the 1st century. In the year 2000, however, it was claimed that he had lived in Galilee! At that time, Bishop Eusebius handed down the Roman succession of bishops, a dishonest historian who was himself guilty of falsifying documents (cf. above, 1. Hooft). Eusebius also falsified the Alexandrian list of bishops, which is similar to most of his Roman list. Likewise the Antiochian one, where he assigned the names of the bishops Cornelius, Eros and Theophilus to one Olympiad each. He also used artificial calculations for the Jerusalem bishops' table, of whose years of office he admittedly had no written evidence at all; later, Bishop Epiphanius dated them to the same period in Caesarea. Around 354, the -Catalogus Liberianus-

nus, a list of popes extending from Peter to Liferius (3J^3 ), continued and "perfected" the dating process by specifying the dates of the months and days. So Catholic

Gelmi, who of course immediately adds -that all these dates have no historical value-. Catholics today also agree with this, but repeatedly emphasize that the series of names itself is all the more valuable - ancient and genuine!

However, the -Liber Pontificalis-, the official papal book, the oldest Roman list of bishops, which contains an "abundance of forged or legendary material and supplements it with further inventions" (Caspar), in short, which is so distorted that it has hardly any historical value until around the turn of the 6th century, does not name Peter, but a Linus as the first bishop of the city. Linus was then placed second and Peter first. Finally, a -Petrine office- was constructed, which -in the "ancient conditions" of course -only occasionally came to the fore (Karrer), and was allowed to develop into a -Papstrum". -Like a seed, writes )e- suit Hans Grotz poetically, "Peter fell into Roman soil. And no matter how many fell and continue to fall - gradually all of Peter's - successors- could be listed, as mentioned, with dates and dates of death, supposedly in uninterrupted succession. In the course of time, however, the Roman list of bishops was rewritten, improved and supplemented, and finally a table of the years of office for the first 28 bishops of Rome, compiled by five Byzantine chroniclers, shows that the numbers in all columns agree in only four places. Indeed, the final editor of the text, probably Pope Gregory I, seems to have extended the series of names to twelve saints, in parallel with the twelve apostles. In any case, the episcopates of the Roman bishops' list for the first two centuries are as uncertain as those of the Alexandrian or Antiochian and -for the first decades - "bare arbitrariness" (Heussi).

The fact that at the top of the official Pope's book is a common Forged correspondence between St. Jerome and Pope Damasus I.

stands! (Not the only fake correspondence between the two: Pseudoisidor brings another one)."

J---it Grisar emphasizes "the fact" that "the list of the ancient Roman bishops, beginning with St. Peter, stands out very favourably from many [1] other catalogs of bishops with regard to the certainty of the order and the names. For while here poetry and falsification have not intruded, the lists of the ancient rulers of other churches were a popular field in which the work of inventors was attempted." But in fact the Roman bishops' catalog, which is undoubtedly particularly important for Catholics, was no different from the other bishops' lists.

Incidentally, such partially constructed, completely fictitious or artificially bridged series of names, tables of tradition, existed long before Christianity and its - in the beginning (likewise) falsified - lists of bishops: the magistrates' registers of the Greek city-states, the Spartan royal genealogies of the Agiades and Eurypontides, the Diadochi series of the Rhulhätipter in the Greek philosophical schools, the rubric of the Olympians. But above all comparable: the Old Testament genealogies, which guaranteed participation in the divine promises in an unbroken sequence of names, especially the post-exilic list of high priests as the government list of Israel. And the efforts of Islam to secure the traditional oral teachings krah a chain of succession, a line of testimony (isnäd) reaching back to the prophet, presumably go back to these Jewish principles of tradition.\*

In any case, the historical reasons - not the theologically composed ones! - for the emergence of the papacy are of a completely different nature than the papacy itself would have us believe. They do not result from the *supposed apostolic hundierung* of the Roman episcopal see, but above all from the *high political-ideological and kuft* "refferi *significance* of the city of millions, from its special position as the center of the Roman Empire, the -Queen of Rome-, indeed, as the pagan

Poets praise it as -caput orbis-, -head of the world-, a decisive factor which the Roman hierarchs characteristically ignore in corresponding statements.

Not only in Rome, but everywhere, the ecclesiastical **rank** of a city was more or less adequate to its older political **rank**, and the local churches also profited to a greater or lesser extent from other secular seats of government. This was true of Milan, for example, or, in neighboring Pannonia, of Sirium, also a temporary imperial residence and seat of a praefectus praetorio. And when, at the end of the 4th century, the Galli prefecture reached Arles, the local prefecture also reported

Bishop immediately laid claim to the metropolitan dignity." But

Byzantium in particular quickly pushed itself to the fore. For between 326 and 330, under Constantine I, the -Constantine City-, the -Second- or -New Rome-, "Nea Rhome-", had emerged

from the small, but militarily and economically favored Byzantium. It was built in competition with the old capital on the

Tiber, but based on its model over seven hills, and surpassed in grandeur and world renown even in the 4th and 5th century, as the late Byzantine scholar Manuel Chrysoloras praised, albeit only a thousand years later: -The mother is

beautiful and shapely, but in many ways the daughter is more beautiful." Constantinople played the leading role in the entire empire politically, militarily and economically. Its patriarch was gradually placed alongside the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antiochia, eventually becoming the "imperial bishop" and a rival to the Roman bishop; it was also claimed that Christianity had begun in the East, that Christ had been born in the East, as the synods of the imperial council of 381 triumphed to the West. And after the invasion of the Arabs in the 7th century, only Constantinople remained as the patriarchate of the Orient."

Another important reason for the emergence of the papacy was the authoritative position given to the Roman bishop, the only patriarch in the entire West (while in the East there were three,

four patriarchs rivaled each other), in Italy and the Latin Church after the collapse of the Roman Empire and which was soon supported by enormous wealth. Once the primacy had been established, tactical power was increasingly underpinned theologically by the alleged proof of apostolicity, the brazen recourse to Petrus\* Petrinology.<sup>10</sup>

### EMERGING PRIMACY CLAIMS

These primacy ambitions of the Roman bishops, mostly based on Mt. 16,18, are of course groundlessly presumptuous. For more than two centuries, they themselves never insisted on their (alleged) appointment by Jesus! May they never have insisted on being followers of Peter! -There is no evidence that the promise of Peter (Matt. 16, 18) played a role in the history of Roman claims to leadership and authority before the middle of the third century, emphasizes Henry Chadwick. Only since then, in fact, has there been the first clearer guaranteed claim to primacy by a Roman bishop - a fact that Jesuit de Vries almost cynically frames in this way: -We must admit that it took a long time for the full significance of the Word of the Rock for the Petrine office of the Bishop of Rome to be recognized in Rome. But it was finally recognized ...- Not even the idea of a special status of the Roman -Stuhlhalter- as -successor- of Peter was developed in Rome! *Every* bishop's see, even the most trivial one, neither distinguished by tradition nor importance, was initially -sedes apostolica-. And *every* bishop also claimed the epithet -apostolicus- as well as the noun -apostolatus- for its Dignity and his work. "The designation of a simple bishop as *summus pontifex* can even be found for the first time in a papal letter - (Catholic Baus). Nor did the oldest chief shepherds of Rome feel themselves to be -popes-. They

had for a long time -no other title ... than the other bishops" (Catholic Bihlmeyer). On the contrary. While patriarchs, bishops and abbots had long been called "pope" (pappas, papa, father) in the East, the term is first attested in Rome on a tombstone from the time of Liberius (352-366). In the later y. The Roman bishops, together with other bishops, regularly used the word -pope- as a self-designation, but not before the end of the 8th century. And it is only from the 2. millennium onwards that the word -pope- becomes an exclusive prerogative of the bishop of Rome, indeed, even in the 12. and 13. Even as late as the 12. and 13. centuries, non-Roman bishops called themselves "Vicarius Petri" (Vicar of Peter). And the title -Summus Pontifex- even existed for all bishops until the high Middle Ages."

Consequently, the primacy of the pope has been disputed ever since it was first mentioned. Initially by Catholic theologians, church fathers and bishops themselves.

#### Dir GABIZE OLD CHURCH KANI'4TE NO1'4

HONORARY AWARD **DONATED BY** J ESU8      **LEGAL PRIMAT**  
THE BisCHOPS OF Ron

The earliest to refer to Mt. IÖ,18 Although the imperious Ste-  
Üäñ I. 1\*54 57) With his hardly collegial episcopal, but rather hierarchical-monarchical conception of the church, he is

The first pope, so to speak, although we have no direct statement from him on the matter. However, the influential bishop Firmilian of Caesarea in Cape Padocia reacted immediately. According to the Catholic "Dictionary of Theology and the Church", he did not know of any legal primacy of the Roman bishop. Rather, Firmilian criticizes the latter for boasting of his position and believing that he "holds the succession of Peter" (successionem Petri tenere contendit). Without hesitation, Firmilian speaks of the -so tangible and obvious folly of St. Peter.

phans" and calls him, in an indirect form of address, a -schismaticus", who separated himself from the church. He accuses him of -frighteousness and impenetrability- (audacia et insokntia), -blindness" (caecitas), -stupidity- (stultitia). He angrily compares him to Judas and claims that he is bringing the blessed apostles Peter and Paul into disrepute.

-How ei(rig-, Firmilian sneers in a letter to Cyprian of Carthage, "Stephen followed the salutary admonitions of the apostle and preserved humility and gentleness above all! What could be more humble and gentle than to be at odds with so many bishops of the whole world ... soon with the Orientals (as you will also be well aware), soon with you in the West." And he directly apostrophized the Romans: -You have excluded yourself - do not deceive yourself about this! For while you believe that all are excluded from you you have only separated yourself from everyone."

And at that time, during the heresy controversy in c5y/56 (i.e. the question of whether Christians who converted to Catholicism had to be baptized or, as Rome taught, no longer baptized: as far as disciplinary and dogmatic matters were concerned), none other than Cyprian took a stand on the question of primacy. The bishop, martyr and saint of the Catholica, obviously in agreement with the prevailing view, nowhere recognized an absolute primacy of Rome, as he - with Tertullian (against Callist: p. q8) - mocks, -The synods of North Africa agreed with this at the time, as did those of the East, both in open conflict and in more peaceful times.

For Cyprian, the Roman bishop is basically no more than any other bishop. -Not once in the Tratime does he even think of granting him any jurisdictional power over parishes other than his own. Indeed, the successor of Peter is not even regarded as the first among equals (primus inter pares). For Cyprian, all apostles were equal, all had the same authority as Peter, the same share of honor. In the same way, no bishop was subject to another, none was superior;



no one could judge the other, no one could be judged by the other; in short, everyone was liable to God for the administration of his diocese: which is why in Rome they even forged a main passage of Cyprian's writings! But not even the forgery (in "De uni-

tate ecclesiae" c. 41 is to be understood in the sense of a Roman primacy. However, Cyprian was backed (after earlier synods in Carthage and Asia Minor had already ruled in conformity) by two

The Council held in September 456 in Carthage saw 87 bishops vote for him by name. The

-The pope, of course, did not receive Cyprian's delegation with the resolutions and also refused them the ecclesiastical communion, any reception and hospitality. He energetically forbade rebaptism, because -nothing should be renewed that has not been handed down- (nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est) - probably the oldest general principle of the papacy; which, of course, no one broke more than the papacy itself. Stephen I called St. Cyprian a pseudo-Christian and a false apostle, a "deceitful schemer" (Pseudochristum et pseudoapostolum et dolosum operarium), while Cyprian accused the pope of madness, obstinacy, arrogance and blasphemy, even denouncing him as "a friend of the heretics and an enemy of Christians" - two saints among themselves."

After all, during this period of harshest confrontation with Stephen, Cyprian did not, as far as is known, excommunicate him; it would have been "to be expected" (Marschall). On the other hand, the question of whether Stephen of Rome excommunicated St. Cyprian remains controversial to this day due to the scanty source base; there is much to suggest that he did. Well-known Protestants, such as Seeberg and Lietzmann, claim this, recently (rather) supported by the Catholic -Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte-. Later, Augustus launched the report of Cyprian's recantation, but apparently contrary to the facts (and with little support in the historiography)."

But since Cyprian in particular is considered typical of Western Catholicism, as a milestone in its development, Catholics like to dispute his denial of primacy. And indeed

It was precisely he who coined the terms "cathedra Petri" and "primatus Petri", which have made history so devastatingly to this day, and it was precisely he who strongly incorporated the Matthew passage "Do it Peter" into his texts and thus almost prepared the way for the Roman doctrine of Peter, if not even directed Rome onto this track in the first place, on most of the history by means of the Bible, dogmatics and doctrine."

Cyprian also invokes the *Ecclesia principalis* ... from where the priestly unity went out. And once this passage was very controversial, it was supposed to be a striking witness to Rome's primacy; Hugo Koch, the Catholic church historian, *1914* lost his teaching office when he proved the opposite - and soon not only in a book. In the meantime, however, many Catholics agree that - *Ecclesia principalis* - does not mean papal primacy, that Cyprian also did not ascribe a special hierarchical position to the bishops of Rome, no supreme governmental authority (Bihlmeyer), *no* "supreme power" (Bernhart), that this primacy played virtually no role in Catholicism at the time."

It speaks volumes that the entire ancient Church does not recognize the honorary and legal primacy of the Roman bishop established by Jesus. That this primacy contradicts the teaching of all the ancient church fathers, even the most famous ones. For like Cyprian, Origen, the greatest, albeit heretical theologian of the first three centuries, also interpreted the primacy collectively. Peter here also refers to the apostles, indeed, to all believers; "all are Peter and rock, and the church of Christ is built on all of them."

And like Cyprian and Origen in the fourth century, Ambrosius, likewise more influential than the popes of his time, did not give them any singular preference. The word of the pillars of hell, for many Catholics the *locus classicus* of the primacy, Ambrose does not refer to Peter himself, but to his faith. In Ambrosius, Peter has no primacy anywhere, no prerogatives anywhere and certainly no successor. Ambrose, whose bishopric competed with the Roman one, also made synodal decisions without, and if necessary even against, Peter.

Rome. With an obviously anti-Roman turn of phrase, the Milanese did indeed attest the primacy to the Apostle Peter, but "the primacy of confession, not that of honor (non honoris), the primacy of faith, not that of rank (non ordinis)". Similarly, the Doctor of the Church Athanasius speaks of the -rights of Rome, also only in the sense of an ecclesiastical court of arbitration ... at no point is there any mention (Hagel). Athanasius grants the (Christian) emperor alone the right to appoint an ecumenical synod. And as far as the Doctor of the Church John Chrysostom is concerned, Benedictine Baur, his modern biographer, "nowhere finds the primacy of the Pope's jurisdiction expressed in clear words."

Like the ecclesiastical luminaries mentioned so far, Basil -the Great- does not concede any claim to Roman primacy (in the East). For Basil, who addressed his letters to the West, with one exception, not to the Roman bishop Damasus, but rather to all of the Western supreme rulers or to those of Italy and Gaul, the clerical hierarchy is a community of those entitled to rule, Antioch, which boasted the -Cathedra Pctri-, is ecclesiastically the head of the world and the head of the Church Christ alone - the Eastern Church never recognized another, a visible head of the same! It regarded the Bishop of Rome only as the first of the Western episcopate. Isolated appeals to him by Eastern prelates do not say much. And when Pope Damasus demanded unconditional acceptance of a Roman formula of faith from the Orientals, Basil firmly rejected this. (Basil's friend and colleague, Bishop and Doctor of the Church Gregory of Nazianzus, spoke of the "rough wind of the West" and called the Christian West "the foreigner".

The Doctor of the Church Jerome (as a Roman) often submissively accepted the decisions of Rome, especially as he himself hoped to become pope. But he can also confess the general view of his time and call the bishopric the same everywhere, no matter how different it may be in terms of size or the wealth of its seats. Wherever, he writes, there is a bishop, in Rome or

Gibbio, Constantinople or Rhegium, in Alexandria or Tanis, -it means the same, has the same office-.'

Even Augustine, who was already quite a Romanist and sometimes awkwardly maneuvered between the Pope and his African brothers, did not advocate papal doctrinal and jurisdictional primacy. Without directly attacking the Roman doctrine of Peter, for Augustine the primacy of Peter was, as it once was for Cyprian, only a personal Ranj; indeed, instead of -solus Peter-, for him the

•universa ecclesia- as the holder of the key power. It is not Peter, the head of the apostles, not the Roman cathedra, not the Roman authority that stands in the highest place for him and is authoritative for the doctrine, discipline and customs of Christianity, but the authority of the universal church - of which Peter is the symbol according to Mt. i6,\*7. The plenary council is superior to the Roman bishop. Thus the First Vatican Council z8yo had to reproach even the most famous Doctor of the Church with erroneous opinions (*pravae sententiae*)! Augustin (*Enarr. in psalm. 43*) had declared -*Sumus christiani, non petriani*- (We are Christians, not Petrians) and Mt. x6,z8 -at no time in his life understood and interpreted in the Roman sense" (Caspar). And it is hardly by chance that Augustine's pupil Orosius - widely read and admired in the Middle Ages - does not ascribe a central position to the Roman bishop, but at best a spiritual primacy.\*

But this attitude of the most celebrated Catholics of antiquity is all the more remarkable because the writings of the Holy Fathers, according to St. Cyril (who may have been thinking not least of his own products), "came about by inspiration of the Holy Spirit".

## HOW BISHOPS AND CHURCHMAKERS ALSO KNEW THE OLD COXCILS CREATED ROME'S LEGAL PRIMATE

Since the middle of the tenth century, the church has been organizing synods, called synodus or concilium, initially particular synods, provincial synods, apparently modelled on the state provincial councils; then also interprovincial synods, plenary councils, as in the Egyptian, Antiochian, African and Italian churches; finally meetings of the "whole church", general or ecumenical councils. So far, one counts ai of such (often only later made)

-ecumenical" assemblies in Catholicism, for which there are no constant characteristics. (The sources use - as do we - the terms council and synod as synonyms)."

However important the ecumenical church meetings are for Catholics, even the first "general" councils nowhere decree the primacy of Rome. And of course these councils did not have their decisions confirmed by a pope who did not even exist yet! Sometimes they communicated their decrees to the Roman bishop, but only like others. For example, the Synod of Arles - anno j4 - transmitted its decrees to the Roman bishop.

Spirit and his angels (angelis eius)- meeting - the bishop  
We have decided this by joint resolution so that everyone knows what they have to observe in the future - but not so that the Roman bishop approves it! So that he confirms it! So that he decides! Nobody thought of that. In those days, it was not popes but synods that settled disputes. "It is impossible to solve major problems otherwise than through synods," wrote Bishop Euseb of Caesarea. Similarly, Bishop Epiphanius believed: "Councils create certainty (asphsleia) in the questions that arise from time to time.^ All the great church meetings of antiquity were not convened by the pope (whose legates were occasionally absent even at "ecumenical" councils: in Constantius 38i and 3 ), but by the emperor. In this respect he had all

Recfite, the pope none. The emperor set the date, the exact group of participants and the subject of the meeting. He opened, chaired and confirmed these conferences and gave them the force of law. He also had the right to bury, cancel and postpone them. He could be represented by high officials and could also have bishops who did not attend punished. No council, no pope denied these rights at the time. Even a pontiff as self-aware as Leo I asked Emperor Theodosius II to order a synod. Thus the church historian Socrates, generally regarded as one of the most honest of the ancient world, can state without exaggeration towards the middle of the 5th century: -Since the emperors began to be Christians, the affairs of the Church have depended on them, and the greatest councils have been and are held at their pleasure. Of course, the rulers did not recognize the primacy of the popes. Only in the later c. It was only in the later c1st century that Gratian conceded a kind of jurisdictional primacy to the Roman see, but only over the bishops of the West. And Damasus (from 37 ) was the supreme ruler only over the Metropolitans, not yet over the suffragans for which local courts are responsible."

Of course, it was at this time that a turning point became clear, a new doctrine, a new concept emerged, according to which the Bishop of Rome was the leader of the whole Church and had authority over all Christians. This tendency, with a first climax in Leo I. The popes Damasus (under whom a synod in Rome in 388 spoke for the first time of the "primacy of the Roman Church", no longer, as previously, of the "primacy of Peter") and Siricius, who admonished, exhorted, commanded, threatened in all directions - -decernimus", -iudicamus", -pronuntiamus-, -we determine", -we judge-, -we decree-. Within a very short time, such expressions became rampant in the vocabulary of the papal chancery, whose decrees imitated imperial law patterns and differed in no way from the canonical decrees. However, Damasus and Siricius did not claim any authority over a council either. Anastasius I (399-430) still regarded himself merely as the head of the West. And for the Eastern Church, the **pope** is also

In the 6th century, Rome was only the patriarch of the West. Even then, no decisive missionary activity emanated from Rome. -All attempts to attribute a leading role in Christian missionary work to the papacy before Gregory the Great do not stand up to the statements of 'ler sources (Katholik Baus). In contrast, the seat of Constantinople *is* now increasingly referred to as "apostolic". Since the 7th century

the founding legend of Andrew, the apostle of the

According to John i,40 f, Jesus called him earlier than Peter. lin q. In the sixth century, the largest

Byzantine patriarch, Photios, opposed Rome's claim to supremacy and its first pope, the elder and "first-appointed" apostle Andrew. For many years earlier, he took over the bishop's see of Byzantium when his brother became bishop of the Romans.-.'

However, the Roman hierarchs' ruler's allures, their restless ambition to be the superiors of all bishops, also came up against them in the West in the later 4th century,

widely met with opposition. "Thus the Bishop of Parma-, reports the Roman Synod 3y8 of Urbanus, meeting under Pope Damasus, "although deposed by our court, keeps his church in his hands without shame, so Florentius of Pu- teoli ... has crept back into his city after six years, occupies the church and stirs up unrest-.'^

Especially in important episcopal residences, people were happy to ignore Rome: in Carthage, Vienne, Narbonne or Marseille, for example, where the respected Proculus, praised by Jerome as holy and revered, exercised the metropolitan rights granted to him by a Turin synod, unconcerned by Roman protests. Even after his deposition, he continued to consecrate bishops with explicit reference to the Council of Turin.

-with an insolence that went beyond the usual-, "with an iron forehead and forgetting all shame", as **Pope** Zosimus was angry, scolding Proculus' "Turin privileges" without shame. Proculus, however, followed the citation as little as the Metropolis Simplicius of Vienne, whom Zosimtis

He could not settle the dispute with the Gallic chief shepherds, including Lazarus of Aix, who was particularly close to him, and the bishops Tuentius and Ursus. Although the Roman had increased authority over the Italian church, he was by no means in charge of the entire western world. Milan clashed with Rome. Western synods still consulted Rome at the turn of the 5th century on important occasions, the hierarchs of Rome and Milan at the same time, such as the Council of Carthage 357. Or one like the Synod of Toledo (400), made a decision so until "the present Pope . . . , the Bishop of Milan and the other priests of the churches" wrote in. At times, people from Gaul and Illyria apparently turned more to Mai- land than to Rome. In any case, the relationship between the two was one of collegial coexistence. The -apostolic- see probably had the greater prestige, but the Roman bishop -no legal exception-. And the -conclaves stood independently and on an equal footing with the papacy- (Wojtowysch). Indeed, they were -not only the most important legal sources of the Church, but also the most important source of faith alongside the Bible- (H.-G. Beck).

The opposition to Rome is sometimes particularly fierce in Africa, where in the early 5th Century around 477 Bishops' Councils,

At the time, an entire regional synod denied the Roman pontifex maximus the right to make correct decisions and denied that his judgment was superior at all. The North African church leaders brusquely rejected any claim of authority over them and did not grant Rome any supreme authority in matters of faith and discipline. The prelates are certain that they can recognize the correct doctrine themselves. Only the Vandal invasion, the regiment of Arian heretics in Africa, brought about close cooperation between the Catholics there and the Roman bishop, from whom the synods of Carthage and MileWg (\* '4 \*7) asked for the confirmation of their flights. After all, the invasion of the West Goren in Spain also led to a more intensive



the Spanish Church to Rome. However, the Council of Carthage in Mñ' 4- again threatened excommunication for "transmarine" appeals, renewing an old canonical principle.'

An incident, the forensic treatment of which extends over several pontificates of the early 5th century, teaches us just how little Romanophile the Africans were.

### THE ÀPIARIUS FEARS

The bishop tJrbantis of Sicca, a disciple of Augustine, had excommunicated the presbyter Apiarius because of his scandalous way of life (-unheard of shameful deeds-) and Apiarius, with the support of his JY(etropolitan, appealed to Rome. However, the Arician episcopate had already banned 3g3 priests from appealing to Rome in the previous year, as well as a the Carthaginian General Synod any appeal to the court of that

on the other side of the sea" (ad transmarina). Pope Zosiinus, however, took sides with the fired priest and, ignoring his superiors, ordered his bishop to come to him for justification.

However, as the Roman fell on deaf ears, he sent a three-man delegation under Bishop Faustinus of Potenza, as if it were his representation at an imperial council, which apparently relied on canons from Nicaea, but which were in fact those of Serdica.

Moreover, the statutes cited literally contradicted the papal procedure, since they allowed a presbyter or deacon who had been removed from office to appeal to neighboring bishops, but contained no mention of a complaint to Rome, let alone of Rome's right to intervene in such cases."

The Africans reacted with reservation. They left the fiir for all -Apiarius, who asked for forgiveness, was still in office, but no longer in Sicca, but in Thabraea. And with regard to the -nicaenic- appellaconsbstimmungøn they were mis-

mournful. They would have bowed to them - but not to the pope - immediately, but they did not find them in their copies of Nicaea and therefore wanted to consult the churches of Constantinople and Alexandria. The papal legate Faustinus repeatedly tried to prevent this, but in vain."

In the meantime, Zosimus had died and Boniface I was in ruins. The African episcopate rebuked the behavior of its predecessor and wrote that if the statutes of appeal had also been observed in Italy, we would in no way be forced to tolerate such things, which we no longer wish to recall, or would not be regarded as intolerable things. But we believe ... that, while Your Holiness provides for the Roman Church, we will no longer experience this arrogant treatment and that we will be respected for what must be respected for us even without extensive discussion. - Clear tones. At the same time, under the presidency of Aurelius of Carthage

the Council - - 419, in which Augustine also took part, the decree of the General Council of the previous year, which allowed any cleric up to the level of priest to appeal to non-African authorities,

and thus also to the pope, and now expressly under threat of excommunication. β soon thereafter, the inherited acts of Nicaea arrived from Constantinople and Alexandria, which were expectedly rejected by Zosimus and sent on to Rome, where, however, the Serdian canon of appeals was also boldly passed off as Nicæan!'-.

the case of Apollinaris was repeated under Pope Celestine. He relapsed, was expelled again, appealed once more to Rome, where the new pope took a benevolent interest in him and once more sent Faustinus of Potentilla, who this time debated for three days even more unhappily and unsuccessfully, arrogantly and insultingly, as the Council Fathers complained in their epistle - Optatum - Celestine. But his protégé collapsed under the evidence, accepted the synodal verdict and the fiasco of the papal legate was complete. -As for our brother Faustinus",

wrote the synodal delegates, -we are assured by Your Holiness, in a legal and measured sense, that - without prejudice to fraternal love - Africa will be spared from him entirely."

But Goelestin also received a rebuff unlike any Roman bishop from Africa. "Because people should be sent from your side," the Carthaginian council replied,

We did not find it established (in niillo) by a Synod of the Fathers; namely, that which you recently transmitted through the sameFaustinus ... as part of the Nicene Council, as it werewe could not find such a thing in the credible codices recognized as

Nicene ... The bishops also did not want to see any more of the pope's clerics as executors, so as not to open the door to the evil, quáíming arrogance of the world (fumosum ryfum saeculi)." The African episcopate was unusually uncompromising in forbidding papal interference in its judicial system. It denied Rome the right

to accept further appointments of priests from its country and declared every synod responsible in principle for the correctness of its decisions. "There will be no one who believes that our God can give a just sense to any (individual) for the judgment, but give it to those assembled in the greatest number for a council.

bishops can fail!'-

The Roman bishop was therefore still not considered the decisive superior for the early y. The Roman bishop was therefore not considered the decisive superior for the gfofite Western Church in the early eighteenth century, neither in matters of faith, ecclesiastical discipline nor, as the Apiarius affair in particular drastically shows, jurisprudence. On the contrary, the African councils in particular considered themselves quite authorized to make their own decisions in all these areas without any doubt. It is not without reason that papal historian Erich Caspar is convinced that the mighty African church would never have been bent by the Roman See and the new papal theory of primacy and the idea of subordination had the Vandal invasion not cut its lifeblood and Islam not put an end to it in the 19th century. Century the end

made. Other people's disasters have - to this day! - almost always a stroke of luck for Rome. And Caspar is right to call the fiasco of the mighty African church a -incredible stroke of fate- for papal history, as this debacle freed the popes from the only serious rival in the West during the decisive times of their rise to supremacy.

-Like a giant tree in the jungle struck by lightning, the Carthaginian primate sank to the ground in one fell swoop and gave way to the Roman primate."

Dm BxsTnEITUi'4G oF **THE PUBLIC ORIMAVS**  
**LASTED UNTIL MODERN TIMES**

Even in the first centuries of the early Middle Ages, ecumenical councils did not bow to Rome's claim to sole representation. Decisions were made collegially and the pope was not even named in the solemn proclamation of the canons. It was not he who was the hierarchical superior authority with the power to issue orders, it was not he who was competent to make an absolutely binding decision on matters of faith, but the Council. The Roman theologian Wilhelm de Vrits summarizes at the end of his study on the synods of the first century: "According to these councils, it is at least normal for decisions on matters of faith and important disciplinary matters to be made freely. It is difficult to see how an absolutist " ' homeland c a n find support in the tradition of the first millennium."

But even in the second millennium, this primacy, which had been achieved both dishonestly and through power, continued to be fought against. By the Greek Church of course, by many -heretics-, the Cathars crwa, Albigensians, Waldensians, Fraticelli. In the early iq. Century by Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno, a professor at the University of Paris. Finally by John Wyclif, Hus, Luther saint the other reformers.

However, resistance from Catholics also continued. At various church assemblies, attempts were made to limit or completely abolish the Roman power ambitions in favor of the bishops; in Pisa, for example, in Constance (where the council declared itself to be above the pope in the decree -Haec sancta synodus- of May 6, 1415) or in Basel (where the view that the general council was above the pope was elevated to dogma on May 10. May 1439). In those times, papal infallibility in matters of faith was also disputed and the right to depose the pope in the event of abuse of office or incompetence was demanded. This also includes the declaration of the French clergy (declaratio cleri Gallicani) of 1682, "Gallicanism", which spread in Germany under the name "Febronianism" (after Justinus Febronius, whose real name was Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim, suffragan bishop of Trier, but who recanted. •77 )."

The view that only the entirety of the bishops (Episcopalism) - The idea that the Roman bishop alone (curialism), and not the Roman bishop alone, represented the unity of the Church thus continued to have an effect in the Catholic Church for a long time, even in modern times, where it was condemned as heresy by Leo X - a pope, incidentally, who was already a cardinal at the age of fourteen and who also made three of his cousins cardinals, including the illegitimate Giulio, the later Clement VII. Let us not forget that under Pope Leo, the Sun God, the number of canonical offices rose to two thousand two hundred' Auri sacra fames. Ja, Episcopalism actually culminated in the 7th- and 18th century. However, in 1962 the First Vatican Council, with the definition of the papal universal episcopate and papal infallibility, gave it a new impetus. the deathblow to its viability.

In the 20th century. However, in the 2nd century - because everywhere the Church preaches the truth that St. Irenaeus teaches - Catholic apologists would have us believe that already at the time of "Constantine's teaching", i.e. in the early 4th century, indeed, as follows from the quotation, even much earlier, the existence of the papacy, i.e. the imperious position of the Roman bishop, had long been an accomplished fact.

fact" (Meffert); that the bishops of Rome, so "Mit oberhirrlicher Druckgenehmigung- Domkapitula- J -eph Schielle, -has *always* exercised primacy; that they, so, gleichfalls ecclesiastical

The Nazi theologian Lortn, "always laid claim to the pre-eminence of Rome over all churches"; that the primitive power of the popes, according to - with imprimatur - Alois Knöpfler, once Privy Court Councillor, Archbishop Geitlicher Rat and church historian at the University of Munich, in antiquity - from the whole church in innumerable (!) *spontaneous* statements not only recognized, but not infrequently downright challenged ...., the Roman bishop was always (!) regarded and honored as the head of the Church, armed with higher\* divine authority; that also the signs of the Holy Fathers, as the apologists Thomas Specht and Georg Lorenz Bauer assert, -unquestionably teach that the Bishop of Rome or the Roman Church possesses primacy". In short, almost the whole of Roman Catholic theology claimed until well into the 20. In short, almost all Roman Catholic theology claimed (and to a large extent still claims today): "The primacy of the *Roman pope* was unanimously recognized by the *church fathers* and the *church assemblies* of all centuries" (F. J. Koch/Siebgartner) - a blatant lie.<sup>10</sup>

The fact is, however, that the *Nota Praevia* attached to the Church Constitution of the Second Vatican Council (on the instructions of a higher authority) grants the pope an authority that, at least verbally, goes far beyond that of the First Vatican Council, as it allows him to exercise his authority at any time as he sees fit (*ad placitum*). Paul VI was therefore fully aware that the pope was the greatest obstacle on the path to ecumenism, and two years later he could proudly claim: "We are Peter": -"We are Peter".

Even in antiquity, the Roman influence on the more important Church of the East was extremely small and therefore hardly to be brought to bear. The Oriental synods did not even know the later concept of the papacy - where did they get it from? At the great Council of Nicaea 325 ( i - ff) the -pope- was neither present nor did he carry any weight. After the Synod of Tyre

(33y), he did not claim any special rights for his cathedra. At the Council of Serdica (383 or 393), there was no attempt to make him the court of appeal in ecclesiastical disputes. On the contrary! The oriental bishops not only turned against St. Athanasius and the other criminals, but also excommunicated Julius from the city of Rome when

Instigator and leader of evil. It was not Julius [53M35\*L] but Athanasius (I ch. 8) who was the leading man of Orthodoxy."

However, if the papacy was never able to subjugate the Oriental churches, it was still able to cope more easily with the opposition in the West in antiquity. Not despite, but precisely because the Roman bishops did not stand out as theologically as others in the West, such as Hosius of Cordova, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hilarius of Poitiers, precisely because they devoted themselves much less to theology than to power, they gradually - decisively supported by their throne in the (old) imperial capital, favored by its importance, wealth and splendor - took away the original independence of all other major Western bishoprics: Milan (once again, Ambrose, not the pope, is placed first among the

-Bishops of Italy), Aquileia, Lyon, Toledo, Braga; with Italy, Gaul, Spain, Portugal, and even Scotland and Ireland becoming enslaved to the Roman hierarchs. And with the debacle of the Roman Empire, their position of power in the West grew even more, which they underpinned more effectively through the theology of St. Peter. In the end, the Roman Church virtually inherited the (Western) Roman Empire, ecclesiasticalized it and, so to speak, took its place.

This increase in Rome's power, at the expense of the Western Metropolitans and the councils, which had been the supreme church institutions since time immemorial, was of course not won without a fight.

This is shown by the considerably older case of the two Spanish bishops Basilides and Martialis, handed down by Cyprian and clearly reminiscent of the Apiarius affair. Having fallen away during the persecution, they were deprived of their see, whereupon

They appealed to Rome - the first known incident of this kind - and Bishop Stephen issued instructions to reinstate them to their offices. However, the Spanish Cemeirides refused, reported to Africa and were vindicated by a synod there. They were expressly encouraged not to associate with ungodly and defiled priests and to ignore the error of the Roman bishop.\*

Rome's power struggle is also shown by the "Easter Controversy" of Victor I (i 8p-i q8?), whereby the Roman declared, to the indignation of St. Irenaeus, that no one could be a Catholic Christian who celebrated Easter on a day other than Rome - which celebrated Easter on the Sunday after ii. Nisan of the Jews (= first full moon after the vernal equinox), but which, as St. Irenaeus pointed out, had not celebrated the feast annually at all until recently! According to church historian Euseb, many bishops at the time attacked the Roman bishop fiercely. This struggle is further illustrated by Stephen's "heretical dispute" with the likewise asserting Africans Mitre of the 3rd century (p. 7f)- And immediately afterwards the -Dionyse Controversy-, a trinity-theological dispute between the Roman bishop Dionysius (zip-z68) and his renowned Alexandrian namesake, who advocated Subordinationism, whereby the concept of the equality of the essence of Father and Son appeared for the first time (35\* !L -"

For all the authority of the Roman pontiff, his power was limited throughout this period, in the tenth and third centuries. For all the importance he already had, he had no supreme authority to exercise jurisdiction and make decisions, and neither the practice nor the thought of his contemporaries knew of a papacy in the later sense. And this essentially remained the case until the last decades of the 4th century."

Of course, with the increasing importance of the Roman chair also led to ever greater battles over him throughout entire epochs. Even during the (mostly exaggerated) persecutions of the Christs, he was coveted - even though the bishops of Rome resided side by side with their imperial persecutors, so to speak.



r! But the rivalries begin early, schismatic congregations soon become the rule, and sometimes people fight so much that streets and churches drip with blood - and all for the sake of Christ ...

## CHAPTER 3

# FIRST RIVALRIES AND TURMOIL OVER THE ROMAN EPISCOPAL SEE

-When the Bishop of Hippo closed his eyes in the Vandalensturm in 430 ..., the magic of splendor and power was already upon the throne of Peter. Donations from rich rulers gave the "Lords of Rome" the opportunity to vorfug the fish of Ksp/tsrnsun. The seriousness of the pious takes offense at their pomp not the noblest passions divide voters into parties - the Catholic theologian Joseph Bernhart'

-The successors of Peter on the Roman Bischnfsstuhl surround themselves with an often ersiaunlichen indeterminacy ... with the cepcänge of the world ... In this way a manifestation of the Petrine amm comes into being, which in its monarchical form in in some ways more like the ancient empire than the biblical image of St. Peter. The Catholic theologian Pecer Stnckmeier'

-Mzn can attribute to the letters of Hieronymus a portrayal of Christian Rome which is tiricr satire .... , and this too to the Christians

Non-hostile historians have already censured the luxury and ambition of the Roman bishops. Ee iet on the occasion of the bloody **struggle** between Damasus and Ursicinus for the episcopal see of Rome, where the famous place is to be found -When I look at the state of **affairs** in the city, I see that those men, eager to attain their wishes, must have fought each other with all the force of party; for if they attained their goal, they could be sure of *receiving* the gifts of the mstmncr cirli, of riding in carriages, of dressing themselves in splendid clothes, and o f eating such sumptuous meals that their tables overtake those of the princes... - Ferdinand Gregorovius\*

There were antipopes in Catholicism, so eager was the high clergy for the "Holy See", for thirteen centuries, right up to the end of the Middle Ages. The first antipapa - the word is only used in the 14th century (instead of the older pseudopapa, anti christus, schismaticus) - appears in the early 13th century. The last, Felix V, in 1439. (According to some, Felix was the 30th; but the number of antipopes fluctuates between 27 and 30, since not even Christian experts always know who was the rightful pope and who was not).

Anti-popes were princes of the church who made their own church more expensive; not always, of course. Felix V, for example, the widowed, wealthy Duke Amadeus VIII of Savoy, at the Council of Basel

\*1439 - m antipapa, finally received an honorable farewell, the title -Cardinal of Sabina-, the first rank in the so-called Sacred College of Cardinals and, although all not poor, because those who have should be given a lifelong pension. Yes, sometimes an antipapa even becomes a saint - and the (real) papa as well. In this church (almost) nothing is impossible.'

#### CAMP OF HL. HIPPOLYT AGAINST THE HL. CALLIST

The first antipope climbed to the honor of the altars. He became a saint of the Roman and Greek churches {feast: 13. August; as bishop of Porto 22. August; for the Greeks January 30}. Hippolytus, a disciple of St. Irenaeus, is the last

Greek-writing author of the West, *whose* extensive literary activity there in the 3rd century is completely unique. He was the first learned prelate of Rome, which is probably why

The somewhat more demanding part of the Christians, a schismatic minority, also rose up. He repeatedly called himself Bishop of Rome and his predecessor, St. Zephyrin, a philistine and ignoramus.

Hippolyte's rival Kallistr (zz2-zzz) is also holy {f-est: Ik. October); at the same time, however, "a man well versed in evil and skillful in leadership", a -hypocrite- who wins over -hardliners- as well as believers in the righteous -with sh)ae phrases- and yet himself belongs to the dregs of -heretic" history. Callist, who is still remembered by the enormous catacomb of San Callisto on the Via Appia (where he did not rest, but worked as a deacon), initially adhered to modalism, before he became an official heretic of Rome. He did not see the three divine persons as individuals, but only as modi, manifestations of *one* God, i.e. God as an undivided person. At least three successive popes advocated this

-heresy-: St. Victor I, St. Zephyrin tind just the h1. CalJist, who of course also accused the nl. Hippolytus was also accused of -heresy||, -divinity|| (ditheism).

Hippolytus, whose Catholic views were later regarded as orthodox, sought to morally destroy his rival in a vita Callisti, mockingly entitled The Martyrdom of Callistus under the praefectiis Urbi Fuscianus. The Christian-educated Callistus, a slave from the harbor district, son presumably of a slave Callistrate and once, according to Hippolytus, also a robber-hatriot, began his career as a banker. For the Roman Christian Carpophorus, a member of the imperial court, he ran a bank in the piscina publica, ann fish market, to which the Roman believers in Christ made large deposits. However, Kallist (a former predecessor of the Varikan bank boss and mafia associate Archbishop Matcinkus) speculates with the money sciries Herm, the numerous Christian widows and brothers, and brings -everything through-.

7' 8 Bankrupt, he flees on a ship to Porto, throws himself into the sea, pursued by Carpophorus, but is fished up, brought back to Rome and sentenced to the penitentiary. There he swin-  
 He breaks away and is soon arguing with Jews over accounts receivable. This causes a riot in the synagogue on the Sabbath. The Jews beat Kallist and drag him to the town prefect, where he confesses to being a Christian. But Carpo- phorus, who has rushed over, declares: "Do not believe him; he is not a Christian, but only owes a lot of embezzled money, as I will prove. The city prefect Fuscianus had Callist exiled and ordered his deportation ad metalla, to the mines of Sardinia, the island of death. Here, however, an intervention by Emperor Commodus' Christian mistress Marcia saves him, and the Roman bishop Victor brings him to safety for about ten years to Antium, one of the most popular villeggiatures of noble Rome, including the imperial house; in a d d i t i o n - what a dazzling light falls here on the "bankruptcy" of the banker - a monthly pension, which does Kallist all honor (Cardinal Hergenröther), the older literature even calls banishment; he is seriously considered a confessor in the church. With Viktor's successor, Bishop Zephyrin (xq ly) - -an unlearned and uneducated man who was ignorant of the church's ordinances, open to gifts and greedy for money- (Bishop Hippolytus) - Kallist gains more and more influence through -his constant presence and scitie Augcndreherei-, his game of intrigue-, he becomes financial advisor to the chief shepherd and, after he -Zephyrinus" and ousted Hippolytus, himself bishop of Rome. "He was a 5windy man and a schemer", writes Hippolytus about St. Callist. He had "Gih deep in the heart", -all wrong views- and a shyness, -to tell the truth-

Is it surprising that the clergy took up the doctrine of the inviolability of the office from Roman civil service law, which also allowed the unworthy holder of the office to retain his authority? Just Kallist was the first in the West to demand and realize the irremovability of the **bishop** even in the case of a death.

sin-. And this despite the fact that the Letter of Clement, which was so highly esteemed by the Church and was even voted Holy

Scripture in Syria, only calls the morally irreproachable irredeemable! In the fight against the schismatic Donatists one then developed, strictly contrary to the traditional preaching, the laxist line further zti the typically Catholic, unsurpassably cynical, but also every crookedness tolerating consequence, according to which the church is (objectively) always holy,

however corrupt its priests (subjectively) are (1\*75)-' The following of his opponent, St. Hippolytus claims, grew because

he, St. Callistus, was the first to allow sins that Christ forbade, sins -which serve to satisfy lusts-. St. Callist also admitted -two

and three times married bishops, priests and deacons to ordination" ...

Yes, he had -Women of noble class, who were unmarried and addicted to marriage at a young age, but who did not want to forfeit their rank through a legal marriage, were allowed to have a baby-sleeper of their choice, be it a slave or a free man, and to regard him as their husband, even without a legal marriage. And so so-called Christian women began to use contraceptive means and to lace themselves up in order to abort their wombs, because they did not want to have a child by a slave or a common man due to their high birth and enormous wealth. Look how far the wicked man has come in his wickedness! He teaches marriage and murder at the same time. And in response to all this, these disgraced people go about calling themselves the 'Catholic Church' and some run to them in the belief that they are doing the right thing ... This man's teaching spread all over the world."

Roman bishops and saints among themselves!

Of course, two careerists are fighting each other here. Of course, Hippolytus was driven by hatred and jealousy - the domain of so many priests. But his invectives probably hit the nail on the head. And the discrepancy with **Jesus'** teaching is evident: -Whoever even looks at a woman covetously has already committed adultery with her in his heart-. Now -Pope Kallis adultery as forgivable. If he allows to commit

young women a coitus of their choice, even without marriage! He unhesitatingly gives way to Christian morality - and the Christian plebs gratefully rally around him."

Terrullian, one of the most eloquent -heretics-, one of the greatest -Protestants- before Luther, also fumes and sneers, thunders at Kallist, -yes, who are you to twist and change ... - and calls the decree of the "Pontifex maximus-, as he mocks him with the pagan title, the -bishop of all bishops-, an -unheard neieriing-, which would have been better published in the brothels. -That's where you should be able to read about this epilogue, where people enter with hope for him. But no! It can be read in the church."

Kallist had undoubtedly demonstrated his spiritual vision, the -actual conditions (the Catholics Seppeltflöfler), - (Protestant Aland), recognized the practical necessities, had initiated a development to which the future belonged. In his "edictuin perperuum", he referred to the -apostolic key- if he, almost universally disputed, delivered it<sup>4</sup>: Mt. i6,iq. (He did not, of course, refer to Mt 5.^7 f.

Not even on x. **MOS.** 344, i. Mos. 20,20; y. **MOS. a2.,2.2; I.** Cor. 6:qj Heb. -3.4-v.A. For out of the Bible everyone takes what he needs). Kallist made his opportunistic adaptation to Daily and mass needs naturally popular. The learned, old-fashioned Hippolytus, on the other hand, author of a famous -Tra- ditio apostolica- (which also forbade soldiers and hunters to kill: I zyo, a -rigorist-, as clerical circles used to call non-lax Christians), upheld the traditional doctrine that no priest or bishop could remit apostasy, murder or fornication. Kallist, however, now declared fornication to be a forgivable sin. After the mass apostasy in the Decian persecution (p. ioo f), when "many" (Bishop Euseb), especially of the noblest, immediately forbade their faith, the church, eager for masses and power, also forgave apostasy.

And 3\*4. with the appearance of the first field monkeys (I M7 β. the murder also immediately lost its absolutely exclusive character. Thus triumphant - typical of the time and the circumstances

The hierarchs - usually the innovators. Kallist allegedly suffered martyrdom for the first time mentioned in iJ4. Later, a passio Callisti was forged, an entire martyrromari. The beadle of Alexander Severus overthrew him during the service Kallist into a well. He is also said to have fallen victim to the people's lynch law or to have jumped out of the window himself, and this - after a long and agonizing incarceration - (Wener/Welte); but he nevertheless preaches, heals, strikes. In the 12th century, the Germans have already erected gruesome representations of his suffering! And for two millennia the church celebrated him as a martyr - today even its theologians admit the falsification.

The schism continued. Hippolytus also held out against Urban I (230-238) and Pontianus (230-235). Finally, the Holy Fathers quarrelled to such an extent that Emperor Maximinus Thrax sent both Hippolytus and Pontianus to Sardinia 235, where they both died - but not in the mines, the quarries-

{Gelmi), where Catholics were still happy to let Pontianus perish in order to have one more of the extremely rare martyred popes. For in the case of honestiores, which already included bishops, the law only provided for deportation (in insulam), not condemnation (ad metalla). Pontianus is said to have been sentenced on 28. September 235 - the earliest date in Roman episcopal history confirmed by day and month! After their deaths, both opponents were brought back at the same time, buried at the same time, but in different places, and both were celebrated as martyrs. Callistus, Pontian and Hippolytus are the oldest Romans mentioned in the Depositio Martyrum of the Roman community from the year 300.

None of them became martyrs. However, the Catholic Church celebrates the feast of St. Hippolytus, who became the patron saint of horses, with

from the later 3rd century until today 13. August. It was the special holiday of the oldest Roman patron goddess Diana, who merged with the Greek Artemis, the goddess of the hunt and protector of wild animals. The legend quickly and completely engulfed Hippolytus's personality, and



After all, not a single train was left to remind us of its historical archetype."

Soon after his death, Latin became the language of the Western Church instead of the Greek world language, which also prevailed in Rome and, according to Juvenal's complaint, turned the capital into a -Graeca urbs-. And perhaps this is (also) due to the fact that the versatile, prolific church author, whose work was still used by Ambrose and Jerome, fell into oblivion in the West: Jerome and Euseb no longer even knew his bishopric. Hippolytus' successors

In an inscription in honor of the scholar, DamäStis I (3\* 3®41 concealed his title of bishop and spoke only of presbyter, apparently to preserve the memory of the first Roman schism. eradicate. He5t if Si was found in the catacombs, probably in Hippolyte's burial chamber, a marble statue, headless in a philosopher's cloak, on the bishop's chair, the outer sides of which, albeit incomplete, show his steps. The great unknown of ecclesiastical literary history, who had been unknown for so long, thus reappeared from obscurity in the West.\*

### KowsLIUS CONTRA NovATInx

Not even a generation had passed when there was a new and sharper schism between the Roman bishops Cornelius (\*II-z33) and Novatian, in which again, apart from personal rivalry, the laxer handling of the practice of the book played a role.

While the generous Cornelius - a saint, especially helpful against falling sickness and cramps - took back the heaps of Christians who had jumped off after the Decian persecution, which of course secured him victory, No- vatian rejected this brusquely. Against the majority of the Roman church and against the African church, he demanded lifelong excommunication for - Lapsi - as the church had committed -deadly sins- such as murder, marriage-

The fact is that they could not forgive a breach, a waste - in fact their oldest teaching!

Novatian was a former professional rhetorician, eloquent, strict, an excellent stylist, with a preference for Virgil and the Stoa. At the time of the persecution, he had been in charge of the Roman Christian community after the death of Bishop Fabian (z3ö bi8 z5y) - *the first* -Pdpsf- martyr on whom the death penalty was not freely imposed, who died in prison. Neither Cyprian nor the inscription plate inside his sarcophagus therefore call him a martyr. The "he

*Church, however, gave up to then of seventeen Roman bishops!*•• •!t as martyrs! -...eu documentation lacked the time; but no tomb is invented, no name mythical, and the 'Zei- The "swarm of genes\* continues to amaze", writes Frits van der Meer in general. But why should there have been no time for documentation? It was also found for masses of falsified martyr reports. And doesn't van der Meer speak on the very first page of the "immeasurable lingering of the church fathers"? But no time to document their own blood witnesses and gnr --martyr-- popes?

Novatian had justified hopes for the bishop's seat, and Cyprian of Carthage had also initially expected to be elected. Soon, however, the most unbelievable slander was circulating about the favorite, especially by Cornelius himself. Stingy and inferior in character, he taunted his opponent

-The "luminary", "dogmatist and patron of ecclesiastical knowledge", accuses him of "insatiable greed", "poisonous snakes", "deceitfulness and falsehood, perjury and lies". He reviles him as a -sly and cunning-, a -bossy-, -criminal-, a "deceitful and malicious bestic- - animal comparisons are particularly popular among arguing Christians (f iyy ff). Bishop Cornelius reports that Nova- tian had -suddenly, as if hurled by a cannon among the people, appeared as a bishop- by deceptively luring -three bishops, crude and simple-minded people, to Rome through fictitious ideas. Here he had them, spread by St. Francis of Assisi.

Cornelius over his rival, by some men of his guardian, who were employed for the purpose, and at four o'clock in the afternoon, when they were intoxicated and deaf, he forced them to give him the bishopric by an imaginary and invalid laying on of hands. And this bishopric, which was not his at all, he claimed by intrigue and cunning."

Further blasphemes, slanders Cornelius: even before his baptism, probably as a catechumen, Novatian had been plagued by evil spirits and treated by Christian exorcists; -the Satan" had -He was accustomed to it for a long time. But the worst folly of his antipode was that Novatian even implored his followers to be faithful to him when sharing the Eucharist. He is said to have firmly gripped the hands of each of them with the sentence: "Swear to me by the blood and body of our Lord Jesus Christ that you will never leave me and never go over to Cornelius!"- And instead of responding with Amen when receiving the bread, one allegedly had to vow: "I will never return to Cornelius...".

Bishop Cornelius, to whom Cyprian finally gives -the most glorious testimony of virtue and faith-, also accuses his opposing bishop of -cowardice and greed for life-, apostasy during the persecution. z58 Novatian died as a martyr. The church, however, denied this. Instead, it had Cornelius -beheaded-, who in reality,•j3. died a natural death in Centumcellae The Catholic theologian Ehrhard writes: "The accen-, -which make Pope Cornelius a martyr- are worthless, i.e. forged; hardly disputed today."

Cornelius excommunicated in the year aJi at a synod of sixty bishops Novatian and his comrades; and after an embarrassing hesitation, Cyprian of Carthage (who himself was given an opposing bishop at a small counter-council in Fortu natus in May Aya) joined Cornelius and was soon in no way behind his agitation.

Like Cornelius, Cyprian castigates the "apostates", the traitors, their "error, madness, their subversion, their rebellion". Especially Novatus, the presbyter, one of his main opponents.

ner, who receives Cyprian's episcopal consecration and soon thereafter supports Novatian, the "abject villain, the delusional-tiny schismatic" in Rome, will crack a major object of his.

-He is a man always addicted to novelty, furious in the greed of his unmerciful avarice ... Always on the lookout to betray, a schemer who only wants to deceive ... He is a loose torch to stir up the fire of indignation, a whirling storm wind to bring about the shipwreck of faith, an enemy of tranquillity, an opponent of silence, an opponent of peace". The Cyprianic tirades conjure up "the orphans whom he has robbed, the widows whom he has defrauded, and also the funds of the church which he has denied ...". -His father also died in open punishment, and he did not even have his body buried. He struck his f-rou on the abdomen with his f-foot, causing her abortion and the death of her child. And now ...""

Enough. Christians about Christians. Priests over priests.

The Novatian Church, proclaimed dead early on, continued in reality for centuries, indeed, in its historical existence it was the latent admission of the bad conscience of the Great Church, which constantly felt compelled to compromise with its environment and must have felt this too- (Andresen). The Novatians were later considered dogmatically orthodox and were also in complete agreement with the Catholics on the particularly controversial theology of the Trinity. Even Theodosius I fully tolerated them, even more so Emperor Julian. From Spain and Gaul, where Bishop Marcianus of Arles (Arles) also became a Novatian, to the Orient, there were soon two bishops and two congregations fighting each other in every major city, even though their

-This made the return to Catholicism much easier. In Constantinople, the Novatians owned three churches in the q. Acesius was bishop there under Constantine. 5Even in Rome, the Novatian schism lasted until the 5th century with a considerable following and several churches. In the East (in Syria, Asia Minor, Palestine, etc.), where Novatian was particularly popular, the sect lasted even longer; there were also numerous

Montanisten joined it here. Sometimes the Novatians even became Montanistae and Montenses. They themselves, the -community of saints-, also called themselves, -in spiritual high courage", says Euseb, -catharoi-, the -pure ones-, because their church was the church -clean of mortal sins-; a name from which the world-historical term -Catharians- and the German loan word -heretic".

In the 4. and 5. century, the Christian emperors usually fought the Novatians for the sake of imperial unity. Honorius and Theodosius II took stern action against them. Popes Innocent I and Goelestine I robbed their churches, so that their bishop Rusticiila had to hold services in private houses (- or should I have said of Coelestine, he probably introduced the Introit into the Mass? Cf. I iz f}). St. Ciril of Alexandria also deprived the Novatians of their churches and their inventory, and even let the private property of their bishop Theopemptos disappear into his pockets (S. roy). Occasionally their places of worship were even destroyed, as by Bishop Eleusios of Kyzi-koz on the Hellespont. And it is no coincidence that little remained of the writings that the philosophically trained Novatian was the first Roman theologian to publish in Latin. It is hardly a coincidence that the Novatians were particularly attractive to more educated Christians.\*

The only two scholars to have represented Christian Rome in the 17. century were antipopes; one, according to Haller, was fought against all his life, the other was excommunicated.

THE "SOUND OF GOD AND  
"PATRON nEs HoRNVIEHS"

But Cornelius (often depicted with a drinking horn) not only outstripped his rival. He became popular. As the rightful pope, a true saint (feast: September 6) and a false martyr, he became one of the so-called "Yier Marshals", "Court Marshals of God", "Himitilic Guardians", who are generally invoked in the event of plague-like epidemics, but are also venerated in the Catholic Rhineland as special emergency helpers, as a supplement to the fourteen emergency helpers (-because of their unique merits and daily help-: Cologne document of

<47f1 | the hermit Antonius above all in Wesel, Bishop Hu- bert in the Ardennes, the tribune Quirinus in Neuss, and Cor.

nelius in Selikuni, St. Severin (Cologne) or in Kornelimünster near Aachen. The extremely rich, i8oz secularized Benedictine monastery was -3-o destroyed by the Aacheners, but had to be fully replaced. And although the veneration of the -four marshals- died out after the Enlightenment, the veneration of the four saints did not. As late as the zo. Thousands are said to make a pilgrimage to Kornelimünster every year on the feast of St. Cornelli, which is even the destination of the pious - the "head" of the former court marshal. D., a silver bust reliquary. (In the late Middle Ages, the pieces of capital revered there included the cloth with which the Hciland girded himself at the Last Supper ... and the sweat stitch that was placed on the face of our Lord in the grave: Beissel SJ). Furthermore, Cornelius - patron saint of horned cattle - and thus probably also of all horned oxen, is also invoked for convulsions, epilepsy et cetera; although St. Valentine is more competent here."

## WATCH, MURDER AND LIES.

### Dix PÄPSTEtRCCELLINUS MARCELLUS MILTIADES SI LVESTER AND OTHERS

In the early 4th century, the controversial question of penance also led to disputes between Marcellus I and Eusebius. Century also led to disputes between Marcellus I and Eusebius. During the persecution of Diocletian, Pope Marcellinus (296 to 304?), like so many Christians, preferred his life to martyrdom. He sacrificed, thurificatus and traditor, to the gods and -h1. Writings; although the historical testimony, at least by Christians, Donatists, did not remain unquestioned. But even Pope Nicholas considered it proven. It is telling enough that even some old papal catalogs do not mention Marcellinus, thus practicing radical justice, damnatio memoriae - a dark chapter - on the apostate during the persecution.

After the pogrom, however, the Christians, one strict and one lax party, each with a bishop, beat each other's heads in. The government intervened twice in succession. Bishop Marcellus, Bishop Eusebius and Heraclius, the leader of the clerical opposition, were forced into exile. A double bishopric then existed until 330. The antipope was Marcus, a man of special holiness. But even Pope Damasus I invoked the vehemence of the strike: furor, odium, discordia, lites, scditio, caedes, bellum, solvuntur foedera pacis-. Thus, on the epitaph that Damasus Marcellus, a harmful rigorist, set, he still lives on as "a bitter enemy to all the wretched", is lamented among the Christians, -Discord and strife, riot and murder".^

Marcellinus and his three presbyters and successors are said to have sacrificed to the gods: Popes Marcellus I (308 to 309?), who only came after almost four years of sede vacante, the longest in papal history; Miltiades (311-312?) and Silvester I (314 to 335). However, as is so often the case, the tradition is uncertain, confused and even deliberately falsified by clerical embellishments. Yes, it is possible that Marcellinus is identical with Marcellus I (the emperor Maxentius, who was in reality

emphasizes tolerant: I zi8 ff, repeatedly delegated to stable duties and who, according to legend, *is* also *said to* have **died** in the stable, caiabulum, of course als {vtärryrer). **In any case, the Church** venerates all three or four as saints to this day. But even the Liber Pontificalis, the official papal book, describes Marellinus as a traditor (defector) and reports that he offered incense, but allows him to die a martyr's death as atonement; he is decapitated on Diocletian's orders. The decisive battle at the Milvian Bridge, the Milan Edict of Toleration and the condemnation of the Donatists took place during Miltiades' short reign.

The actual contemporary of Constantine, however, was Silvester I.

- "groß like the times-: Pope historian Gröne. In fact, however, the Roman played virtually no role in the emperor's decisions. Although he "reigned" for a full year, less is known about him than about any other bishop of the th century! This makes later Christian fictions and forgeries, to which the popes owe their entire state, all the more important. No genuine letters from St. Silvester have survived. The delivery is literally fabulous. -St. Silvester's "empire entwined with a wreath of legends" (Seppelt/Löffler), he heals the leprous emperor, he frees Rome from the poisonous breath of a dragon. And since he was presumably sacrificed to the gods, the Christian tales emphasize his steadfastness at length. The governor, however, who tries to force him to give up his Catholic possessions, suffocates on a fishbone. Yes, in the battle with the twelve Jewish masters, Silvester brings back to life a bull killed by the last master. - Your God can kill, but mine can make alive". (And indeed: on Gregor Ehrhard's high altar in blue.

beuren, -4si s', atlch on numerous later pictures, the bull lies in the püBen Silvesters)."



OF ALL KINDS OF B LUTVERGIES AND  
 FURTHER BLOODZEUG6N-  
 The FEcIzlan SCHISMA

A civil war broke out in Rome in the middle of the 4th century by Liberius (352-366)

We already encountered this pope under Emperor Constantius, when he first preferred to suffer death for God rather than agree to things that contradicted the Gospel, but then denied his faith in exile and excommunicated the "orthodox" Athanasius (368). The church teachers Athanasius and Jerome testify to this - even if in the eighteenth century the theologian Köstler from the Jesuit University of St. Georgen in Frankfurt (with double ecclesiastical approval) lies that the Pope had certainly not signed any heretical formula. In contrast, the Catholic theologian Albert Ehrhard, almost to the year, but without imprimatur, records the result of the research: "There is no doubt that Liberius signed the so-called 3rd Syrian formula. In doing so, he not only gave up the person of Athanasius, but also the keyword of the Nicene 'Homousios'."

Other Catholics have also long acknowledged this. Thus for papal historians Seppelt it is not only "beyond doubt" that Liberius -gave his signature to the so-called third Syrian formula, but that he also voluntarily accepted and signed the -first Syrian formula (of 368), which likewise reproved the Homousios. As it is also -certain- for Seppelt, -that Liberius gave the person of Athanasius preis-.

When the traitor to the Nicene faith returned to Rome on August 368, Pope Felix II was reigning there.

(368-369). But Liberius had to promise the emperor that he would recognize him as an equal, that he would be married to him.

The Roman Church had to be governed by the Roman Catholic Church - a severe humiliation and impossible under canon law. But only under this condition, which was also advocated by the Synod of Sirmium (368), was

Liberius had been allowed to return. On the other hand, Felix himself, together with the deacon Damasus, the later pope, and the entire Roman clergy, had sworn a solemn oath when Tiberius was banished that no one else would be recognized as bishop of Rome during his lifetime. Only months later, however, Felix, allegedly raised by the Arian party at the emperor's command, accepted the papacy, reinstated the Arians into the church, and the Roman clergy joined him. Both the clergy and the new pope broke their oaths. And even Liberius was not deterred by the *wen* given to the ruler from throwing himself on Felix and his weaker followers. For the people are said to have remained loyal to the hidden one, cheering and shouting for him on his return: -One God, one emperor, one bishop! - The Felician Schism, the power struggle between two Roman bishops who had both betrayed the orthodox confession of Nicaea for the sake of advantage, led to bloody battles, the so-called Felician Murder. Felix II, as bishop in the

official bishop's catalog, was 3i -exiled and went to his country estate near Porto. Spiter he tried a come-back, conquered the Basilica Julii on the other side of the Tiber, but was soon chased away and died, forgotten for a long time, in Porto ann ze. November 36a. But Pope Liberius, who had signed a semi-Arian confession of faith under the Arian emperor Constantius, persecuted the Arians again under the Catholic emperor Valentinian I.'-.

Nevertheless, the official Roman tradition reverted to Felix 11th and even counted him among the rightful popes and saints, while Liberius no longer played any particular role outside Rome even in the last years of his life and was morally compromised without salvation. The oath-breaking Felix, however, was considered a legitimate pope and holy martyr since the 6th century, allegedly due to the strange confusion with a martyr Felix on the Via Portucnsis or with another of this name venerated on the Via Amelia

{Fixed: zq. )uli).

The official pope's book, which admittedly took more than half a year to complete.

send is of little historical value, vouches for his martyrdom.

-Felix was a Roman ..., he reigned one year, three months, three days. He declared Constantius a heretic, so the emperor had him beheaded ... He suffered death in the city of Corona with many priests and believers in the month of November ...""

Since Constantius, who had Pope Felix beheaded, had already died in 361, but Felix only died under the Catholic Emperor

After the death of Valentinian I in the year 3 y, some of his successors seem to have thought about this martyrdom of the (anti-)pope. The process of forming an opinion took time, as Rome can wait longer than a millennium. But then Gregory XIII (1572-1585) - that -Holy Father- who not only celebrated the mass murders of St. Bartholomew's Night with a Tedeum, but also approved the plan to assassinate the English Queen Elizabeth I (affirming, -sinceQ anyone who *scarfs* her out of the world *with* the due intention of serving God thereby, not only does not sin, but even acquires a merit") - this sensitive pope wanted to be able to do so while reviewing the

"Roman book of torture - delete his early predecessor Felix from it."

Now, however, wonderful and miraculous things happened in the church of St. Cosmas and St. John the Baptist, built by Felix IV in the 6th century on the ruins of two pagan temples.

Damian, twin brothers and martyrs. On 303 \*they and three other brothers lost their heads, after they had been thrown into the sea in a fist, saved by an angel, a fire that

The first of them, who was supposed to have destroyed the gods, burned the bystanders, turned a whole series of arrows and stones hurled against them and slew their henchmen; whereupon they were soon invoked throughout Christendom as popular saints, and also became patrons of doctors, apothecaries and medical faculties. And although in the last century even J. P. Kirsch, Apostolic Protonotai and Director of the Pontifical Archaeological Institute, Rome, stated with imprimatur: Genuine historical accounts of the life and martyrdom of the twin brothers are missing", the Catholic Hümmeler, likewise in the eighth

century and

also with imprimatur: -since then", since the 6th century, -their veneration has not died out". On the contrary, they were -the only saint of the Oriental Church ... included in the canon of the Holy Mass. And Kirsch adds: -her alleged relics came to Bremen in 968, -<49 fläCh St. Michael in Munich (precious shrine). - : \*7 +ptember, at the Greeks -October 7-."

How here the natural and the supernatural, legend, that is The fact that lies and history (which, of course, often mean the same thing) are intertwined is also the case with Felix II. For it was precisely in the Roman church of these miraculous blood witnesses, St. Cosmas and St. Damian, that on July 28. July 1882, on the eve of the memorial day of (Anti-)Pope Felix II, a marble coffin with the -alren- Inscription: -"Here lies the body of the holy Pope and blood witness Felix, who condemned the heretic Constantius". Thereupon the name of Felix remained -in the book of martyrdom-."

### **MoRE POPE DAMASUS FIGHTrr COUNTERPOPE URS INUS AND OTHER DEVILS**

With the growing power of the Roman See, the ever-increasing influence, wealth and luxur of its holders, the priests became ever more eager for this *seal*, whereby the increased use of the term "sedes apostolica" and a new authoritarian tendency towards other churches was noticeable. In the year 37, a Roman synod already spoke of Bishops who threaten other bishops with death, chase them away, deprive them of their bishopric. The historian Ammianus Marcellinus, a pagan who strives for impartiality and takes a rather benevolent view of Christianity, who moved from his home town of Antioch to Rome around 380, attributes the battles for the Roman cathedra to the feudal lifestyle opportunities of the popes. Around the same time, the highly educated

The city prefect Praetextatus, also a pagan like, according to Augustine's testimony, almost the entire Roman nobility at the time, mocked Damasus' attempts with the **San:** -Make me bishop of Rome and I will immediately become Christa. The table of this ecclesiastical prince is said to have already eclipsed a royal banquet. "But the poor country clergy occasionally come to Rome to get drunk there unseen- (C. Schneider).\*"

The Catholic papal historian V. Gröne, who is a shocking representative of distortionists and whitewashers, reads it all like this: -At the time **when Damasus** assumed the pontificate, the papacy had attained such a high reputation that he had to refrain from the apostles' arexuth for the sake of the common church and limit himself to practicing it only in spirit. The supreme bishop of the church was compelled to surround himself with worldly splendor and to make an effort in clothing, housing and banquets in order to represent the church with its precious libraries, golden vessels, purple robes and magnificent altars in a manner worthy of the world. Just as Peter had to come to Rome with a pilgrim's staff in order to conquer the opulent, rich, over-saturated, so his successor had to turn the wooden staff into a golden one with the passing of the years and clothe his feet with purple sandals in order to protect and preserve the torn, plundered, deserted."

It was under Damasus I (3d -38d), servant of the Most High since his youth and known as the "ear tickler of the ladies" (*Matronarum auriscalpius*) because of his beautiful oratory, which was especially stimulating to women, that there were more battles than ever before; intrigues, Yerleimdiingeri and financial dealings so sinister that they already remind scholars of Renaissance popes. After all, this first reasonably outstanding, but difficult to understand, sixty year old pope had already clearly recognized the allure of power and ruled for longer.

ats all his predecessors, eighteen years. "Beyond human measure", writes Ammian, he, Damasus, and his opponent Ursinus were "eager to seize the episcopal see". Through terror and bribery, Damasus, who had first sworn allegiance to Pope Liberius, who had made him a deacon, finally prevailed, but then, under antipope Felix, defeated Felix and returned to Liberius after Liberius' return.

Knun, the light celebrations for the latter had ended on a<sup>c</sup>. *September 66*, when a part of the clergy elevated Deacon Ursinus as his successor and had him consecrated immediately in the Basilica of Julius (S. Maria di Trastevere) by the Bishop of Tivoli. Meanwhile, the greater part of the clergy was still busy in S. Lorenzo in Lucina with the election of the priest's son Damasus, who incidentally now again left the party of Liberius and led that of the inferior (Gtgen) Pope Felix to victory (his third change after all): The start of months of rioting in -holy- Rome, the "capital of piety" (cf. Sozomeaos). There were outright battles in the streets and squares, the basilicas swam in blood. For Damasus, the whole Catholic Church was a single bridal chamber of Christ, but the Roman Church was something special, superior to the other churches ... through the *word of* our Lord and Savior in the Gospel, who gave it primacy by saying: 'You are Peter and on this rock I will build my church'. Damasus did not forget to additionally commemorate St. Paul, who "on the same day with Peter gloriously attained the martyr's crown under the Emperor Nero-, and by this double triumph -worthy of veneration- the Church of Rome is -ahead of other cities of the whole world. It is therefore the first seat of the Apostle Peter, the Roman one, which has no stain or wrinkle or anything of this kind.

has - .--

So in the year 38x. What follows now already happened<sup>3 6</sup> at the papal election, after which Damasus "continued the policy of conciliation begun by Liberius (Catholic Seppelt}).

First, a mob armed with truncheons pounced on the

the followers of Ursinus still assembled in the church, **WO2U**, as it had, had inflamed Damasus and won the meage by ample money. For three days, the Catholics again bloodily fought over the - already contested under Liberius (p. 109)

- Basilica of St. Julius. Damasus, who was hiding in the Lateran with a bodyguard, then had all his opponent's clerics dragged off by police beaters and threw them out of office. However, a pack of people snatched them away and entrenched themselves with them on the Esquiline in the Basilica Liberiana (Santa Maria Maggiore). On 26. On October 6, 366, the pope's troop of thugs, a bunch of carters, circus men and gravediggers, whom the wealthy pontiff had hired as private mercenaries, broke through the gates, entered, set fire to the building and bombarded it with roof tiles from above. For Damasus,

-This "God-inspired and art-loving priest", "a very great character", made the *power of* the original Christian temple, which had been set aside for the battle for so long, free for the reconstruction (Hümine- ler, with ecclesiastical printing permission). At least 27 men and women, all followers of Ursinus, gave their lives for the reconstruction of the holy place; according to an Ursian report, as many as 200 people - not counting the seriously injured who still succumbed to their wounds, a total of hundreds of victims, wounded and burnt. Yet, in a sheer miracle of God, *not* a single one of Damasus' spies perished, whose "childlike and pious mind" is also praised in the old Catholic church encyclopedia by Wetzer/Welte (a twelve-volume, -encyclopaedia" published "with the collaboration of the most eminent Catholic scholars in Germany", on the first page of which - I can hardly suppress this for the sake of the humility always preached there - the Freiburg senior pastor

1847 so -Our approval- granted and authorized to pre-print it to the work": "Sfr Hermann von ViCori, by Goxes

Mercy and Apostolic Grace Archbishop of Freiburg and Metropolitan of the Upper Rhine Ecclesiastical Province, Grand Cross of the Order of the Lion of Zähringen, Holder of the Princely Hohenzollern-Hechingen and Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen'-



Honorary Cross I. Class ..." -so, yes "thus We grant this first volume Our Approbation ...-).

City prefect Viventius, -integer et prudens Pannonius", as Ammian says, was undoubtedly a capable man, but without sufficient means of power. Thus, respecting the motto of non-intervention in sacred disputes, he first enjoyed the spectacle as a spectator, then withdrew to the peace and safety of his country villa, the Ursians held funeral litanies and the crowd shouted, apparently remembering Damasus' leading role in the Felician murders: -For the fifth time already Damasus makes war, down from the throne of Peter with the murderers!- Various pamphlets also circulated. An Ursian party paper praised the God-fearing people, -who, although tormented by many vedolgings\*, feared neither emperor nor officials, nor the author of all crimes, the murderer Damasus. Not to forget that this pope also hincer the "The blood edicts of the Emperor Theodosius were followed by the hunt for the Christians who had apostatized from him, Damasus, whom the state itself supported with all means of violence."

Of course, the papal mass murderer became a saint. Feast: December i i. And in his memory, as it were, the court of Damasus, the representative court of the **papal palace**, was named after him. **I** always remember Claude Adrien Helvétii" (7\*5 \*77\*):

-When you read their saints' legends, you find the names of a thousand holy cows - an accommodating exaggeration by the great Enlightenment philosopher. (And if I am allowed to express a personal preference: Of all the saints, I only like the holy cows; but all the other cows are just as important to me)."

**Damasus**, who conquered the little ship of Peter with the help of the government, now had to steer it with the rudder of the apostle, which we have received. **Although** he hypocritically confessed that he was not worthy of this honor, he made every effort to see if we could not achieve the glory of his beatitude. Even when the main battle had been fought, his bishopric was still

denied during his entire term of office. For years to come, there were turmoil, acts of violence and the torture of clerics of the antipope. The Luciferians were also on the rampage; Damasus urged the judge Bassus to intervene against them in vain. The Novatians still existed, as did remnants of the Markionites, Montanists and Valentinian Gnostics. The **Pope took action** against the Arians and Semiarians, against the "heretical" bishops Ursacius, Valens and Auxentius of Milan, all of whom he had to condemn, against the emerging "heresy" of Patriarch Macedonius (Pneumatomache) and against the Apollinarists. The Donatists had also been represented in Rome for a short time, where at least four different -churches- fought, all of which had their own chief shepherds, the Donatists the sixth bishop in succession since the beginning of the fourth century. Damasus forbade the Luciferian presbyter Macarius from performing ceremonial acts and, when he held services in a private house at night, had him arrested by his clergy together with the state police (officiales) and hauled before a secular judge with a hearing. As Macarius did not go over to Damasus, even through threats, he was sent to Ostia, where he succumbed to his injuries (vg1. I 390). It should also be remembered that St. Damasus had the hunted Spanish bishops Priscillian, Instantinus and Salvian in the winter of 312, in spite of their imploring pleas (-Give us a hearing ... give us, so we ask f)ehentlich ...-) did not receive Priscillian in audience and Priscillian, along with his richest followers, including the Mitwe Euchrotia, who was blessed with goods,

318 in Trier, whereupon the Inquisition spread to Spain (I 319 ff.). Assemblies and services of the Ursinians were also blown up by Damascene shock troops at Friuli, Ursinus and his comrades were banished by Emperor Valentinian I first to Gaul, then to Milan, without him ceasing to act from afar, not only against Damasus, but also against his successors. And when the emperor allowed him to return, new battles broke out, whereupon he was expelled for good and interned in Cologne. But the conflict **continued**, as Dama-

sus lived. And as late as 1968, the majority of the Roman Synod refused to excommunicate Antipope Ursinus, no matter how much Damasus urged and promised. -We did not come together to condemn someone unheard." The pope was too suspect in too many ways.

And more than suspicious.

3yz, Damasus was accused of adultery.

Now the "ear tickler of the ladies", whose father himself had been a priest (at San Lorenzo), was in close contact with rich women, but he was also the author of several (not preserved) treatises on virginity and, according to Jerome, who was highly experienced in this area, was himself a virgin teacher of a virgin church; a priest who preached to clergymen to "keep the bed chaste", to "beget children for God" (a somewhat ambiguous formulation), who commanded perpetual abstinence, since "holy things are meant for holy people" and "carnal union means corruption" (cf. Leo I., p. xy8), the -unchaste" living priest -puts himself -on a level" with the animals- and does not deserve the name of priest. Could such a pope be an adulterer? A man, -adorned with all kinds of animal dignities-, who through his godly walk -set himself an eternal monument-, as Bishop Theodoret praises? A man of whom Grönes last sentence of his Damasus chapter affirms:

-His contemporaries venerated him as a saint and even today the Italian people invoke his intercession against fever!"

However, Damasus was not only accused of adultery, but also of a whole series of serious crimes by the converted Jew Isaac, who had returned to the Synagogue (and was allegedly not left alone until his death 38 times). Yes, he was even accused of murder. -The party of Ursinus finally got so far out of hand," they later lamented, "that the head of our holy brother Damasus was demanded on the pretext of the Jew Isaac. And since he was incriminated, although the emperor stood behind him, bad things had to happen.

burdens are present. Valentinian I. had his special representative, the prefect Maximin (whom Ammian compares to a circus beast let loose - he was executed in \* 37), initiate the undercuts, then in the trial, in which individual witnesses, invited clerics, were also tortured, he tried them before himself, but finally discontinued the proceedings. Of course, this was hardly due to the intervention of the Antiochian priestess Eulogios, a childhood friend of the emperor, but because the government had supported Daitlasus from the outset and could not now bring him down with a criminal complaint from the opposing party. Thus Valentinian now called Damasus "virum mentis sanctissimae".

Nevertheless, his reputation was so ruined that seven years later, at a synod in Rome, which he himself presided over, he rehabilitated himself and denounced the accusations against him as slanderous. However, it was precisely this synod that sought to remove the Roman bishop from state jurisdiction altogether! And it also sought the involvement of the state in the enforcement of ecclesiastical judgments! It already understood the -worldly arm-, which the Holy Father rejected far from himself, as the executive organ of the Inquisition. Clerics from all over Italy who disregarded the judgment of an ecclesiastical court were to be brought before the Bishop of Rome in the second instance with the help of the authorities. For the other clergy of the West, the metropolitans were to be the second instance, and for the trials of the metropolitans themselves, the Roman bishop or his appointed judge. -Your from me Majesty, it says in the petition, which St. Amōrosius had also strongly influenced, -would order that anyone who was condemned by the Roman bishop's decision and wanted to keep his church unlawfully ... be summoned by the prefects of Italy or the imperial vicar of Rome, or else submit to judges appointed by the Roman bishop ... But whoever is excluded in this way, if he does not shy away from God's judgment, should at least be *brought by state coercion* not to increase his sins. , .-"

Damasus's aggressive initiative was successful. The still very young emperor (I yoz ff), who was strongly supported by the clergy, especially Ambrose, adopted the synod's proposal almost verbatim and gave it the force of law. Indeed, Gratian was more papal than the pope in one respect. He authorized the involvement of Catholic officials in the execution of episcopal judgments not only for Italy, but for the entire Roman Empire. Of course, all this was more on paper, as the patriarch of Rome did not yet have the position in the West that the patriarchs of the East had within their patriarchate."

Even a Doctor of the Church, St. Basil the Great, complained bitterly about this pope. He called him blind, arrogant, saw him as arrogant on an -exalted throne- and once regretted having asked him for something, as the arrogant one becomes -even more arrogant when he is met politely-. In the West, Basil writes, -they neither know the truth, nor do they want to know it-, indeed, he claims that -they argued with people who told them the truth, but approved of heresy themselves.- In contrast, St. Jerome (a great schemer, liar, document forger and predestined patron of Catholic theological faculties), who always hung his coat of arms to the wind, courted this pope: I I6Q ffi this pope. Whoever is associated with Peter's chair, Hieronymiis wrote, is his man. "Following no leader but Christ, I join in communion with Your Holiness, that is, with the Cathedra of Peter; I know that the Church is built on these feet."

Hieronymtis' sycophantic diligence met with the warmest approval from the hierarch in Rome, where the Doctor of the Church 38s traveled. He soon played a major role under Damasus, served him as secretary, secret scribe, wrote, so he himself says, "the decisions on synodal consultations from East and West", apostrophized the Pope as "light of the world and salt of the earth", flattered him: -Now the sun of justice is rising in the West-. He also supported Damasus' fight against the Luciferians. And although Jerome called St. Lucifer

of Cagliari (I 38q ff) as a stronghold of orthodoxy, he immediately opposed the Sardinian bishop's followers in Rome, where the priest Macarius was massacred (p. i iö), and hurled one of his infamous controversial harangues against him, above all to please the old pope, in whose place he himself hoped to be replaced. (Instead of him, however, St. Siricius followed, whom Jerome still belittled years later). Lucifer's partners, however, complained about Damasus after 380: -Increasing the authority of a king (accepta auctoritate regali), he persecutes Catholic priests and laymen and sends them into exile. "\*'

### ACHIEVING ŪRIMATIC APPEALS UNTEL Dan sus

Various initiatives of this marine now opened up a development that increased the importance and rank of his see and gradually made the Roman bishop the lord of all Western prelates.

It is no coincidence that a contemporary speaks of the -arrognn- tia Damasi (ut princeps episcopatus)-. And today, the Catholic Handbook of Church History calls him a "determined advocate of a steadily growing Roman claim to primacy, which through him finds hitherto unknown formulations". In part, he strives for this primacy by appealing to Mt. i6,z8 f, to the Petrine principle, which gives Rome singularity, but also creates new expressions for it.

However, Emperor Gratian, a mostly docile young man (I 4oz fi), supported his desire for leadership. Not only did he renounce the title of -Pontifex maxi- mus-, to which the ruler had previously been entitled, in favor of the Roman bishops, but he also increased their jurisdiction by means of imperial law for the Westen, within limits that could ultimately still be fixed. Damasus, who issued the first decretal, i.e. made decrees in the imperial tone of command, also asserted the foundation of the church of Rome by Peter

and Paul, a double apostolate, he was the first -pope-, as far as is known, to speak of the "apostolic throne", he had it said of himself that he towered over all those to whom he was equal in office (munus) -by the prerogative of the apostolic throne- (praerogativa apostolicae sedis), and to this day the Roman episcopate has been called the -Sede Apostolica-. All this established and promoted Roman primacy. -Damasus Iie4 was privileged by the state and acted like a king (merchant)."

Incidentally, he also acted as a poet. He wrote lamentable but numerous inscriptions (tituli), of which more than half a hundred still exist in full, *in* fragments *or* in literary form. He met his poetic needs with stereotypical phrases borrowed from Virgil and then had his epigrams transferred to marble by the hand of the calligrapher Furius Dionysius Philokalus - never, scoffs Louis Duchesne, "have worse verses been endowed with greater lavishness". Damasus's excerpts, which are as artless as they are spiritless, were not least intended for his own posthumous restitution, but were above all dedicated to the "many saints he tracked down, found" and, according to the Vita Damasi of the Liber Pontificalis, "glorified in verse".

For example: Deep under the burden of the mountain lay hidden the grave, Damasus brought it to light. Or: -Damasus did not suffer that those who were buried according to common law, after they had found rest, suffered another sad punishment. So he set about the great, laborious work and had the huge masses of earth removed from the top of the hill, diligently searched the secret bowels of the earth, drained the entire area soaked by water and came across the spring, which now gives gifts of salvation." Or, to come back to the actual topic, one last papal poetic product: - Know, here once the saints had their dwelling, whose names, if you ask, are Peter and Paul. The Orient sent these disciples - We readily concede this - but for the sake of the merit of her blood - even though she follows Christ across the stars into the shoB of heaven and the kingdom of the pious

Rome was allowed to claim them as her citizens. So may Damasus proclaim your praise, you new stars!

It may be left open or written in the stars as to how many saints the man so eagerly searching for martyrs has swindled in this way. But this is what it looks like when a murderer pope "Poet Pope". (Compare the far more eloquent steles of Pius XII in the 20. century!)

Since Damasus, there has atich been the theory of the three Petrine seats of Alexandria, Antioch and Rome to justify their patriarchal rights; whereby among the three great thronoi, the first seat of the Apostle Peter naturally belongs to the Roman Church. But even according to Pope Gregory I, -the Great- and Doctor of the Church, these three seats are "one seat and that of one (St. Peter), presided over by three bishops by divine authority". According to this, the Alexandrian and Antiochian patriarchs, as successors of St. Peter, have the authority by divine right to govern a part of the Church. Apart from a number of historical dubiousnesses, this is a **ziemlickly** twofold theory.

How did Rome come to this? Well, at one time, when it was not yet as powerful as it wanted to be, it was able to put itself on an equal footing with the influential Eastern church leaders and yet, as the headquarters of the Princes of the Apostles, so to speak, claim the greatest honor itself. And then, the real reason, it tried to use this theory to fight its most feared rival, the Patriarch of Constantinople, since he, as the representative of a non-Petrine see, had a right to precedence. And it is precisely in this context that the theory often emerges: at the time of Damasus, with Leo I, Gregory I, Nicholas I, Leo IX - whereby the theoretical denial of Constantinople's claims to patriarchal dignity was followed, reluctantly enough, by practical recognition.\*'

The development of papal supremacy was only just beginning. Even in Rome, Damasus's office was strongly contested during his entire pontificate. In the evening and beyond, it was not he who led the Church, but clearly the Pope.



Ambrose (I chap. q). The Milanese influenced, if not to say dominated, the work of Ambrose with a sophisticated

-The emperors were the most important spiritual strategy, and his episcopal city was also the capital of the destens. Even the sensational triumph over the Roman goddess of victory in the senate hall (I Uni ff) was not won by Damasus, but exclusively by Ambrose, the powerful resident prelate, as in all other cases.

Nowhere can we speak of papal politics. The Bishop of Rome did not even rule all of Italy in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. He apparently only governed the so-called suburbicarian

churches, the southern and central part of the peninsula (bounded there by a line roughly from the Gulf of Lu Spezia to the mouth of the Po). -Beyond this, nothing can be discovered of any kind of authority of the Bishop of Rome (Hal-ler). Certainly his see was the most prestigious in the West. But he himself was still subject to the jurisdiction of the vicarius urbis. And when an attempt was made at that time by petition to remove the Roman bishop from the punitive power of the city prefect (almost always still a pagan) and to give him a privileged judicial status before the ruler, even Gratian rejected this without going into detail. As an alternative to the imperial court, it was now also suggested that the Roman be subjected to the spiritual jurisdiction of a council. For the first time in church history, the assertion - also reported by Ambrose - that Emperor Valentinian I had decreed that clergymen could only be judged by clergymen appeared at a papal synod. For it was not yet known at the time that "the first see may not be judged by anyone", as was later taught."

INNOZENZ I " THE TOP OF THE BISHOP'S OFFICE - ,  
OR JUST LIES)

The popes who followed Damasus and Siricius (34-398), who was also still completely overshadowed by Ambrose, who was his personal friend, and who did not appear to be a leader anywhere, built

The primacy of Rome, its monopoly position as "apostolica sedes", as "cathedra Petri", in short, the idea of the Roman church as the head of the universal church, was nevertheless increasingly being challenged, whereby they used the Bible, i.e. what suited them in it, as well as Roman law.

And not least the official jargon.

Siricius in particular, who also coined the term "heir of Peter" - a foundation of every future papal ideology - in order to suggest a quasi-legal connection between himself and the apostle, largely adapted his decrees to the style and terminology of the imperial decrees. Of course, only the synods had previously used their model in the Church. Siricius, however, now presented his new decretal legislation as a well-known type of ecclesiastical law and at the same time placed it on a par with the synodal canons (Voytovych). However, as much as the heir of Peter liked to appear as overlord, as much as he emphasized his leading role and legal supremacy within the whole church - -We describe-, he wrote in his first decretal, immediately after his consecration, to the Spanish bishop Himerius of Tarroco, -what from now on all churches must follow and what they must refrain from ...- -, reality was still a long way from theory. The

-Heir (haeres), the succession of Peter, the appointment of the pope as heir, was a pure construction that lacked and still lacks any provability and thus legal validity.

Innocent I. (401-417), who was said to bear the title of "first pope" with more justification than any of his predecessors, developed the papal claims to primacy and the monopoly position of the Roman Church in a targeted manner.

and continued to have an impact into the 13th century. He set the tone for the millennium. He was helped by a number of factors: the powerful Ambrosians, the concurrent in Milan, was dead, Milan itself was no longer a residence but Ravenna, and the White Roman Empire was already very close to collapse. The decisive factor, however, came from himself. After all, he felt himself to be the head and highest peak of the Episcopate. Indeed, to the synods of Carthage and Mileve Jxö he represented the claim - which he dared not always and freely defend to all churches - that without the knowledge of the -apostolic see-, even con- councils of even the most distant regions should not make final decisions. He, the jurist, coldly presented new law as old, new customs as traditional, sacred ones, without the past offering any examples or basis for this. But all this was cleverly calculated, for: -Only by fixing for long existing what was in reality the boldest innovation could he hope to withstand the criticism of his contemporaries- (Haller). He was unabashedly self-confident, albeit adapted to local conditions, i.e. somewhat more brash in Spain than in Gaul, where Rome had recently experienced difficulties. He wanted supreme supervision of the synods and proclaimed the Apostolic See as the highest court of appeal, to which all grave cases (causae maiores) - which he could of course interpret as he wished - were to be submitted. (-The tombs praise him especially for his virtues of gentleness and modesty:- Gröne.)°.

As a crsccr?apsc, Tinnozenz T. used the legal concept of the pope as the successor of Peter consistently and systematically" (Ullmann). Peter or his disciples are regarded by him as the founders of all the churches of the West, for which there is not the slightest evidence anywhere. -It is a revealed fact, he boldly states in a letter to Decentius of Gubbio, "that in all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily and the islands in between, no one has built churches except those who were made bishops by the worthy apostle Peter or his successors. Just read whether

another of the apostles is found in these lands, who according to tradition is said to have taught there. But if it is not to be read, because it is not handed down anywhere, then all must follow what the Roman Church preserves, from which they undoubtedly took their origin.- Because nothing else is written anywhere, Pope Vincent breathtakingly concludes that everything was missionized by Peter or his disciples and thus subject to the Roman bishop. One understands Haller's mockery, with greater audacity the argumentum e silentio, the proof from the silence of the sources, -which has never been used for a historical assertion that in truth was completely up in the air. Erich Caspar emphasizes that the Doctor of the Church Augustinus, next to whom "the figure of Innocent I almost seems to disappear", represented "the exact opposite of the Innocent thesis". Even the Catholic papal historians Seppelt/Schwaiger write that what the Pope is saying - a tremendously serious, far-reaching assertion, or more correctly: untruth - is now in no way consistent with the historical facts; -but it reflects the ideas that have gained more and more influence in Rome - and to which, we may add, we owe the papacy - nothing but lies! Innozenz, however, deduces special rights, that is, of course, privileges, the observance of the "referre ad sedem apostolicam", the respect of the consuetudo Romana as the only valid norm, from his brazenly obtained premise. Only the decision of the Roman bishop made every decision on any matter of importance, on the causae maiores, final. The alleged seat of Peter becomes "fons" and "caput" - -all waters flow from the apostolic see, as it were the primordial source, and pour out in the purest form over all regions of the earth'- (totius mundi regiones). And log ice-cold, the referre ad sedem apostolicam corresponds to ancient tradition!"

Perhaps lies and deceit were already in Pope Innocent's blood. He was most likely the son of his predecessor Anastasius I, who in turn came from a priestly marriage.

Parenthetically, there were priestly offspring in Rome throughout the entire first millennium who became popes; among others: Boniface I, Felix III (allegedly the great-grandfather of Pope Gregory I, the "Great"), Agapet I, bishop's son Theodor I, bishop's son Hadrian II (whose former wife Stefania and whose daughter Eiri murdered the son of Bishop Arsenius, a multiple father). Martin II was also a priest's son, as was Boniface VI (who led such a scandalous life as a presbyter that Pope John VIII had to suspend him; he reigned for only two weeks and was possibly poisoned). St. Pope Silverius (banished by his successor Vigilius to the island of Ponza, where he died) is even the son of Pope Hormisdas. John XI. (who threw his mother into prison together with his papal half-brother and ordered her to die there, but according to the chronicler Flodoard of Rheims without violence, only

to do divine things"; "vigor and energy cannot be denied to his pontificate-: the Catholics Seppelt/Schwaiger), Pope John XI was the son of Pope Sergius III. (the murderer of his two predecessors). But he also rebuilt the Lateran Basilica, which had been destroyed by an earthquake, not to conceal the -daø good- (?) And did Damasus not demand that the clergy -beget children for God- (p. ^\*7J "

Or should I have read the liturgical decrees of the papal priests? Innozenz II sollte teilen sollen? To give the peace sign at Holy Mass only after the consecration? To read out the names of the sacrificing faithful only after the corresponding prayers of the priest over the gifts? To fast on Saturday for the sake of the Savior resting in the tomb? Cf. I ia f.) Pope historian Gröne fills exactly half of his chapter on Innocent with such nonsense, to the greatest benefit of course of the reader, who thus gets to know in St. Innocent a pope experienced in church customs and laws and imbued with an apostolic spirit.

In any case, he knew his business. Did he know how to challenge the Roman superiority, the superior, the monarch?

The tone of his letters, richly interwoven with biblical quotations, was less threatening than cuttingly polite. The tone of his letters, richly interwoven with biblical quotations, less threatening than cuttingly polite, not infrequently subtly ironic and discreetly humiliating, had a stylistic effect in spiritual epistolography. -We believe that you know that anyway-, he writes. Or: -Who should not know?" -Who should not yet have recognized?" *Miramur* was his favorite word, his almost stereotypical rebuke. -We are astonished that a wise man should ask our advice about these things, which are absolutely certain and well known". -We have long wondered when reading your letter"; -we wonder that the bishops overlook such things, so that one could judge that they were abetting or were unaware of the illegality. *Gtit* comments *Caspar*: -The true virtuosi of ruling prefer to work with such soft, sharp tones than with the thunderbolts of violent threats; in this way they know how to make the person concerned flinch in fright, while coarse means repel him or provoke him to resistance. One can imagine that the suburbicai episcopate must have trembled before this spiritual overlord."

But Innocent I was certainly flexible.

He was already behaving more moderately towards the more distant Gallic bishops. And in the East, even this cunning priest had little to say. It is true that he wanted to control the church of Constantinople. He was probably the first pope to keep a *chargé d'affaires* at the residence there, an -apocrisiar-, as the permanent papal representative at the imperial court of Constantinople was then called, the most important diplomatic post in Rome - under Innocent, apparently the priest *Boniface*, the later pope (p. \*3 ff). It is true that Innocent - after *Damasus*, assuming the authenticity of his letters, had already spun his threads there - was, so to speak the founder of the papal vicariate of Thessalonica {Sa- loniki), in that he, in the struggle against Constantinople and at the

On the side of his own state republic, he claimed jurisdiction over eastern Illyria (Illyricum orientale), entrusted Liz Bishop Rufus -in our place- (nostra vice) with all the districts of the Illyrian prefecture, the churches in Achaia, Thesialia, Epirus vetus and nova, Crete, Dacia mediterranea and ripensis, Moesia, Dardania and Praevalitana, also generously extended the privileges of the metropolitan, namely -to judge everything that is negotiated in those regions . But when he and Honorius sent a delegation to Constantinople in the dispute over John Chrysostom, it was treated abusively, not received by the emperor and ignominiously sent home.

(p. \*54) The patriarchs of the East did not think of submitting to the "Archbishop" of Rome, as even a Leo

I at the Council of Chalcedon, to Origen. And even more so, the emperor did not let a Roman bishop take the decision out of his hands. According to imperial law, Illyria was subject to Constantinople both ecclesiastically and politically, and Christian emperors and bishops continued to argue about it for a long time, and it remained a particular bone of contention between Rome and Byzantium, a source of constantly renewed conflicts of jurisdiction and power games."

**EuLALIUS AGAINST BONIFAZ,  
"THE APOSTOLIC APPLE"**

There was a months-long struggle for the Roman see after the death of Pope Zosim - (4<7 4-8; cf. 4s7 fi, who was the first to apply Jesus' alleged word of binding and loosing to the bishops of Rome, claiming for them, by astonishing inference, the same authority and veneration as Peter. Indeed, Zosimus claimed that he had such great authority that no one was allowed to shake his sentence - -ut nullus de nostra possit retractare sententia-. And he crowned this impertinence with the greater one that the "fathers" had this authority as

apostolically recognized! Despite his short pontificate, Zosimus further consolidated the *auctoritas sedis apostolicae* he so fiercely desired, although he provoked no less fierce opposition, especially from the African Church.

On the very day of Zosimus' burial, a \*7- December, the archdeacon Eulalius ('ti8-qiq), the oldest of the diocese, was made the spiritual head of Rome in the Lateran Basilica. According to the opposing party, he had occupied the church during the funeral ceremonies, barricaded the entrances and had the "will-less, because half-dead, dying bishop of Ostia"

{Wetzer/Welte}, was forced to ordain him. The next day, the majority of the presbyters, who were against the college of deacons, and the majority of the people - but the reports, especially about the numbers, contradict each other, as is so ok

- In the Church of St. Theodore, the already very old presbyter Boniface I- 14< -vz) was appointed Roman chief shepherd. He was the son of the priest Secundius and Innocent 1's representative at the court in Constantinople. (The apocrisiar at the imperial residence was considered a particularly promising candidate for the papacy).

The undecided Honorius came under pressure. A first imperial rescript of 5 January jiq recognized the election of Eulalius and expelled Boniface. A second imperial rescript from i8. January ordered both bishop candidates to be sent to Renna for negotiations. However, when the situation came to a head, and a synodal resolution voted by Honorius was rejected due to the disagreement of even the neutral prelates, a third imperial rescript on

\*s- J nuar the two high priestly candidates atis. A foreign bishop, Achilles of Spoleto, was entrusted with the Easter celebrations \* 3 Maen; such a humiliation that a series of further imperial decrees became necessary: to the pagan city prefect Aurelius Anicius Symmachus (a nephew of the famous prefect of Rome of the same name, who once fought so vainly for the statue of the goddess of victory Victoria: I txt ff), to Bishop Achilles, to the Senate, to the people of the city. But the deacon party wanted the disgrace to be avenged by the emperor's appointed



The deacons did not allow the Spoletinians to be ignored and did not allow Easter to be celebrated by a foreign bishop in Rome - although, as St. Irenaeus testifies, it was once not even celebrated annually here (p. qx)! Perhaps, however, the deacons, who were already competing strongly with the presbyters at that time, only saw a favorable opportunity to intervene. In any case, Eulalius returned to Rome on i8. March to celebrate Easter himself in the Lateran. Shortly afterwards, Bishop Achilleus of Spoleto also appeared in the city, leading to arrests, interrogations, riots and renewed bloody battles over the churches.

Emperor Honorius, however, now went over to Boniface, who was supported by strong forces at court. Princess Galla Placidia wrote several letters to prominent Catholics, Augustine, Aurelius of Carthage and Paulinus of Nola, in support of her protégé. Above all, however, it was the later Emperor Flavius Constantius (p. 4s), who was fond of intra-church conflicts, who decided the battle for the Chair of Peter in Boniface's favor. Honoritis, however, who first stood by Eulalius, had him chased out and, in view of the "ambitiones" of the Roman priests, decreed the first, albeit practically meaningless, state papal election regulations: in future, in a double election in Rome, none of the elected candidates were to be elected, but the entire congregation was to vote for the bishop in a new election."

In fact, disputes and condemnations were now so common in Roman episcopal elections that Augustine began a letter to Boniface's successor Coelestine I (w\*\*4ii) with the words of congratulations: -As we hear, God has raised you to the chair of Peter without any division of the church ... -"

Antipope Eulalius later became Bishop of Nepe. Boniface But I, like Innocent I, a jurist, continued the papal ambitions of his predecessors and, always and unwaveringly focused on the universal episcopate of the Roman Church, continued them as usual with biblical and historical digressions, with "historical" examples, -documenta-. Not the effect

However, this was due to the ever-increasing importance of the Petrine idea that the past was viewed through papal eyes and interpreted accordingly.

Dabci was of particular importance to Boniface, who had long been an eastern expert on Rome and Illyria before his election. Of the nine letters he received, three concerned the jurisdiction over the so-called papal vicariate of Theasalonica. At the instigation of the bi8courts there, who were satisfied with Ront, and Patriarch Atticus, an edict issued by Emperor Theodosius II on July nt. July pi placed it under the jurisdiction of the Church of Constantinople, which claimed the prerogative of Ancient Rome. Boniface immediately protested, supported by the Emperor of the West, Honorine, to whom he complained about the deceitfulness of some Illyrian bishops, and was even successful. With appropriate biblical sayings and "historical" examples, he insisted, like his predecessors, on Rome's primacy, the monopolization of the Petrine office, the Petrine doctrine, the rapid rise of which actually began with him, and continued the monocratic idea of rule, the

-favor apostolicus-, iris most beautiful light. The origin and governing power of the Roman Church go back to Blessed Peter, and Rome is the head of all the churches in the world ... Whoever stands up against it is excluded from the kingdom of heaven, for only

-Peter's favor (gratia ianitoris) could open it. The doctrine of the indisputability of Petrine judgments and statutes, advocated by Zosimus in his scilion, *would* now rather prohibit the presumptuous declaration: -No one may venture to raise his hand against the apostolic summit (apostolico culmini), whose judgment no one is permitted to appeal. In short, the Church rests on Peter and his successor, on him depends -the totality of things-, only he who obeys him comes to God.^

The difficulties in Illyria had not yet been overcome. eliminated. The opposition in the local episcopate did not fall silent, but Boniface took action. He called on his vicar to put up fierce resistance by giving him the (not always so)

and eagerly honor the brave Peter as a hero: -You have the blessed apostle Peter, who can fight for his right before you ... That fisherman will not tolerate that, if you make an effort, his seat will be lost ... He will assist (you) and suppress the supremacists of the canons and the enemies of ecclesiastical law ... What do you want, he wrote harshly another time, echoing St. Paul, -shall I come to you with the rod or with love and a gentle spirit? For both, as you know, are possible to the blessed Peter, to favor the meek with meekness and to chastise the proud with the rod. Therefore, keep the reverence owed to the head." In any case, Boniface wanted to see some cases "resecari". In this way, the Roman asserted himself in Illyricum, making its independence his sphere of influence for the time being; indeed, in his attacks against the Illyrian opposition, he took Rome's claim to rule the game kingdom "to a hitherto unreached height" (Wojtowysch)."

Thus, out of the ever greater internal political fragmentation and misery of the West, the papacy - fighting with or against the state, as required - grew into a highly political power, one of the most powerful and long-lived parasites in history. eThe Holy See, it is said in a sensible misprint in the -Archivum Historiae Pontificiale- of the Pontifical **Ullianz'** # . \*97 ->--dc more or less openly recognized as a qualified holder of the right of faith."

However, the fights over the large bishoprics of the East were even more fierce than in Rome over the -Saint Snihl-.



## J. CHAPTER

# THE BATTLE FOR THE EPISCOPAL SEES OF THE EAST IN THE J. CENTURY UNTIL THE COUNCIL OF CHALKEDON

-%mpfg and discord have not spared the Roman Church  
either - ... But they have never avoided the  
degree of passion and bloody savagery that was the order of  
the day in the East-. Johannes Heller'

-The simit about Origen developed into a formal war between  
the two main cities of Origen and their real bishops:  
Theophilus of Aezandtien and John of Consta itinepe1.- Jun  
Sicinatann-

-In alliance with the Copten and as far as possible with Ron,  
TlieophiJoi, Kyriu and Dioskur of Greekness in Chrisien-  
ti2tD Yeff8Cot, t1D2 to secure and increase the mßCht of the  
patriafCes of AlexAftdfCin Z4t. But there were pyrriiocsiegc . . .  
The urinag ng of Greek Christianity in Egypt was already there  
at the moment when Theophilus, under **duress**  
the copies the Origenist Animonios with the words: -Cetzcr, curse the  
Origeiies-, mi8acting lich. This was also the death sentence for the  
Greeks in Egypt in general.  
The **Tlwoleg** Cerl Schneider-

Just as Alexandria was first among the cities of the Eastern Empire, the Alexandrian metropolis also played the leading role in the Eastern Church for a long time. Its patriarchate was from the beginning the most closed in the Orient, had an immense amount of land and until the Council of Constantinople {38x} was unquestionably the pontiff. At least de facto it retained it, occasionally supported by Rome, until the

-The "robber synod" of Ephesus q. Gradually, however, it was supplanted in the hierarchy of oriental patriarchates by Constantinople, which had long been on the rise. The patriarchs of Alexandria wanted weak and incompetent colleagues in the capital because they themselves were striving for an oriental papacy. They were perhaps the first obnr bishops to use the title "archbishop" (archiepiskopos), at least since your

In the 3rd century they also used the term -pope- (pa- pas), which they kept permanently. (The term patriarch came only very slowly in use in the 4th century). Even on the Catholic side, since the founding of Constantinople, there has been an almost uninterrupted jealousy of Alexandria against the seat of Constantinople (WetzerfWelte). However, in order to bring down their rivals in the capital, the

Alexandrians in this era - murderous battles over the emergence of dogmas - (Catholic Heer) the theological disputes'.

The power struggle between the patriarchs Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople demonstrates this with great intensity.

For a century, the Alexandrian biosphere has been occupied by the

Lente in the btsteii tradition of St. Athanasius, the Doctor of the Church. This means that they made brilliant use of tried and tested techniques against the state: Bribery, public opinion-making, the use of their own bodyguards or bands of armed sailors and monks" (F. G. Maier). The bishops of Alexandria kept hordes of so-called "stretcher-bearers" as a soldierly posse\* with which they stormed temples, synagogues, plundered and chased away Jews and terrorized everything that did not suit them, including the imperial authorities. Gradually, however, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the new capital, the "Second Rome", gained more and more prestige and influence. Finally, the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 581 granted him honorary primacy over all Oriental bishops (can. 3). Indeed, the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon placed him on an equal footing with the pope (can. 28), against the pope's fierce protest. As a result, the patriarchate's possessions and income naturally increased, as his properties and holdings (domains, vineyards, mills) were scattered over his entire territory and constantly increased through donations and legacies.

However, the Alexandrian hierarchs did not voluntarily. They were reluctant to do so, but took up the fight with all means at their disposal. Their attempt to enthrone an Alexandrian in Constantinople during the Council of 533 failed. Equally unsuccessful

After the death of Bishop Nektarius (357) - whom Emperor Theodosius I had supported but Pope Damasus had opposed - the intention

of the Alexandrian Theophilus to get his candidate through in the capital, the Alexandrian presbyter Isidor (we have already encountered him on a fatal political mission: I 66). He was probably only meant to be a placeholder for the still young patriarch Nefferi Kyriilos. But twenty years later, Theophilus (35—4\*\*)

Success. For now the equally educated and unscrupulous

The court of the Nile, a pharaoh of the lands nm the Nile, who hoped to become a kind of primary of the entire Orient, overthrew John Chrysostom, the head of the Church of Constantinople, with the help of the court, sent him into the

desert and to his death.\*



Barely two decades before John's entry into Constantinople (3Q8-qOq), wild feuds with the Arians had raged there (I go). Now he found only a secondary bishop, Sisinnius, chief shepherd of the Novatians, who tolerated Theodositis as the only one besides the Catholics. Sisinnius caused the patriarch little grief, was also appreciated by "orthodox believers", especially at court, and was eloquent and witty. The only conspicuous thing, especially with the stricter asceticism of the Novatians, was his twice-daily visit to the temple. But when asked why he bathed twice a day in a warm bath, Sisinnius parried deliciously: 'Because three times is not good for me!

The Doctor of the Church John Chrysostom (I i33 ff), born in Antioch as the son of a high-ranking army officer who died at an early age, was, according to the *Menaeon*, the liturgical book of the Byzantine Church, remarkably short, extremely gaunt, had a large head, large ears, a large nose and a thinning beard. After being a monk in the desert for several years, he became a presbyter in Antioch in 386 because of an illness (through asceticism), where he was presumably called by Bishop Meletios (I 3yq ff). He then owed his fateful transfer to the patriarchal see to the old Eutrop (p. z f).

Because when Emperor Arcadius was undecided about his successor after the death of Nectarius (3971), the supreme court eunuch and all-powerful minister brought in the already famous (anti-

Jewish) preacher John to the capital by special post. Theophilus wanted to prevent this. But a reference to the material against him, which was sufficient for criminal proceedings, silenced him. Indeed, none other than the protesting Alexandrian had to consecrate John as bishop in February 3q8!

Theophilus did not abandon his plans, however, but used the almost worldwide war against Origenism, the "war between Origenists and Anthropomorphites", which was particularly destructive for the oriental monks, to promote his church policy, i.e. to fight against the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

NDALiNg MOUID UISiD THEOPHi1.S FRONT CHANGE

In the later . century, tens of thousands of monks were already living in the East, especially in Egypt, the classic land of ascetics. From countless monasteries and hermitages, they began their triumphal march through Sinai, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor and the western provinces of the empire. In the Orient, however, they were already having a considerable influence on society, the people and the leading classes. In some hermit colonies, people traveled from far away to be edified. People admired the ext.en-trish, the mortifications and night vigils of the wrestlers of Christ; they were revered almost superstitiously, almost as supernatural beings.

On the one hand, these people had charitable merits: by offering hospitality, by providing real hostels for foreigners, refuges, by caring for the poor and the sick, by caring for the deceased, slaves; here and there also by a certain "cultural" activity: the creation of books, for example, libraries, without, of course, as Harnack has already shown, being particularly well versed in theology. On the other hand, Emperor Valens;7 already had to take action against the "lovers of laziness" in the -Communities of monks (monazontes) are legally incorporated into the and order them -to be brought out of hiding by official decree and ordered back to their duties in their home town. After all, the monks, these "perfect Christians", had a profession "the practice of which, like that of no other, was compatible with every degree of stupidity, laziness and ignorance" (E. Stein). And despite the prohibition of Emperor Theodosius 1, they soon roamed everywhere, crowding into the cities in particular, where there were eventually almost 600 monasteries of monks and nuns in the Ennaton district of Alexandria - populated like beehives (Severos of Ashmunein). The orthodox Chrysostom criticized their roaming through the cities, as did the "Heretic" Nestorios, who even excommunicated them for this. But could

cin bishop could be sure of their support, his power was hardly limited if necessary. The monks were still in power throughout the ages, right up to iris zo. In the 20th century - most blatantly in the Croatian Ustasha state, where they were the instigators of downright murder bands and concentration camp commanders - they were politically abused by the powerful, the clergy and the state, and were apparently happy to be used. They play a prominent role in the destruction of paganism, in the robbing and razing of temples, but not infrequently also in the struggle within the church. Their "spirit-led" existence turns into a "life of lawlessness" (Dominican Camelot). They move into towns, cause unrest, they get involved in dogmatic disputes, in church political affairs, they stand against their abbots, in the Great Laura against Sabas or against Georges. More often still, they attack bishops; in Constantinople, the Catholic church leaders Paulo8, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, who "often" wished that "there was no need for monasteries and that there was such peace (eunomia) in the cities that no one would ever have to go into the desert". Monks also fight behind the notorious Abbot Schenute, saint of the Coptic Church (p. ao3 ff), under the holy church teacher Cyril or his uncle Theopilus. -It was not for nothing [!] that the popes and patriarchs repeatedly turned to the monastic circles. They knew that it was easy for them to exert effective pressure on the government's decisions by means of the masses". The majority of them are of a -eretaunlich primitiveness", which is -balanced- by the arguments of -physical violence-; yes, they fight -all the more riickless as they consider themselves to be pneumatics under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit- (Bacht SJ)-."

In the East, the result - as significant as it is fatal - is that a change of front by the Alexandrian bishop. He needed the religious monasteries to pursue his goals. Those of the Nitrian Desert, a depression in the Libyan land where, according to Palladios, about yoon of them are said to have lived, were often

lig followers of Oz'igcnes (! +7+ 0, those of the SLetic Desert probably predominantly anthropomorphites; they liked to understand biblical anthropomorphism literally. Theophil, already

Through his confidant, the presbyter Isidore, a passionate Origenist, he became attached to this faction and initially joined forces with the monks of the Nitrian Desert. He supported their leaders, the "vj2\$ elongated brothers", with the exception of their eldest, Ammon, a fanatical ascetic, who allegedly burnt one limb or the other with a red-hot iron and resolutely withdrew from the patriarch. But he made Dioscorus, who also opposed him, bishop of Little Heropolis, and Euthynius and Eusebius priests and administrators of the church assets in Alexandria, until the patriarch's blatant greed for money drove them back into the desert.

In his Easter encyclical of 399, Theophiliis fiercely attacked the -anthropomorphites- who thought of God in a physical form like a human being. They then poured out of the Sketic desert, from the Pachomios monasteries of Upper Egypt, to Alexandria in large numbers, plunged everything into panic and threatened to kill the patriarch if he did not recant. Theophil, on the one hand an avid reader of Origen's writings, on the other hand reviled as the "dictator of Egypt" compared to Pharaoh because of his lust for power and his love of pomp, now switched camps as the general mood turned more and more against Origen. He declared that he also hated Origen and had long since decided on his damnatio. He became a fiery defender of the Anthropomorphites, flattered the active monastic demonstrators: "You seem to me as if I were seeing God's Antlin-, began to purge Egypt of Ori- genism, and even launched a large-scale anti-Origenist propaganda, a -formal crusade-(Grütz- macher). Still an advocate of Origen, at a synod in Alexandria just one year later he banned his controversial teachings and his followers, especially the "long brothers", with the exception of Dioscorus. However, he also used a series of Easter letters in the following years for a wild polemic.

mik, now warned against the "blasphemies", the "madness", the -criminal error of Origen, this hydra of all heresies, who equated Satan with the Son of God. Origen, claimed Thcophil, was an idolater, he half -mocked Christ and brought the devil to high honors-, had written -numerous garrulous books, full of vain words and unrhyming stuff- and -his fragrance of heavenly doctrines added to his own stench-. Whereby he deliberately served up such a ghastly ragout of this theologian, so that it would have

-right-believers- had to get sick.

In a circular letter to the bishops, he claimed that the -Pseudo-monks-, capable of any crime in their madness-, sought his life. They -bribed common rabble with money to conjure up a bloodbath. Only by the grace of God was a greater disaster prevented. We have endured everything with humble patience ..." In reality, he himself, accompanied by soldiers, hurried into the Nitri desert to persecute the Origenists, including the four "stangen Btüder". He threatened to strangle one of their spokesmen, Ammon Price, with his cloak and beat him so that the blood poured from his nose. He also took ecclesiastical action against the presbyter Isidore, the almost eighty-year-old Origenite, whom he had wanted to elevate to parriarch of the capital only a few years ago, after attempted bribery and coercion to give false testimony (he was supposed to testify untruthfully that a deceased woman had bequeathed her fortune to the patriarch's sister. He also slandered him severely and accused him - eighteen years earlier! - of "sodomy" with a ship's boy). Finally, in the middle of the night, he himself, at the head of a half-drunk raiding party, including his black Ethiopian slaves, attacked a monastery, plundered and burnt it together with its library, killing a boy in the fire - and even the most sacred mysteries - (Benedictine Banr). The indictment of the maltreated monks comprised seventy points. Pope Anastasius 1 [39W4 -), however, called Theophil a -holy and honorable man" (vir sanctiis et honorabilis) and

confessed, in a letter to the Patriarch John of Jerusalem, his theological ignorance by confessing that until recently he had neither known who Origen was nor what he had written!"

KIRCHENLEHRE" HIERONYMUS UHD  
KoxSORTRN LEISTEN THEOPHIL -SCHERGENDIENSTE"  
AGAINST KIRCHEI4TEACHER JOHANNBS

Several hundred monks fled to "Egypt"; some to Constantinople, most of them to Palaitina, where, of course, the Doctor of the Church Hieronymus was now also fighting the Origenists. The great

Saint and patron saint of scholars, immortalized by Altdoder, Dürer, Leonardo da Vinci, had so far done much to disseminate Origen in the Latin West, had enthusiastically translated several of his works, had also shamelessly written him out, like so many, indeed, ikn as the -greatest lecturer of the Church since the apostles" (1 -7\*), as an "immortal genius", to be about it indignant that he was once attacked in Rome - not because of the novelty of his theses, not because of heresy, as angry dogs now claimed against him, but because one could not bear the fame of his eloquence and knowledge". After all, the Doctors of the Church Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius and Ambrose had also once advocated Origen. But now that his opponents were gaining momentum, Pope Anastasius opposed him, the bishops Simplicianus of Milan, Chromatius of Aquileia, synods in Jerusalem, Alexandria and Cypem, Hieronymus, like other prominent church leaders, abruptly changed sides. He shamelessly disowned his old master and, like Theophil, became a rabid anti-origenist overnight, so to speak.

In one of his own writings, he attacks Bishop John of Jerusalem, who does not want to abandon Origen, but is in any case opposed to Jerome in the "war of the monks". -You", apostrophized

Jerome, -the holy father, the exalted bishop, the celebrated orator, you hardly give a glance to your fellow servants who, like you, are bought by the blood of your Lord ... You despise the laity, the deacons and the priests, you boast that you could make a thousand clerics in an hour ... Your sycophants claim that you are more eloquent than Demosthe- nes, more astute than Chrysippus, wiser than Plato, and you apparently believe it yourself". The holy Doctor of the Church fights against the Jerusalem bishop, whom he accuses of having mobilized the state against him, in such an insulting, scornful and insulting manner. -A monk, alas, a monk threatens other monks with exile and obtains a decree of banishment: a monk who prides himself on sitting in the chair of an apostle."

You can see how politics, church policy and theology are inextricably intertwined here, as they usually are. While Pa- triarch Theophil was still trying to mediate between the conflicting parties, he now quickly changed sides. At the end of the year 3qö, he had still wanted to defeat his opponents, but Hierony- mus gave him an answer that would be repeated throughout *the history of the Church*: "We too desire peace, and we not only wish for it, we demand it, but the peace of Christ, the true peace.

The disciples of the Lord have been seeking this peace, the peace of Christ, the "true", the right peace", for hundreds of years: against schismatics, heretics, unbelievers, against external enemies, internal enemies, against anyone who does not think like them. Always and everywhere, e v e n in the eighth century, one hears this phrase of -true-, of -real- peace-and it is too frequent, too typical, too much to spoil the masses, the generations, is also far too promisingly exalted not to insist on it casually here. It was rampant in the First World War, in the Second, in the Cold War afterwards, in the Church's support for the rearmament of West Germany, when Cardinal Frings, a member of the CDU, for example, at the German Catholic Congress in Bochum scolded conscientious objection as "a reprehensible sentimentality", "a conceit of humanity", and **said:** -According to the Ge-

Thanks to the Pope, therefore, warfare directed against injustice is not only a right, but even the duty (1) of all states ... Genuine peace [!] can only be achieved (1) by the divine order. Wherever this is attacked, the peoples must also restore the destroyed order by force of arms.'-

Ergo: real peace is only where ifire interests, where all the interests of the papacy - and where it would have none! - are safeguarded. If not, then war one way or another, but not least -This and that is understood by the saints from Jerome, Augustine e quanti viri to trente under the -peace of Christ-, the -true peace-, the -divine order-  
- rfiren advantage, ifire power, ifire glory: otherwise aide!

In the meantime, Theophil had also changed parties, and Jerome, who always spilled all his venom against heretics, drove the patriarch to cut out the bad germs with a sharp sickle. Triumphantly gloating, the saint observed and reported on the hunt and the Alexandrian's success. He congratulated him on his attacks on the -heretics-, -the scattered Nattem", even in the most secret corners of Palestine. Egypt, Syria and almost all of Italy were thus freed from the danger of this heresy, and the whole world rejoiced in his victories.'\*

Since Theophil was zealous against the refugees everywhere, wrote letters to the chief shepherds of Palestine and Cyperiiis, to individual bishops, to Anstasius of Rome, since he sent emissaries against the GHctsteri, so that even John of Jerusalem did not protect them, they fled further to Constantinople. And John Chrysostom took them in, interceded for them, indeed, the government summoned Theophil to a council in the capital, where John was to pass judgment.

But Theophil knew how to turn the Spie0 unziid.

As much as John dominated the masses, he was completely unsuitable as a court bishop. He not only held his Alexandrian rivals against him, but also many other Catholic priests. Above all, Severian of Gabala in Syria, one of Constan-



a popular preacher in Tinople court circles with an unusually good knowledge of the Bible, who fought for the Nicene faith as well as against heretics and Jews. He was also Bishop Acacius of Beroea (Aleppo), whom the lyrical poet Balaeus sang about in fünf hymns. Perrier Bishop Antiochus of Ptolemais (Acre in Phoenicia) and Macarius Magnes, probably identical with the Bishop of Magnesia {in Caria or Lydia).<sup>1</sup>

But John himself became persona non grata in the rich, highly civilized capital. He was fatal to the millionaires through -communist- sermons in which he thundered that their toilets made of gold were more important to them than the beggars in front of their villas. He also refused the invitations of the nobles (aristoi). His intransigent asceticism, the cause of constant stomach ailments, displeased the vivacious men of the court and others, whom he reproached privately or publicly for their attempts at rejuvenation. -Why do you ask for powder and make-up on your face like the whores ...?- Especially since Empress Eudoxia, patron of the clergy and the church, at first also of Chrysostos, had him last. He reviled her after confiscating a piece of land - Jezabel. Reason enough for Theophil to charge his opponents with a criminal offense: laesa maiestas. John simply excluded many clergymen; one deacon for adultery, one for murder. Even bishops who had been consecrated by the metropolitan of Ephesus, Autorin - he withdrew by death - were rigorously banned in exchange for fees, because simony and greed were already flourishing among the clergy.

John was also often unpopular with his own pastors, who indulged in the good life; especially against the devotees of syneisactism, the liaison with a consecrated woman, a -gynä syneisaktos-, a -spiritual wife". The union, which even included being together in bed in complete chastity, was biblically proven by its practitioners, as was almost everything else, was tried and tested thousands of times and survived for several centuries in East and West. Chrysostom, however, misunderstood this stubborn mortification and issued a harsh rebuke.

double treatise against them and claimed -that it would soon be better if there were no more (consecrated) virgins-'.

Finally, certain groups of monks strongly opposed the patriarch. Under Abbot **Isaac**, a *ycec* who had founded a monastery in Constantinople, a party of monks had already formed when the Antiochian ascended the throne and had bitterly opposed and slandered him for years. Abbot Isaac himself became a passionate partisan of Theophilus and a successful accuser in the trial against John."

#### of the courage of a church prince

Isaac and his followers had also called the patriarch arrogant, proud, and had hardly done him any injustice. The saint, a priest of the Most High, was, like so many of his peers, anything but modest. He not only preached:

-Therefore he (God) has placed us in the world to be the stars ... to walk as angels among men ..."; he not only taught: -Nothing is more powerful than the Church, man ... The Church is stronger than heaven ... Heaven exists for the sake of the Church, not the Church for the sake of heaven"! Instead, he himself called the emperor a fellow servant before God, boasting that the bishop was likewise a prince, "even more venerable than the emperor. For the **sacred laws of the (spiritual) authority of the bishop also subordinated the person of the emperor**. He boasted that "the priest is much higher than a king", that "*even the person of the king himself is subject to the power of the priest ... that the latter is a greater ruler than the former*". He could also shout: The heads of the government enjoy no such honor as the ruler of the churches. Who is first at the court, who, when he comes into the company of women, who, when he enters the houses of the great? No one has rank before him."

And of course the patriarch wants to promote spiritual dignity in everyone.

If he wants to see them always honored, -may their bearer be of whatever kind" - a demand, a doctrine, which no "white" tyrant could afford without being drowned in hurricanes of laughter; a peasant's catch of the simplest kind, which here, however, covers every amorality, every villainy, which satisfies all the sheep, especially the stupidest, the most. No matter how many, how great villains this church may lead, no matter how colossal exploitations may make it rich, no matter how enormous gangsterism may make it powerful - it itself is always immaculate, is holy - simply

fabulous! (Cf. \*7J ) And it is not at all for his sake that a church-first wants to be idolized, courted, ah, who thinks so petty selfishly: "we want to be honored, but not for our sake - God forbid!" No, consider, calls -Goldmund", the patron of the Preacher - who, it must always be remembered, also permits lying for the purpose of the salvation of souls, as evidenced by examples even from the Old and New Testaments -, -remember: this is not about us, but about the shepherd's office itself; not about this or that personality, but about the bishop! Let no man give ear to me, but to the high dignity! As long as we sit on this throne, as long as we occupy the chief pastoral position, we have both the dignity and the power, even if we are unworthy of it. As I said, fabulous - and their reasoning is still valid today. They are still capturing the masses with it today. No, they themselves do not want to be wanted. They are very simple, modest, staid - even mere human beings. Only God should be honored in them, and he is greater than everything."

So John had enemies, and his worldly-wise opponent Theophil, not by chance in Alexandria -Amphallax" (**crwa**: Schlauffox), played everything possible against him and took trump card after trump card. Instead of defending himself, he went on the attack and took the fight to the dogmatic terrain, according to the tried and tested Arr, by attacking John the -Häresic" of the Origines b i c h t i g t e .

KiRCHEI'4VATER ÜPIPHANIUS, THE SYHODE en QusoCUM,  
MURDER U1'4D TovsCHLAG AT THE PATRIARCH'S PALACE

In the fourth quarter, the Alexandrian s e n t an inveterate heretic hunter **after** the Constantinople Patriarch, Church Father Epiphanius of Salamis (Constantia) in Cyprus.

(I z63 f). Theophil wrote to him grandiosely that the Church of Christ had "cut off the heads of Origen's serpents crawling out of their caves with the sword of the Gospel, and had inflicted the pernicious plague on the holy flock of Nitrian monks". Epiphanius, the notorious manufacturer of a -medicinal kit for the cure of all diseases-, had raised the battle cry against Origen and had taken an early shot at the most controversial theologian of the early church - in his -poison cabinet": Registemummer 6ç; - especially as his followers were causing Epiphanius problems in his own blast and he found Origen's spiritualizing tendencies, his symbolic exegesis, obnoxious. Even many Catholics now attest to the famous bishop's enervatingly poor spirituality, a fervent but unenlightened zeal - as if the whole of Christianity did not spring from the late antique "failure of nerve" (Murray), a lack of thinking power and nerve ...

As early as 390 \*\* 3f\* Who the -Patriarch of Orthodoxy- (Nicaea II, y87) traveled to Jerusalem, whose local bishop with Origen sympathized. Epiphanius had fought Origenism in front of an assembled congregation and implored Archbishop John to abandon Origen, "the father of Arius, the root of all heresies". He then called on John to condemn the heretic unconditionally. And Theophil tried to mediate through Isidore, his old confidant and convinced Origenist sent to Jerusalem, and even supported the Jerusalem bishop in his feud against the monks of Bethlehem, who expected him to condemn Origen in vain. Now, however, the Alexandrian patriarch called the Cyprian metropolitan, previously labeled by him as a "troublemaker" and "heretic", now the -all-

Epiphanius hastened by ship from Cyprus, collected signatures against Origen and agitated against John Chrysostom, who had called the

-Origen's Heresies. He did everything he could to have the patriarch deposed, but then fled from the patriarch's threats and died on the high seas during his journey home on May 3. At the same time, Theophilus made contact with his opponent's dismissed prelates and worked recklessly with slander, bribery and fraud. He sent money to the court cleric and had Bishop Severian of Gabala and his accomplices forge John's sermons and circulate them with all kinds of jibes at the Empress Eudoxia in order to defeat the patriarch with her help.<sup>10</sup>

In the summer of 433, after successful digging by his friends and assistants, Theophilus finally appeared at the Golden Horn himself, not without having declared before his departure: - I go to the court to depose John. He arrived with 24 Egyptian bishops, an entourage of monks, lots of gold, a wealth of precious gifts for the emperor's entourage and dismounted outside the city in a palace of the already incensed Eudoxia-she died of a miscarriage the next year. Then, in weeks of effort, a public scandal, he won over the greater part of the clergy of Constantinople, including some bishops, to his side. Since the emperor John Chrysostomos ordered the trial of Theophil in vain, he opened a council in September in Chalcedon (today's Kadikoy), on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus opposite the capital, in the Oak Palace (ad Quercum), which had recently been opened by the ge-

The building, which was supported by the Praefectus praetorio Rufinus (p. 40), has been imperial property since his murder. The indictment

The Synod named 24 offenses committed by the holy Doctor of the Church (among other things, he had beaten clerics bloody or had them beaten and sold a lot of precious stones et cetera from the church treasury. A synodal member, Abbot Isaac, supplemented these misdemeanors with

-7 others (including that the patriarch had the monk Johannes whipped, bound and robbed foreign deposits)."

The defendant himself did not appear, but sent three bishops. They beat him bloody and hung a chain around the neck of one of them, actually intended for John, so that if he had been killed, he could have been transported by ship. In fact, he was taken away by the -fathers- after many sessions, dragged off to a ship in the dark of night, but was rehabilitated a day later. To Eudoxia, a miscarriage seemed like divine punishment. Ioi triumph, the humiliated man was brought back. It is said that there were riots between Constantinopolitans and Alexandrians, bloodshed, and the people searched for Theophilus in order to throw him into the sea. He and his Sufcagans fled to Egypt, accompanied by Abbot Isaac, who apparently feared the return of his opponent. However, the rest of Theophilus' clique in the Haiiptstadt continued to agitate against John, and Theophilus himself hurled a wild pamphlet against him. One murder was, of course, not long in coming: the servant of the clergyman Elpidius, allegedly stung by yo gold sticks, stabbed four people to death in the patriarch's palace before he was arrested, but his employers were not prosecuted. Instead, the military was deployed against Johanes. The emperor refused to receive the corn union from him. Robbery, murder and manslaughter continued. Then the regent, who was more inclined towards him, but dependent on Eudoxia and won over by opposing clergymen, exiled him forever.

**Dix NixDERBRENNUxG THE CGEA \$OPHIA, THE  
END OF JOHN AND THE "JOHANNITES-**

While John was being deported to a ship at night, a special firework was prepared for him: from the sec he saw Hagia Sophia, the church of divine wisdom, go up in flames and with it the magnificent Senate Palace. (The emergence of the Branded, which was set alight from the bishop's throne of the Cathedral went out and sic in rubble and ashes, is still today

*unaffected*. The parties accuse each other). Moreover, the Hagia Sophia, in whose annexes the patriarch resided, was destroyed a second time by the Nika uprising 3z

(p. 3 3 f), but after each reconstruction it became more the -mystical center of the kingdom and the churches: the -heaven on earth-, the

-preferred dwelling place of God-, overflowing with artistic masterpieces and relics, but also endowed -with a wealth of goods and possessions for the maintenance of the shrine and its clergy" (Beck).^

In the same year in which John went into exile, Patriarch Theophil again addressed an Easter letter against Origen, who had "deceived the ears of the simple-minded and gullible with his ingratiating arguments", he had demanded: "Those who want to celebrate the feast of the Lord must therefore despise the illusions of Origen" - and brazenly concluded with the usual hypocrisy: -Let us pray for our enemies, let us be good to those who persecute us-. Indeed, two years later, as the exiled John was dragging himself to his death, the Alexandrian hurled a diatribe after him, in which his experienced competitor was portrayed as possessed by an evil spirit, as a plague, godless, Judas and Satan, a mad tyrant who had given his soul to the devil, as an enemy of humanity whose crimes even surpassed those of the robbers. -Christians at the time called this pamphlet "monstrous" and "gruesome because of the repeated curses."

St. Jerome, however, found such shameful insulting.

St. John's work was quite splendid - it was not for nothing that he boasted (in an epistle to Theophil) that he had been "nourished with Catholic milk from the cradle" - indeed, he translated the muckraker. After all, Pope Theophilus had, he certified, "proved with all freedom that Origen is a heretic". He ensured the dissemination of the Alexandrian heresy in Rome<sup>8</sup> and praised it and himself in an accompanying letter to Theophilus:

-Your writing, as we have noted with admiration, will be of use to all churches ... So receive your book, which is also mine or, even more correctly, our book ... -"

But the best proof that theology was merely a cover for church politics and that Origen was only a pretext for fighting John Chrysostom is shown by the behavior of Theophilus. No sooner had his opponent been eliminated than he had completely forgotten his antipathy towards Origen, whom he had so venomously denounced for years.

-He was often seen reading Origen, and when he was astonished by this, he used to reply: "The works of Origen are like a meadow where there are beautiful flowers and some weeds; the only thing that matters is that you know how to choose them."

John's exile was followed by the *damnatio memoriae*, the deletion of his name from the diptychs, the official *church charters* of Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople (probably an imitation of state branches). Three Jahre exile still, driven from place to place to the furthest corner of the empire, a chronic stomach ailment, frequent fevers, raids by robbers, of course also support, help, visits, money enough; and on il. September 4w the Death in Komana (Tokat), where a famous temple of the goddess Anaïtis with thousands of priests and hierodules. Iii èIn one of his letters of exile to Olympias, saints of both the Greek and Latin churches, Chrysostom confessed that he feared no one as much as the bishops, with the exception of a few."

Ringstim, however, had already witnessed a wild persecution of the -Johanni- ter- bcgoncn, not only in the capital; countless arrests, tortures, banishments, fines up to a'!o pounds of gold. Hundreds of monks are said to have been slaughtered by believers in Constantinople churches in the fall of 4 3 after the deposition of John; many fJohen to Italy -a tragedy that seems even darker than it is staged by Catholic bishops- (Benedictine Haacke).<sup>2</sup> '

In his distress, the hunted patriarch (the bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia once set a whole horde of monks on him), without recognizing the primacy of Rome, had written in identical words



appealed to the bishops of Rome, Milan and Aquileia in the letters. But three days earlier, a courier from Theophilus had already appeared at the Pope's house. Later, a second messenger arrived with a detailed letter of justification from Alexander, which contained sentences about Chrysostom such as: -He has murdered the servants of the saints -He is a mangy (contaminans), godless plague-ridden man, an insane, angry tyrant, who still rejoices in his folly, he has given his soul to adultery {adulterandum) dedicated to the devil!

In response, Innocent I (p. 12 ff) declared in letters to both parties to maintain communion with both! In Kaiier Honoriiis he suggested an ecumenical council. However, a five-member delegation from the ruler and the pope (including the bishops Aemilius of Benevento, the leader, Venetius of Milan and Chromatius of Aquileia) was chikan'ied on arrival in Arhen, as well as in Constantinople, They were arrested, interned in several castles on the coast and expelled after a futile attempt to bribe them to give up John Chrysostom and join his successor Atticus. When she returned four months later, she reported -babylonian misdeeds-. However, Innocent I merely sent a letter of consolation to the complaining exulant himself, who had asked the pope for help "as soon as possible", whereby John -conjured up this terrible storm in the churches, the -chaos-, exhorting him to patience and compliance with God's will and praising the advantage of a good conscience. Innocent's attitude was such that it was falsified into the opposite in manly letters from the pope to the emperor (and alleged defamations of the emperor)."

Thirty years later, at the end of January 43, Theodosius II had the remains of John Chrysostom solemnly transferred to the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople, from where they were transferred to the Roman Peters Church after the successful conquest of the city by the Latin Christians. And there, where a large statue commemorates him, they still rest today!-

The life of a bishop - as not only the fate of John shows - was far more endangered by Christians at that time than perhaps ever before by pagans. No fewer than four bishops of a Phrygian city were murdered in succession by their faithful. And the Emperor Theodosius probably made the very popular poet and prefect of Constantinople, Flavius Cyrus, whom the people had cheered louder than himself in the racecourse, degraded and dispossessed, by force bishop of that delinquent community of Phrygia (although he suspected Cyrus of being a pagan) only because he was thinking of the end of his four **unreliable predecessors**. However, **Cyrus** won the hearts of his wild flock on the fly with extremely short sermons - his inaugural sermon consisted of a single sermon - and resigned from his ecclesiastical office when the climate at court seemed more favorable again.'-

The Doctor of the Church St. John Chrysostom was destroyed, Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria the victor. And his successor and nephew, the church leader Cyril, openly resisted efforts to rehabilitate St. Chrysostom and remained ignorant of his guilt for a long time (Library of the Church Fathers). He compared him to Judas and refused to include him in the Alexandrian diptychs, the lists of names of deceased saints that were read out at the Eucharist. It was not until 8 that he reluctantly agreed to the efforts of the new chief shepherd of Constantinople, Nestorios, to place John's name in the Alexandrian diptychs. I am silent about John, Nestorios apostrophized his opponent Cyril at the time, -whose ashes you now grudgingly venerate-, And then Cyril overthrew this new patriarch of Constantinople with very similar methods copied from his uncle.

PAzRiaacii KYRILL TRrrrr cscEN  
PATRiAecii NfISTORIOS AN

Only a few days after the death of Theophilus, Cyril of Alexandria (čza- ) ascended the patriarchal throne - against his rival, the archdeacon Tirnotheus - amid heavy tumult. The saint, who was supposedly -not guided by imperiousness and personal considerations, but only by a sense of duty and zeal for the purity of the faith (Cardinal Hergenrö- ther), was in reality a -new Pharaoh", the epitome of domineering hierarchs, was more devious and ruthless than any A)exandrine before him, not even Denietrius, not even Athanasius. The holy Doctor of the Church controlled the Egyptian grain trade and increased his possessions with the help of brutal monks. He practiced the worst simonics, sold bishops to the most evil lente. He persecuted the Jews to such a gigantic extent that it is no exaggeration to call him the initiator of the first -final redemption-. In fact, his own clergy sued him for acts of violence in Constantinople - for Cyril, of course, these were merely tolerable existences from the "filthy heap of A)exandria".

The emperor referred the accusers, including the monk Victor (p. \*94 0. who was particularly impressive to him, to the patriarch of the capital, Ncitorios. However, Cyril was able to resist the

ProzeB euvor, following the noble example of scinc's predecessor and uncle, whose extermination campaign against heresy and paganism he had helped to create and in whose infamous -Eicheiisynod" (bo3) he himself had already taken part. In any case, he disliked the autonomy efforts of his Constantirio- pel colleague and competitor and so, like his predecessor Theophilus (and his successor Dioscorus: p. zi6 f9, he continued the fight against the patriarchate of the capital in order to maintain his own position of supremacy. When Nestorios, probably at the emperor's request, was supposed to sit in judgment of him, Cyril, he accused Nestorios of -circumcision-. He accused him of bad and wrong views. He claimed that he

Pnzniancu Kreicr Rirr cctn P" aiancu Nes o "ios au \_\_\_\_\_'D7

had "given the whole Church a heresy and introduced the leaven of a new and strange heresy to the peoples. Kurn, following the tried and tested tactics of his predecessor and master Athanasius and his uncle Thcophilus, he immediately transferred the ecclesiastical-political rivalry, the struggle for power, to the religious sphere - all the easier as there had long been theological differences between the Alexandrian and Antiochene schools, from which Nestorios came; a follower' probably even a disciple of Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had shaped the extreme Antiochene Christology.

Nestorios, with whom - it sounds promising! - the classical period of Christological struggles begins (Grillmeier SJ), i.e. two and a half centuries of quasi

worldwide campaign, was born after 3 \* of Persian parents in Germanicia (Marasch, Syria). His life is in many ways reminiscent of that of his predecessor John. Nestorios was

He was a monk in the Euprepios monastery near Antioch and was made a priest because he had a beautiful voice and could speak well (church historian Socrates), but otherwise, according to Wetzer/Melte's old "Lexikon der katholischen Theologie-, "without higher spiritual education. Seen from the outside, his manner was exemplary. He seldom went out among the people, sat at home over books, and by his dress, emaciation and pallor gave himself the appearance of an austere marine. As a result, he soon became famous far and wide". °\*

Like Chrysostom, Nestorios was also appointed bishop by Theodosius on zo. Aprl 42.8 to the episcopal see of Constantine Pel. He immediately began to speak out against the Jews and heretics, but spared the Pelagians, which did not win him any sympathy from Rome.

There was unrest throughout the patriarchy, with bloodshed here and there. Give me, O emperor, the earth cleansed of heretics, and I will give you heaven for it. If you destroy the heretics with me, I will destroy the Persians with you!" Nestorios already called out in his inaugural sermon

and ruthlessly attacked Christians of other faiths, schismatics, "heretics", the Novatians, Apollinarists and others.

-sects-. Just five days after his ordination, he ordered the destruction of the Arian church in which they were secretly praying. When they

' went up in flames, the neighboring houses also burned. He fought the Macedonians or Pneuma- tomians just as fanatically, taking away their prayer halls in the capital and on the Hellespont - -a gross heretic enemy-, says Har- nack, -a careless daredevil, but not an ignoble man ...-. And the emperor further condoned the pogroms of his patriarch through a tightened **Strsf law of jo. fv'tai 4.\***

Emphasis."

But Nestorios himself soon gained a reputation for "heresy".

Cyril made sure of this, because the rival in the capital obviously seemed far too bdeclarative and un)u0rich. Thus Cyril, in continuation of the old pledge of the two patriarchal seats, sought to bring down Deti Nestorios just as wickedly as his predecessor and uncle had brought down St. John Chrysostom.

As **always** in such matters, a theological reason was quickly found, which soon moved the Church of the East and West, but by its nature should not have moved it at all. According to Erich Caspar, however, the only thing that fueled it was the lurking hatred and relentless will to destroy with which Cyril persecuted his opponent and brought him to ruin. However, even a historian of dogma such as Reinhold Seeberg emphasizes that Cyril was hardly driven by theological differences to fight Nestorios and the anti-Chenian doctrine he represented, which had previously been considered his equal, but rather by personal differences and, above all, church political concerns, the constant struggle with Antioch and even more so with Constanrinople. The position of power of the Alexandrian archbishop was only comparable to that of the Roman archbishop, but Rome *had* always been more or less connected to Alexandria since the Council of Nicaea. Antioch and the aspiring capital, however, were closer, and Constantinople in particular had to be bowed to, whereby

Cyril repeated the same tragedy that his uncle and predecessor had staged against John Chrysostom against Nestorius. -But if Theophilus - according to Seeberg - had accused his opponent of Origenism\* because he held the Origenists he persecuted in high esteem, Cyril himself made his opponent's doctrine a heresy and thereby achieved not only that the Bishop of Constantinople became a heretic, but also that the theology of Antioch became suspect. This was a political masterstroke, because it hit both rivals of Alexandria with the same blow. It was in keeping with church political tradition that Cyril sought and found the alliance of Rome in these battles. Antiochian theology succumbed to this policy."

Din ANTIOCHEI'41SCHE UHD A LEKANDRINISCHE  
TxSOrLOGY SCHOOL

4 century, the problem of the nature of the -father- and the -father- had been discussed in the dispute about the complicated nature of God.

-Son- as well as their relationship. In addition, against Arianism with all the power of the state, the full divinity of the Son-, his equality of essence with the -Father-, and was enforced by a famous word of the Emperor Theodosius I on 28, February 380 (I 311). -In an inexpressible way, the Son corresponds to the essence of the Father, in that he breathes the whole nature of the creator into himself ..." was the poetic formulation of St. Cyril. And St. Ambrosius comments sharply on the Bible passage: "Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven for the illumination of the earth" (Gen. 1,5):

-Who speaks this? God speaks it. And to whom else does he speak it but to the Son!" Further proof of the dogma of the churches

liti . But in the 21st century - because it is also madness, it has  
Method - it went in the times and generations stultify-

fought out with almost every kind of intrigue and violence.

-Christological spectacle surrounding the question, the great mystery: How do the "divine" and "human" natures of Christ relate to each other? Even if this clerical outburst had occurred, could such a literally bottomless mystery be explained rationally or with any kind of human soul krara? The experts were again completely at odds. And again, the entire population of the Eastern Roman Empire took a lively interest (cf. 55s).

After the Antiochian school of theologians, which was undoubtedly the

According to the Alexandrian doctrine, which was closer to the teachings of the Bible, which assumed the -historical-Jesus of the Gospels, the human being and the independent existence of a human nature before its connection with the Son of God, there were two separate natures side by side in Christ. According to the Alexandrian doctrine, which was based on the Logos, the Son of God who took on human nature, the divine and human natures were completely united in him. This -hypostatic union-, this -communicatio idio- matum- was called more or less precisely in the ancient church (- leaving aside the fact that there was and could be nothing precise!): mixtio, com<"tio, concursus, unio, connexio, copulatio, coitio et cetera. For the Antiochians, the "realists", the unification of the two natures was merely psychological, for the Alexandrians, the "idealists", "mystics", it was metaphysical and ontological. The Antiochian school was also represented in its more moderate form by the Doctor of the Church John Chrysostom, while the Alexandrian school was championed by the Doctor of the Church Cyril, its actual founder. The beginnings of the latter, however, were already evident in Athanasius, for example in his sentence: "It was not man who later became God, but God who became man in order to divinize us. Instead of the Arian schism, we now had the Monophysite schism, which was to shake state and society far longer and more severely, damaging them far more than the invasion of the "barbarians", the migration of peoples."

---

 THE FIGHT FOR THE "MOTHER OF GOD" BEG t INT

Nestorios came from Antioch and was a representative of the Antiochian school. In Constantinople, where the Mother of God was the subject of heated debate, he energetically wanted to use all means at his disposal to

-He wanted to assert the "right" and this entirely in the spirit of the Antiochians. Trembling at the thought of Apollinarianism or Photinianism, he used phrases that (perhaps unintentionally) suggested a certain dualism in the person of Christ. Thus he taught a "ket-znic" Christology for the Alexandrian Cyril, who at the end of the year 8, without mentioning Nestorios by name, clearly declared himself against him. However, Cyril, who was basically not at all concerned with the Christological issue he was focusing on, made the dogmatic distance between him and Nestorius greater and sharper than it actually was. In fact, against his better judgment, he insinuated the doctrine that Christ consisted of two different persons - "which neither", writes Johannes Haller, "Nestorios nor any of his followers ever claimed. Cyril thus revealed that it was not zeal for or against a doctrine that drove him to fight, but that - as in all similar cases sooner or later - the doctrinal dispute had to serve as an excuse and weapon to open an ecclesiastical power struggle and destroy a feared rival."<sup>3</sup> -

And none other than the French Dominican Pierre Thomas Camelot, patrologist, historian of dogma and advisor to the Second Vatican Council, seems to agree with Haller, as the Catholic - with ecclesiastical permission to print: -The Bishop of Alexandria was forced to watch as his prestige dwindled before that of the 'new Rome', to which the Council of Constantinople conferred an honorary primacy 38 times.

had. And so it is only too understandable [!] that Alexandria now made an attempt to intervene in the ecclesiastical affairs of the capital. This had already been the case with Peter of Alexandria, who supported the usurper Maximus against Gregory of Nazianzus.



that Theophilus played in the deposition of John Chrysostom ('Synod of the Oaks' Jo3).-''

But according to Camelot's findings, which further incriminate Cyril: "the saint does not fare well in comparison with the tragedy of Nestorius"; one must "acknowledge that some of Cyril's character traits seem to prove Nestorius and his contemporary and modern followers right to a certain extent"; it is also "undeniable that he sometimes lacked the "moderation" that his opponent preached to him "; that his "unauthorized intervention in the affairs of Constantinople ... .. astonish us, some intrigues even annoy us", after such concessions, more correctly inspections, Camelot seems - in contradiction to the power-political motive admitted only one page earlier, namely Cyril's

- "more and more" dwindling reputation in the face of his rival - but one thing was certain: Whatever character traits Cyril may have had, he was guided only [!] by concern for the truth and zeal for the faith. Nothing in the texts [!] justifies the accusation of a domineering nature, nowhere is the intention to give Alexandria supremacy over Constantinople, to overpower and destroy his opponent. Of course ...", the Dominican continues immediately afterwards. And: -He was hard on Nestorius. But, he triumphs, in the negotiations v - 4i3 Cyril knew -moderation and, for the sake of peace, to give up things we love. to "deny" the use of formulations that are contestable.

In reality, of course, it is precisely this plea, this seemingly overbearing concession, that is further, even particularly blatant proof of Cyril's real motive, his power politics. For ç33, hardly after Nestorioa had been dealt with, the victor in the absurd Christological theater quickly relented (p. x8q fi). He now had nothing more to fear from Nestorios and he was never primarily moved by the dogmatic mirror fencing as such. The union of the two natures of the Lord certainly did not affect a man of his stature in his innermost being, if at all. It was primarily a means to an end; was

often recurring words - "unspeakable and unwritable" - and yet his peers spoke and wrote about it continuously throughout the centuries.

Today, however, it is no longer so easy.

For on the third page of his introduction to Ephesus, Camelot explains how a Catholic theologian has to keep his head down, how, on the one hand, he constantly looks to research and, on the other, constantly looks to the magisterium, his own authority, and then has to agree with it after all

and Chalcedon" (cf. my own, especially I zö . 54 f5 quite impudently. For, he writes, the historian could certainly "not overlook the sufferings and interests of

The history of the earthly pilgrimage is made up of incidents, just as little as of the often quite regrettable "in-between cases" (incident of the extermination of pagans, for example; incident of the burning of witches; incident of the extermination of the Indians; incident of the dumbing down and fleecing of the people; incident of St. Bartholomew's Night; Incident of St. Bartholomew's Night; Incident of the Three-Second War; Incident of the First World War and the Second and Fascism and Auschwitz and Vietnam and and and, history is made up of incidents), -through which the earthly pilgrimage of the Church passes ...-. -But he, the historian, -must not **stare**, as if hypnotized, only at these miseries in history, but must look at things from a higher perspective if he does not want to obtain a view of the course of events that is too narrow and incomplete, not to say biased".\*'

Only those who fix the course of events with the bias of this church are unbiased.

"from a higher vantage point - with a completely obfuscating, falsifying, indeed, often enough completely upside down perspective and distance, sub specie aeternitatis. Whereby one then likes to turn black into white and white into black - see the 13th rule of the Jesuit order! -, so that it is no longer -these miseries in history- that are decisive, but the aspects of the -higher perspective||! Here and again and again the question arises: What actually gives these people the -courage- for their monstrosities?

tions? And again and again, since they are not ignorant, the answer is: a disgusting mixture of a lack of spiritual honesty and overflowing spiritual opportunism, all in all a frightening deficit of shame.

-The great figures of Cyril find Leo the Great must also be put in the right light ...-\*

Have to! Exactly ... And the "right light" is the darkest on Earth.

Nestorios thus represented a -heretical- Christology for Cyril by allegedly denying the -hypostatic union" and teaching two (merely moral, psychological or ecclesiastical) hypostases connected within the Lord - instead of, like Cyril, only one hypostasis or physis, -the one incarnate nature of the divine word- (Mia physis tou theou logou sessrkomene). Curiously enough, Cyril, the teacher of the Church, takes the mia-physis formula repeatedly used before him from Bishop Apollinaris of Laodicea, a friend of the Doctor of the Church Athanasius, in the opinion that it comes from Athanasius, the passionate opponent of Arianism, whose denial, however, led or tempted him, Apollinaris, to also deny the full human nature of Christ and to recognize only one nature in him, which makes the friend of Athanasius a "heretic".

-This man-, writes Adalbert Hamann with ecclesiastical permission from Cyril, -was of the inhuman orthodoxy of an inquisitor-, and shortly afterwards adds almost grotesquely, "yet he was misled by the erroneous formulas of Apollinaris, in the belief that they came from Athanasius, and had the tactlessness to want to impose them on Nestorius. An opponent of equal ingenuity who had interpreted the twelve anathematizations of Cyril verbatim would have been in a position to inflict the same fate on him that he inflicted on the pronouncements of Nestorius - indeed, the Monophysites soon invoked Cyril's authority. And as far as Nestorius is concerned, the Catholic theologian and church historian Ehrhard at least attests to his theory that it was "in a very similar way" to the doctrine of Cyril.

of Aritis was suitable for pacifying 'rational' thinking. He also pursued the goal of dispelling the objections of Jews and pagans to the deity of Christ in the most plausible way.

Consistently, Nestorios did not want to make the Virgin Mary a goddess or deity. He certainly did not want her to be called the "Mother of God" or "Mother of God" (Theocokos), a term that does not appear once in the extensive work (the greatest of all ancient ecclesiastical writers of the **East**) of the church teacher John Chrysostom, who also came from the Antiochian school, which cannot be a coincidence. Nestorios, one of whose first measures was to insert the name of his stepped predecessor<sup>5</sup>, M. John, into the church vault. John, into the church vestry, castigated the idea of a deity wrapped in swaddling clothes as a pagan pabulum, which it actually was! From the end of y8 he preached against the Theotokos, although he was opposed to it.

-He did not oppose the -rightly understood- usage of the term at all, and occasionally even used it himself; however, he preferred the title "Mother of Christ", "Christ-bearer" (Christotokos). He feared the word "God-bearer" as a misunderstanding. For would this not make **Mary** a goddess in the eyes of many? And how, asks Nestorios, who here, as he writes to the Roman bishop Coelestine I (yz-J3z), notices a -no small corruption of the true faith- could God still have a mother? No one would give birth to someone older than himself. But God is older than Mary.

This, however, only confused his congregation, especially those -who, in their blindness to the right view of God's incarnation, do not understand what they are talking about or what they are arguing for. It was only recently that he heard again how they asked each other's souls in our midst. But if God has a mother, Nestorios concludes, then of course the pagan deserves no reproach when he speaks of the mothers of the gods. And Paul is a liar when he calls Christ's godhead fatherless,

motherless, without genealogy. My dear friend, Mary did not give birth to the Godhead ...; the created being is not the mother of him who is uncreated ...; the creature did not give birth to the Creator, but to man, who was the instrument of the Godhead ...-. So much logic, however, irritated the flock, the "wretched gang", as the patriarch also said, against whom he called the police and had them flogged and imprisoned. Many lay people and monks had already begun to venerate Mary as the Mother of God and in general exuberantly - although the New Testament only mentions her extremely rarely, without any particular appreciation, or ignores her completely, like St. Paul and other writings. And although the Mene testament clearly speaks of Jesus' siblings as children of Mary, as did Tertullian much later, for example. But the great crowd wanted to be "redeemed"! Wanted a whole God! So his mother also had to be a "mother of God", especially as such mothers of God were already known in the pagan world - in Egypt, Babylon, Persia or Greece, where Alexander the Great's mother was also a "mother of God".

But Cyril, who, to emphasize this once again, was not driven into battle with Nestorios by the dogmatic dogma, attacked his undoubtedly traditional recommendation as a new "ketosis". He skillfully presented the personal accusations against him as a side issue that was disappearing alongside the religious dispute (Schwartz) and made the keyword "Mother of God" the hallmark of the true faith. He ingratiated himself in Rome with his most holy and beloved father, Coelestine I - for God requires us to be vigilant in these matters - and, familiar with all the subtleties of church politics, he stirred up the agitation against Nestorios, outwardly seemingly noble and prudent, but secretly obsessed. Through his agents in Constantinople, he spread the rumor that Nestorios was shitting the word -God titian" because he does not believe in Jesus' divinity.\*'

A good two decades before Coelestine, another pope had behaved strangely discreetly towards the Mother of God.

At the end of the 4th century, Bishop Bonosus of Sardica denied the permanent virginity of Mary and declared, in accordance with the Gospel, that Mary had several sons in addition to Jesus

although biblically proven, it was a highly ecclesiastical thesis. The Synod of **Capua** (3q1), however, did not condemn Bonosus, but left the decision to the neighboring bishops, who, of course, also avoided it. They consulted the Bishop of Rome, Siricius, who defended Mary's permanent virginity, but again did not issue a ruling. He left this to his -colleagues- - all the more conspicuous as Siricius otherwise gave orders on all sides and almost in imperial letter style (S-Hd). Wdhis reticence probably reflects the fact that in the 4th century there was still no Marian cult was officially known\*'

The title "God-bearer" is missing in the early Christian literature. It is nowhere to be found in the New Testament, which only speaks of the Mother of the Lord, but only as Gotiessofoin, not as Goffesgebärerin. This terininus for Mary is also missing throughout the Christian scriptures of the a. and 3. centuries, when it still played no special role. (The Theo- tokos predicate in Aristides apol. \*7 \*is only found in the Armenian translation. And in Hippolytus it is also a later addition, i.e. a forgery). Only in the twenties of the

q. The Theotokos titulature - after Camelot - was first used for a long time in Christian parlance at the end of the fifteenth century, without being able to name a reliable witness before the 6th century! - in the Creed of Alexandria by Bishop Alexander. And the Synod of Antio- chia (3a\$/3;ZJ), which summarizes Alexander's tomos, also writes: -The Son of God, the Logos, was born of Mary, the God-bearer (theotokos) ...- Yet many decades later, to reiterate this, even the church teacher John Chrysostom never uses the word -God-bearer- in his gigantic work and, moreover, rarely mentions Mary.

Other bishops were also still looking around in the J. century,

to call them that. Even Sixtus III (d3z-go), who soon after 41- built the magnificent Basilica of St. Mary Maggiore on the Esquiline, the

The first Roman Marian church, and for a long time the only one to be completed, referred to Jesus' mother - despite Ephesus - only as "Virgin Mary" in a dedicatory inscription. And around twenty other Roman Marian churches were always simply called -Santa Maria-. In general, the cult of the Mother of God spread only slowly in the West."

The title "Goddess of God" could also have risky consequences. Did this not bring Mary close to pagan goddesses and god mothers? Didn't a woman who gave birth to a god have to be a deity herself? It was not only simple believers who believed this, even educated people were susceptible to it. In fact, there were already Marian sects, there was a branch of the Montanists who called Mary "Goddess", there were Christian groups who saw Mary and Christ as two deities alongside God. According to the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychios (d. s44), patriarchs and bishops who believed that Christ and his mother were two gods alongside **God** were already meeting in Nicaea; they were barbarians and were called Marianites.\*'

It is curious that both Nestorios and Cyril invoke the fides Nicaena - the holy and great council - in their dispute. They therefore change Qp/43o - while the Sandals land in Africa, then besiege Hippo, the Huns advance to the Rhine.

- a series of letters to each other and to others. In the very first letter, Nestorios justifies the rejection of the title Theotokos due to its absence in the Nicene Creed. Cyril, however, invokes this very fact, accusing his -oathbrother- of "blasphemies" in his letter, "a nuisance" that he had given "to the whole church", "the dissemination of an unusual and strange doctrine" and announcing the "unbearable wrath of God". Nestorios ignores "the insults you **have** hurled at us in your astonishing letter. They also demand the patience of a doctor ..." He insinuates Cyril -nir superficial reading and wants to free him -from all false speeches-. He is still full of optimism or does little-

stens so. -Because the affairs of the church are developing more favorably from day to day ...-\*

Cyril cannot deny that the "God-bearer" is missing in the *fides Nicaena*, but he finds it there indirectly and threatens with Christ's word in view of the widespread writings of the adversary: -Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the world; it was not peace that I wanted to bring, but the sword". And because Nestorios had "misunderstood and misinterpreted" the Council of Nicaea, Cyril demanded: "You must therefore confess in writing and under oath that you will banish your wicked and godless teachings and think and teach like all of us who are bishops, teachers and leaders of the people in the East and West".

Cyril works against the patriarch in Constantinople in every possible way, of whom he sneers that he thinks he is "wiser than all, that he alone has grasped the meaning of the divinely inspired Scriptures, the mystery of Christ". He calls him "swollen with arrogance and, by virtue of his chair, hostile to all others". Cyril hoarded pearls of the Church Fathers as well as sermon texts from his adversary that suited him, who soon had every speech co-written and sent by express mail to Alexandria. The saint wrote five books against the blasphemies of Nestorios. He distorted him in confidential letters to such an extent that no amount of concessions helped. He sent groups of monks forward as stooges. He agitated feverishly on all sides. In East and West he looked for allies, comrades-in-arms, naturally as influential as possible. He flooded the court with his epistles. He wrote (carefully) to Emperor Theodosius, to the Empress Eudocia, the princesses Arcadia and Marina, and even to the emperor's sister Pulcheria, whose strained relationship with Nestorios he obviously knew. He turned to bishops, to Juvenal in Jerusalem, to the almost hundred and ten-year-old Acacius of Beroea, and last but not least, in SOFTmßr 430. to Coelestine in Rome, to whom he enclosed a collected patristic flower reading together with a description (*commonitorium*) of the opponent's heresy."



Nestorios had, when he made contact with Rome - as an equal, which must have been disconcerting there - wanted to discuss theology objectively, so to speak, and fight the devil, the enemy of peace, with his brother in office - in harmony ..., as he saw among his own clergy, as he wrote to the Pope, -a Hsretan disease breaking out that stinks of Apollinaris and Arius. But he soon recognized the Roman, quite rightly, as -far too simple-minded to be able to penetrate the subtlest interpretation of doctrinal truths-. Cyril, on the other hand, initially unpopular with his Eastern colleagues due to his attack, chose to approach Rome more skillfully, even though this was by no means pleasant for him. aHoliest and most beloved Father-, he apostrophized the **Pope**, claiming that ecclesiastical custom commands me to report to Your Highness. I have hitherto observed profound silence ... But now that the evil has reached its climax, I believe I must speak and report everything that has happened ..." And against his better judgment, KyriI1, who also presented his agi- tation against Nestorios in Latin, which the latter omitted, presented the teachings of his opponent in such a slanderous and distorted way that he "would not have recognized himself" (Aland). All the light fell on him, all the shadow on Nestorios.<sup>1</sup>

Even in the interest of its pretensions to the prince, Rome accepted the Alexandrian's first attempt at contact in the summer of 430 with satisfaction. And although it was always much less concerned with theological disputes than with questions of power, it nevertheless learned to wield power by means of doctrine. Thus the deacon Leo, who later became pope, obtained an expert opinion (of course for refutation) from his friend Johannes Cassianus, the abbot of St. Victor in Marseille. He had lived in Constantinople during the time of Chrysostom, knew Greek and had already found the term "God's building" (mater Dei and genetrix Dei) in the Bible! And with a Roman synod Yom ii. August 430 6RtG, Coelestine I decided against Nestorios, so to speak, summarily, "without closer examination of the documents" (Hamnian, with imprimatur). The pope graciously authorized Cyril to take his place (vice nostra

usus) the doctrine- of Nestorios -with great severity- beat down the -*gic* of his preaching", and at about the same time sharply rebuked Nestorios, indeed, demanded of him within ten days -openly and in writing to revoke the deceptive novelty.

-We are preparing," he threatened him, "fire-irons and knives, since the wounds that deserve to be cut are no longer to be favored. Cyril, on the other hand, saw the Roman -only like-minded with us", - tested as a powerful defender of the right faith-, praised: -You have uncovered all the pitfalls of the doctrine of lies", and encouraged: "One must cut out such an oath ... So carry out ...-

And Cyril carried it out. He continued to collect material against Nestorios, continued to take little care with the truth and deliberately subordinated false teachings to the one who also recognized Mary's title - Mother of God - as quite orthodox. The emperor accused Cyril of -wrangling-, -madness- and warned him: -Know then that the Church and the State are absolutely one and that they are becoming ever more united at our command and with the providence of our God and Savior ..., and we will under no circumstances tolerate that cities and churches be thrown into unrest by you-. Theodosius was on the side of the man he appointed to Constantinople. And Nestorios was also protected by Empress Eudokia, the beautiful and educated daughter of an Athenian philosopher. However, the patriarch already had many enemies in Constantinople, above all the ruler's scheming elder 5 sister, Pulcheria {3sw4ij }, whose secret violations of criticized Nestorio's vow of Jungfräulichkeit, and the, on Eudokia5, 43q was forced to leave the court. Furthermore, various sects opposed the patriarch, which he fought to the point of bloodshed. Numerous monks in the capital also fought for Cyril under Abbot Dalmatios, stirring up a fierce conflict in his Theodosius' mood was set by the order and he blurted out lies about Nestorios; for example, that he was the herald of two sons of God, two hypostases in Christ, that he saw only one man in Jesus, nothing more. So the oppressed man hastened to speak about Theodosius for

Pentecost 4i- - e imperial synod to Ephesus, the capital of the province of Asia, not realizing that it would bring him down."

### The coXziL OF EPHEsus 431 OR A Dooux THROuGh BESTECHUHG

When <93- apostle Pius XI decreed the iyoo-year celebration of the Council of Ephesus, he lied in his encyclical sLtx veritatis-that the Conxil was held by papal order (lussu Romani Pontificis Caele-

stini I) came about. In fact, however, the holding of imperial synods since Nicaea was always ordered by the Roman emperor, never by the Roman bishop! Not a single one of the eight ecumenical councils in early church times - which were only later appointed by the church because they were particularly useful to it - was called, opened, presided over and confirmed by the pope, but each one (more or less directly) by the emperor (cf. p. 80 f). The emperor's right of appointment has long been proven, especially by

F. X. Funk. But the regents did not only claim this right

The church conceded it to them -even without further ado-(H.-G. Beck). And the same, of course, applies to their right to preside over synods, even smaller ones, the patriarchal synods, the local church assemblies, personally or through representatives, to sign their resolutions and make them legally binding. The monarchs were also able to influence the religious and disciplinary matter of these meetings by choosing the location or by screening the participants; indeed, they themselves had formulas of faith drawn up and enforced - and no less a personage than the Church's teacher **Pope** Leo I recognized the emperor's infallibility (p. aJq f)!"

The Council of Ephesus was also convened by Theodositis II on 19 November J30 at Pentecost (y-J••) (3• ) in order to consolidate the peace and tranquillity of the Church-although these councils were usually

had the opposite effect. -The welfare of our deer-, wrote

the emperor, who had been hostile to Cyril from the outset, accusing him of arrogance, quarrelsomeness and scheming, -depends on religion. These two goods are closely related to each other. They interpenetrate each other, and each derives its benefit from the growth of the other ... Above all else, however, We strive for respect for the affairs of the Church in the measure that God demands ...-'\* The imperial letter of convocation shows the close connection between empire and religion. Each was dependent on the other, each hoped to profit from the other. And the fact that the church, in particular, could never get enough is clearly demonstrated by the

The letter of Bishop Goelestine of May 8, 43\*\*IITheodosius II: - The cause of faith must be more important to you than that of the empire: your majesty must be more concerned about the peace of the churches than about the security of the whole earth. Everything will

You will succeed if only that which is more valuable before God is preserved first."

These lines can hardly be considered enough - a mirror of Roman Catholic thought through the ages to the present day (as the atomic bomb policy of influential clerical circles, including Pope Pius XII, drastically teaches). First and foremost comes the more valuable thing: the Church. Her cause is more important than that of the empire; her peace, that is, her advantage, nothing else, more important than -the security of the whole earth-! Jesuit Hugo Rahner comments triumphantly: -superiority of the church over the state ...-"

All the metropolitans of the East had been invited to Ephesus, as well as those of the West, including **Rome's** Bishop Coelestine, who sent legacies, including Augustine, of whose death, four months earlier, the court was still unaware.

Nestorios was the first to arrive with six bishops, accompanied by an escort of soldiers, who went into battle (Hefele); although the soldiers were still "the most peaceful of the assembled fighting cocks" (Da)lmayr). The patriarch, however, later refused to appear before the synod with six or seven chief shepherds before all were assembled. Likewise

present: local archbishop Memnon, who sided with Cyril with all his churches, as well as the episcopate of Asia Minor, which sought to free itself from the dominance of Constantinople. Juvenal of Jerusalem, who arrived with around fifteen Palestinian prelates and was an ambitious opportunist seeking a supreme metropolitan position and independence from Antioch, also sided with Cyril from the outset. He himself had come by ship and had already reported home from Rhodes: -Through the grace and humanity of Christ, who is the Savior of us all, we have crossed this great and wide sea with gentle and mild winds ..."^^

Contrary to the emperor's orders, Cyril had arrived with an enormous domestic force, with a swarm of around fifty Egyptian suffragans, many clerics and belligerent hordes of monks, some illiterate but strong in faith. Originally made up of loiterers, pallbearers and ship's men, the Alexandrian patriarchs' whipping guards have been the willing tools of episcopal power politics since Athanasius (I ch. 8). Highly fanatical and not shying away from any form of exorcism, they terrorized the courts, authorities and their own ecclesiastical opponents. The monasticism, which had been pampered and chastised by the high clergy, worked with the most brutal means on the hardening of the masses (Stein). Local bishop Memnon had also turned the people of Ephesus against Nestorius, closing all churches to him; Cyril himself had not only, as early as 430, written five books e@dversus Nestorii

blasphemias- was written, not later, in the same year, three more. He had not only hurled out the -De recta fide-, one to Emperor Theodosius, two -Ad reginas-, to his three sisters Arkadia, Marina, Pulcheria and Empress Eudokia, but he had also already condemned the -enemy of the Holy Virgin- together with his alleged theses in twelve anathematisms and swapped the role of the defendant for that of the plaintiff. He treated Nestorius as an outlawed heretic - an unlawful step, as according to current imperial canon law, only a synod appointed by the emperor was allowed to decide a religious dispute.

Moreover, Nestorios had declared in several letters that, under certain conditions, he would also recognize the title of theotokos for Mary, and wrote to the Roman bishop, for example: -As far as I am concerned, I am not against those who want to use the word theotokos, provided only that it is not interpreted in imitation of the folly of Apollinaris and Arius as if it meant a mixing of the natures."

The council could not begin on June y. June, as the patriarch John of Antioch - who had been traveling for weeks on arduous overland routes, during which some chief shepherds fell ill and several pack animals perished - and the bishops of Syria and Palestine were delayed. But although (or because) a message from John on zi. June promised his imminent arrival, Cyril decided to get things underway. It was heifi, several bishops fell ill here too, some even died, and even before the crowd devoted to Ncetorios was present, Cyril opened

" --- J >' 431 in the main church of Ephesus, already transformed some time ago into a Marian church, on his own initiative the synod - despite the explicit prohibitions of the government; despite the (in the Greek council acts suppressed!) sharp protest of 68 bishops of various provinces, -that all rash acts, of which some have professed, will be turned by Christ the Lord and the divine canons against their boldness and presumption; despite the protest also repeatedly raised by the representative of the emperor, the commissioner Candidian, who feared a -private council-, until he was finally -imperiose et violenter" out the door. Cyril thus obtained a secure majority in the simplest possible way. And subsequently it was given the status of a third ecumenical Council of Ephesus.

Later, the saint, who simply took everything to himself, claimed that a few Syrian bishops had rushed ahead of their colleagues, had been in the city earlier and had asked him, Cyril, in the name of Patriarch John, who had then protested and voted against him! - Patriarch John asked him, Cyril, to go straight to the synod

to begin. Even Camelot has some difficulty with the data provided by Cyril ... But before questioning Cyril's honesty, it's better to remember that he didn't remember things exactly or got them mixed up ... - And don't we see it so often today that politicians can no longer remember? That the church in particular simply no longer remembers the most important things? Or that they confuse their collaboration with Hitler, with Mussolini, with Pavelic with resistance? Nothing nice under the sun.

Cyril presided over 153 bishops and also represented, according to the minutes of the meeting, "the place of Coelestine, the holy and venerable bishop of the Church of the Romans". Cyril also did not wait for the arrival of his legates, Bishops Arcadius and Projectus and the presbyter Philip. First, many golden words of the Fathers were read out about the incarnation of the Logos, the union of divinity and humanity in the one Christ. Then they effectively confronted twenty selected 5 passages from Nestorios, terrible blasphemies, which attacked Bishop Palladius of Amasia to such an extent that he covered his ears, almost staring in dismay. Then they condemned the accursed "heretic", Euoptius of Ptolemais, "worthy of all punishment by God and man", one after the other, of quite noisily. And on the very first day of the session, Cyril had the -godless Nestorios-, the preacher of -godless teachings-, excommunicated, deposed and informed of everything by address, unheard - he had wisely stayed away: -to Nestorios, the new Judas-. The synod, according to the formal decision, came to this sad judgment about him with many tears: "The Lord Jesus Christ, blasphemed by him, therefore decreed through the most holy synod present that Nestorius, stripped of his episcopal dignity, was excluded from the entire priestly assembly. But -that NestOfIOS 2U was unjustly condemned as a heretic is today probably the unanimous judgment of historians of dogma- (Klausel). And also that Cyril's actions -were ingloriously characterized by the greatest ruthlessness- (Schweiger).

While Nestorio's soldiers were protecting him, Cyril celebrated himself frenetically with torches and censers, a regie as roguish as it was successful.<sup>10</sup>

He happily reports to the clergy and people of Alexandria - "Hail to the Lord!" -of this za. June, -that after a sitting lasting the whole day, we finally punished the unfortunate Nestorius with deposition and removed him from the office of bishop. He had been condemned and had not once dared to face the holy synod. Over two hundred bishops were assembled - a considerable overreach of the saint. The Council's judgment bears the signature of

\*f7 bishops, but there were only -about 150 BÎBCourts- (Camelot; also the -Handbook of Church History-).^

Cyril goes on to tell his followers that the whole of Ephesus awaited the judgment of the "holy synod" from early morning until late at night and then unanimously began to congratulate the "holy synod" and praise God "because the enemy of the faith had been crushed". After leaving the church, they were led by torches to their homes. - Celebrations and illuminations took place throughout the city. Women even went so far as to walk in front of us with censers! The Lord has shown his omnipotence to those who blaspheme his name."

It is striking: in this whole letter there is not a syllable about the proclamation of Mary's motherhood, which was supposedly the point! In fact, this was not defined at all. The Council texts do not contain any explicit definition of the Theotokos! -*The Council chronicler and betrayer of the Second Vatican Council, Camelot, emphasizes that there were over- Y'rupi iicfif definitions in Ephesus: -In Ephesus, this simultaneously human and divine history led to a dogmatic definition in which nm the highest religious values and the entire realism (!) of tinseres Héles were at stake. This shows once again that, along with the character of Catholic theologians, their logic also goes to hell. And that he probably has one head only to twist the other. (Incidentally, beautifully put: this at the same time human*



and divine history!) In his announcement of the Ephesian drama, Pope Pius X. repeatedly spoke of a solemn definition (solemniter decretum) of Mary's divine motherhood. But someone - the Holy Spirit perhaps

- must have enlightened him. His encyclical -Lux veritatis- (what a mockery!)} of December 1931 Mcontains no further reference to a definition! Instead, Pius now explains the dogma of the motherhood of God only as a consequence of the doctrine of the "hypostatic union", which, of course, was not formulated conceptually at that time either.

For Cyril, neither the one nor the other was secretly of any great importance anyway. That is why his letter consistently speaks only of his own adulation and that of his followers - and of the destruction of the heretic, the feared rival, who was informed by letter: -The holy synod, by the grace of God, and by order of our most pious and most holy emperor, assembled in the city of Ephesus, to Nestorius, the new Judas. Know that because of your ungodly doctrinal utterances and your disobedience to the canons, you were deposed by the holy Synod on about this month of June and that you no longer hold any rank in the Church."

Church Father Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus and participant at this council, wrote about it: -Once again the Egyptian rages against God and fights with Moses and his servants, and the greater part of Israel agrees with the adversaries, for only too few are healthy, who also gladly endure hardship for the sake of piety ... What comedy writer has ever told such a fable, what tragedian has ever written something so tear-jerking?"--

Nestorios declared of this ecumenical meeting that Cyril was the whole meeting itself, because whatever he said, everyone followed him. There is no doubt that he represented the Church through his person ... He summoned those he liked from near and far, and made himself a judge ... Who was the judge? Cyril. Who was the prosecutor? Cyril.

Who was the Bishop of Rome? Cyril. Cyril was everything". Pope Cyril I, for his part, naturally vindicated himself -the greatest ten, thanks to the help of the venerable Trinity- and boasted of having "handed the knife to cut this ulcer out of the body of the Church", as it "made the terrible rot appear ràtually". (In the eighth century, the Catholic church historian Palanque attests to the -heretic- Nestorios a bad character - and to St. Cyril -malice- .")

Pope Celestine, however, declared the Ephesian congregation to be a "great multitude of saints" who bore witness to "the presence of the Holy Spirit". Cyril had only used the Romans as a front, only for his fight against Constantinople, the patriarch and the emperor, the papal envoys had no influence whatsoever on the decisions, they did not even represent the entire West: the episcopate of Africa and Illyria was represented independently. Finally, the Roman legates, whose arrival had not even been awaited, were mentioned only briefly and incidentally in the long report to Coele- 8tin, which was entirely in keeping with their appearance - despite some full-blooded phrases, that the most holy and blessed Peter, first and head of the apostles, pillar of faith and cornerstone of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the human race, the bowl of the kingdom and the power to bind and loose; he who lives in his followers to this day and for all time ... -, urid so on."

Immethin, however, not only had Cyril won Rome for himself, but Coelestine, at that time really not much more than a trump card in the hands of the Alexandrian, had also been honored in the East as hardly ever before. After all, the declaration of his lieutenant, the priest Philippiis, was added to the minutes of the Council and still served as evidence of papal infallibility at the First Vatican Council (IË7 O) 81! The papacy, at any rate, offered the tragedy of the patriarch Nestorius in his struggle with Cyril and the Council of Ephesus the

opportunity to visibly demonstrate the new Roman claims of the Decretal Age to the whole world on the great stage of the Oriental imperial church. One can rightly speak of a tragedy, because the differing views of the Antiochian and Alexandrian schools on the question of the Incarnate Word need not have become heretical and divisive. The driving force behind the catastrophe was the lurking hatred and the relentless will to destroy with which Cyril fueled the Nestorian dispute and drove it to its peak. His strongest fighting force consisted of monks - poorly educated, hostile to reason and therefore easily fanatized ... - This is the verdict of Catholic theologian and church historian Georg Schwaiger on one of the greatest saints of Catholicism."

The council was triumphant with Cyril's triumphant victory announcement

is not yet over.

A few days later (because of bad weather and because the horses were stalled), the Syrian courts, who had been preemptively excluded by the saint and were then called "Orientals", appeared under their patriarch John of Antioch, a friend of Nestorios. They immediately confraternized on z6. On June 6, in the presence of the imperial commissioner and official council protector Candidian, they united with some of those who had opposed Cyril on June 6 as the "undoubtedly legitimate council, it cannot be called anything else" (Seeberg), also known as the much smaller synod of erwa o Biachöfen. They deposed Cyril, as well as the heavily incriminated local bishop Meianon, whose order of monks harassed Nestorios to such an extent that he received military protection. (The decree of deposition bears the signatures of Hz in the Greek records and 3 in the Latin version of Rusti-cus J). However, the synod declared all the other council fathers excommunicated until they condemned Cyril's heretical propositions, "which openly contradict the teaching of the Evenbelium and the apostles". The minority addressed an angry protest to the emperor against the -barbaric assembly- of opponents and began Cyril's letters

Theodosius, whereupon the saint sent his hand- and punch-proof monks, among whom Seeute of Atripe {p. 203 ff), saint of the Copts, was particularly prominent, into the streets<sup>4</sup> and total anarchy prevailed. The Nestorian minority council could hardly be protected from the enraged crowd, although Nestorios was also accompanied by a guard of cudgels and threatened the lives of Cyril's bishops.

In the course of July, after the Roman envoys, the bishops Arcadius and Projectus and the priest Philip, the actual spokesman, had arrived, the majority of the council met five more times. In his welcoming speech, Philip remarked that Pope Coelestine had already decided the matter in a letter to Cyril, whereupon a second papal letter was read out, first in Latin (the delegation insisted on this) and then in Greek, and those assembled, obviously prepared by Cyril, shouted: -A right judgment! To the new Paul Gölestin! To the new Paul Cyril! Celestine, the guardian of the faith, Celestine, who is in agreement with the Synod! To Celestine the whole Synod gives thanks! One Celestine, one Cyril, one faith of the synod, one faith of the whole world! (-"One people, one empire, one leader!" Which German of my generation would not think of this - even more eccheidenic? -cry of the Nazi era ...?f)

A belief of the whole world! Yes, they still want that  
- if it is their faith! Their unbelief ...

Through the synodal acclamations, Alexandria and Rome were, as it were, on an equal footing, parity. The pope, Philip, therefore put the matter in Roman terms, using sacred jargon: - We thank the holy and venerable Synod that after the reading of the letter of our holy and blessed pope before you, you have joined the holy members to the holy Hatipte by your holy voices and holy exclamations; for your blessedness knows well that the head ... of the whole faith and of the apostles is the blessed apostle Peter.

Roin's ideas of primacy. But Bishop Theodor of Ancyra very cleverly undermined this intention. Even Cyril himself did not think of allowing himself to be made the Pope's mandate and finally emphasized again the primacy of the old synodal order, the consent of the Romans to the decision of the synod (not the other way round!), without, however, either side getting into each other's way. Each needed and used the other for its own purposes.

The papal delegation confirmed the deposition of Nestorio on July II. On 16. July, the majority council declared the deposition of Cyril and Memnon by the Orientals to be non-canonical and invalid. \*On July 7, it excommunicated the Patriarch John of Antioch (after he had refused a threefold summons) together with his followers and ordered their suspension from all ecclesiastical offices until they had been removed.

rung". Each council had thus cursed the other in quite Christian terms, each sent a delegation to the court by supreme command and the emperor confirmed the resolutions of both. An attempt at unification failed. Abbot Dalmatius, who was considered holy, had even become active on Cyril's behalf and had allegedly not left his cell for 8 years. **Now**, however, he stood on the spine of a crowd of monks and demonstrated in front of the imperial palace, accompanied by holy chants and huge crowds of people, until the indecisive ruler received him, who was now supposed to decide, had to decide, but wavered longer. At the beginning of August, the state treasurer (comes sacrarum largitionum) John appeared in Ephesus with a letter from his herm, which deposed Cyril, Memnon and Nestorios, until he himself, Comes John, when a dispute arose in his presence at a meeting of both parties in order to prevent unrest, also arrested all three main protagonists, Cyril, Nestorios and Orisbishop Memnon, the latter separately in his own palace.

In this decisive phase of the Council, at which Cyril introduced the dogma of the "Mother of God" and the "Mother of God", a change in the mood of the Council took place, for reasons that are partly shrouded in darkness.

court (Library of the Church Fathers). For Cyril was soon back in Alexandria at the end of October, where he rewarded his guards by being accepted into the clergy there, but above all, through his agents in the capital, he continued the Council in his own way, a la Cyril, so to speak. For now the man who speaks most often and most pathetically of the charismatic in the Church (K. Rahner SJ), Pope Goelestin I. -my holy brother Cyril1- ntnnt, bonus fidei catholicae defensor", -probatissimus sacerdos-, -vir apostolicus-, whom Athanasius Sinaita praises as "the seal of the fathers" and whose name generally lives on in the history of the church and dograe as that of the chosen instrument, the great administrator, indeed, savior of orthodoxy, he now lavishly poured the gold of the Alexandrian church over the court. He was interspersed with his assistants and spirits, and the saint bribed God and the world,

"All that was to be done, but everything only -in favor of the threatened faith- (Grilltneier SJ). Last theological negotiations ...- Dominican Camelot {with ecclesiastical permission to print) headlines this section - ... all things that we do not want to go into in detail because they do not directly affect the Council-<sup>o</sup>.

But we'll linger here for a while - especially since hardly anyone believes that the Alexandrian flooded the imperial court with his -egg-logies- for charitable reasons.

St. Cyril, by decree of the Congregation for Rites of  
 z8. July 188a with the highest title of the Catholic Church, -Docror ecclesiae-, excellent - gcbbrandmarkt! -, donated, personally and through others, generously and at the right moment putting everything on the line, to the princesses, the court cainarilla, coveted ostrich feathers, expensive fabrics, *tapestries*, ivory furniture. He pushed *large* sums of money to *high* scaats6camten, his well-known "means of persuasion", as Nestorios mocked, although the mockery was to pass him by. -golden arrows-, money, lots of money. Money for the wife of the praetorian prefect, money for influential eunuchs and camuier-

The Alexandrian throne, although very rich, had to borrow another 1500 pounds of gold (ion one gold piece), but still did not get into debt. (When Cyril's successor Dioscor took office, he found the coffers empty as a result of these bribes). In short, the Doctor of the Church, Cyril, notwithstanding his holiness, on the contrary, committed -bribery maneuvers of the greatest style- (Caspar), but at least those, writes Jesuit Grillmeier, -which did not fail to have their effect-. The list is available, it can be read in the original council records, a letter from Epiphanius, Cyril's archdeacon and secretary (syncellus), to the new patriarch of Constantinople, Maximian, supposedly the oldest source, names the gifts, an enclosed list records them precisely, and church father Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, reports on them as an eyewitness."

An expensive dogma, no doubt about it. But it still applies today. And success justifies the means and here, quite literally, even the mediators of success. After all, the Holy Spirit has also been made very much available and theology, i.e. what it brings in, has cost a lot. Money plays a relatively early role in enforcing faith and violence - and then even more so. Jesuit Bacht casually strikes -the rich bribers-, with which -the patriarchs of Alexandria never [!] skimped" - but others, such as the Romans, just as little! Church and "heretic" leaders have operated with it, paid it, pocketed it, even Christian emperors, like the first, Constantine, who not only rewarded the clergy with money and favors, but also the clergy with money and favors.

(1 z f, \*35 K, but also gave donations to the poor to make them Christians."

And it certainly played a role that the dogma of the divinity of Mary came about precisely in Ephesus - at the headquarters of the pagan mother goddess, the Phrygian Cybele, the Ephesian city goddess Ammis, whose pilgrimage knit the Ephesians had known for centuries. Artemis, worshipped as the -hearer of prayers-, -savior", eternal virgin, especially

The last devotees of the goddess buried her image in the temple and carefully placed all the pieces of the broken ssiilchen and hinds that could still be found, while the building was torn down by the Christians in holy zeal" (Miltner).

Cyril, to whom the world owes - among other things - "the most famous sermon on the Virgin Mary of the Ancient Alm" (HO - 4i (Altaner), if it is genuine, which even Catholics have strong doubts about.

had put his "golden arrows" right into the bull's eye. Even the pious, episcopally approved -Handbook of Church History- cannot help but speak of "an extensive gift campaign to the most influential personalities in the capital- whereby the Patriarch -burdened the Alexandrian Church with an enormous burden of debt-; but at the same time seems piqued by the fact that Nestorios later bitterly characterized this as a bribe- - as if it had not been one of the most outrageous. The Catholics, as is always the case in highly embarrassing cases, freely make no less highly embarrassing excuses. Theologian Ehrhard, for example, does not, of course, subsiimize the church teacher's huge sins -behind our modern term of description-, because otherwise he would have to be "condemned most emphatically", and that is not acceptable. So he glosses over it as a well-known contemporary custom ... not to approach a higher-ranking personality [?] without a gift. Even for Ehrhard, however, the saint would be -higher in our esteem if he had not submitted to this custom, but had relied solely on the goodness of his cause-. But that is precisely what he could not do.

However, the Constantinople patriarch was now visibly losing his footing. The mood at court changed. Emperor Theodosius II, dependent on his surroundings for the rest of his life, intimidated by Cyril's terrorizing monks and perhaps by the letter from Pope Coelestine that he had just received.

< \* . 43\*, inculcates Christ as the proper Lord of his kingdom ("-imperii rector"), which is why the regent has orthodoxy



Theodosius I and Nestorius fell, especially since the latter made the mistake of offering to abdicate. He renounced his episcopal office and only sought to influence the ruler to proclaim edicts in all churches on the rejection of Cyrillic chatter so as not to give the simple-minded any cause for suspicion. On September 3, 451 Nestorius returned to his old monastery near Antioch and held the \*5 October the presbyter Maximian as successor, a man that Cyril did not mind.

Ditto the pope. Coelestin welcomed Maximian's "elevation", honored him with a letter in the tone of his superior and addressed a long pastoral letter to the Clergians of Constantine Peter, as if they were all under his command. And on

10. Mär 451- he once again attacked the dethroned Nestorius. He compared him to Judas, but the latter came off better. He castigated his godlessness, but was so careful to -his

Perfidie not the "Irrglaube" to give, because -not every godlessness is "Irrglaube"; a very interpretative word. And while he called Nestorius a "sinner" with an "envious look", he put himself in the most beautiful light. -To myself, wrote the Pope, -I owe the greatest share, thanks to the help of the venerable Trinity, in the restoration of the tranquillity [!] of the whole Church and the summit of the present joy; for it was I ... I cast the seed ..." And: -since cutting this boil from the body of the Church made the fearful fate seem advisable, we passed the healing bandage with the knife at the same time.

Cyril, of course, also trumpeted his triumph into the world and did not rest until his damned adversary, the -reverent Wolf-, the -reappearing dragon-, -the treacherous man with a poisonous tongue-, who had already resigned himself and kept quiet for years, came into his own sphere of power. 36 Initially exiled to Petra (southern Palestine: Tadi Muse), he was finally banished to a worldless, almost waterless nest.

The Egyptian desert (with the evocative name of "Oasis"), a place of residence for court officials and prisoners who had become "fugitives". Guarded by the saint's scouts, in the most primitive of conditions, but inwardly dejected and still believing himself to be orthodox at the end of his life, Nestorios vegetated lonely and forgotten, abducted, killed several times until, after a futile plea for mercy, he presumably died around 451 in the region of Panopolis (Upper Egypt). He left the world his memoirs, the *Life of Heraclides*, his (1910 edited) sorrowful autobiography, in which he draws parallels to the fate of his predecessor John Chrysostom, also to Athanasius and to Flavian.

Nestorios was the interplay of Alexandria, Rome and also allowed the court to experience it. Pope Celestine I had implored Theodosius to provide assistance in order to make his own rule all the more permanent. And after the council, he celebrated the monarch almost effusively, calling his kingdom with the prophet a *kingdom for all eternity*. This title of glory would remain with him, "no time and no ageing will erase it. For eternal is that which is done out of love for the eternal King". This was entirely in keeping with his earlier wish: "Blessed is the empire that is devoted to the service of God's cause. In truth, of course, it is not the empire that is blessed, but the papacy. And so it should be. That's what it's all about\* Which is why every hardness, meanness, baseness is self-evident. Walter Ullmann rightly emphasizes that it was the pope who asked the emperor to exclude Nestorios, who had already been condemned by a bishop's decree, from society - for Johannes Halter a sign of how much the overthrown man was still feared and held responsible - who was even believed to be capable of rolling up the Pelagian strike again."

Council chronicler Camelot, however, presents us with a typically Catholic rheological summary. Starting with the question of which was the "real Council of Ephesus", he begins by saying that many modern historians see this

Synod -only a rather sad affair-, a -lamentable- and convoluted tragedy, staged by the alenandrinese aPha- rao- (quote, by the way, from a famous Catholic, the ecclesiastical historian Louis Duchesne, who, of course, has not remained entirely unaffected), and iusses, Indeed, even today, many scholars, even good ones, who are not all heretics, feel driven to judge Cyril's behavior in this whole affair, and thus also the Council itself, harshly, even to 'bring it into disrepute'. It is not uncommon to think that Camelot himself is ncige to do so, as he cites weighty reasons in favor of the Council of Nestorius and John and important ones against that of Cyril, whose contestability and objectionability are "completely beyond doubt". Then, of course, he writes:

"The presence of the Roman legates, however, was sufficient to ensure the ecumenical character of Cyril's council, which the synod of the Oriental bishops lacked. Thus Cyril's council, and not that of John in Gemcinshah, stood with the

Which proves once again, as a thousand times in history, that you only need to make common cause with the pope to turn injustice into justice. Nevertheless, Camelot says that some speak of the "robber synod of Ephe- sus", which is worth no more than that of ç q (p. zzo ff). Indeed, Horst Dallmayr, in his book -The Four Great Councils-, published by the Catholic publishing house Kösel, calls this assembly, at which the papal legates nevertheless decided -all canonical and in accordance with the ecclesiastical rule-, -a fiasco-, that  
 -"The most annoying council in church history."

Today there are only a few Christian monuments left in Ephestis, the former council church is in ruins, and in Izmir, the largest city far and wide, there are about aooo Christians out of a population of around J5o one."

THE "UNION", Elfi FAST  
INCREDIBLE ,AND KYRILLS  
GAUNERSTÜCK MIT DEM MÖNCH VIKTOR

But when the wind changed again and storms of protest began throughout the East, Cyril, whose gold and cunning had triumphed in between, abandoned almost everything he had represented theologically in Ephesus for the sake of his position. The two synods

- Pope Coelestine had repeatedly congratulated the Council on its successful work in May 43\* - were in fact completely unreconciled. But after some toing and froing, they capitulated.

Cyril was already dogmatic in 433. He gave up considerable parts of his terminology and signed a creed as a union formula, which Nestorios would also have accepted as far as possible, if not completely. For now he accepted the distinction between the human and divine characteristics of Christ, which he had rejected at the beginning, and professed a typically ambiguous compromise formula: Christ true God and true man in - unmixed unity-; and accordingly Mary God's Mother. -In the end, Nestorius could also have signed this (Haller). Yes, today there are atich for Horst Dallmayr, who professes to be a Christian, not many Letites who doubt that Nestorius would have signed this symbol of union with all his heart. It was the wording of a protest letter against Cyril's "Anathematisms", a synbolum probably from the pen of Theodoret of Cyrus, which the Antiochians allied with Nestorius had already **q31, often** word for word, drawn up in **Ephesus** and sent to the **court!** "Let the heavens rejoice, let the earth be glad," Cyril now called out to John. And in return for no signature, the Antiochians now recognized the consecration of the new patriarch of Constantinople, Maxiniian, and - compared by Seeberg to a "moral suicide" - the dam- ming of his predecessor Nestorios.

Yet they taught the same as he did! Even on the return journey from Ephesus, in Tarsus, in Antioch itself, they had condemned their chief bishop Cyril as an apologist in two synods out of great indignation, an insult that also recurred in their controversial writings, and excluded the holy Doctor of the Church and his followers from the Church. Bishop Alexander of Hierapolis continued to demand his retraction of the Anathematisms. Indeed, an opposition group, led by Bishops Helladius of Tarsus and Eutherius of Tyana, urged the new Pope Sixtus III to condemn the Alexandrian. Ganm provinces fell away from John. Emperor Theodosius, however, had no use for the priesthood. He called in Symeon the Stylite, a saint much mocked in ancient and modern times (by Gibbon, Tennyson, Haller) but highly praised by the Church, who first stood on a small column for seven years, then on a larger one for three years, allegedly condemning entire tribes of peoples to the

-Government services- and such a quantity at all, besides Symeon worked such miracles that even Catholics would find them unbelievable (Wetzer/Welte). In the face of the clergy, however, Symeon, the miracle-working and gosichtsreiche, who was once even persecuted by his own monks in the monastery of Teleda, was obviously powerless. And even when a special envoy of Theodosius, the tribune and no- tary Aristolaos, who had been sent to Antioch, demanded the condemnation of Nestorius and his writings, the Orientals resisted far and wide at a synod. It was only after the patriarch John invoked the -worldly arm- and the emperor's officials cracked down that the Syrian episcopate signed the condemnation of Nestorius, with the exception of a weak minority gathered around the Nestorian Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis, who was dethroned and exiled to Egypt at the instigation of the patriarch. Once again, corruption triumphed

and violence. But John, who\* 43\* had deposed Cyril in Ephesus with all his priests, now cried out: -We agreed (with the Orrho- dox bishops in Ephesus) in deposing Nestorius . . .!-"

It was an almost unbelievable deal called the "Union" between the patriarchs Cyril and John, in which two popes had a hand: Coelestine I, who was now dead, and his successor Sixtus III, who wrote to John with complacency bordering on cynicism: - Through the outcome of this matter, you have experienced what it means to be of one mind with us" (and in memory of the Council, decorated the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore, which he had rebuilt, with mosaics of the Virgin Mary).

Several bishops outside Cyril's sphere of influence, such as Succensus of Diocaecarea and Valerian of Tarsus, attacked him fiercely. But even some of his own supporters, including one of his first, Acacius of Melitene, a fierce antipode of Nestorius, were scandalized to such an extent that Cyril had to take reproaches, make declarations, and in short, to be harsh and cruel in order not to lose them; while Johannes, who was bound to Nestorius by an old friendship, appeared to be his traitor. More and more the Antiochians stood accused, while Cyril and Alexandria, as the stronger power, tritimphezied. Curn darsuf Theodosius II and Valentinian Iß. had all the writings of Nestorius burned. -See, beloved brother," said Pope Sixtus of the Armenian patriarchs in praise of the -most gracious and most Christian emperors, -how vigilantly they devoted themselves to the cause of religion; they knew my rest in reflection and did not concern themselves with worldly things if they had not betan the heavenly (before) enough ... They have espoused the cause of Him Who has never denied Himself to their empire. They know that they lend their care to Him who repays them with rich rewards. Praise is due to us because we see the earthly rulers allied to the heavenly King.

Throne and altar! -Give me, O emperor, the earth cleansed of the heretics, and I will give you heaven for it. If you destroy the infidels with me, I will destroy the Persians with you!" This is what Nestorius had called out in his antrim sermon

(p. I J7)- Now he himself was -heretic- and destroyed. With the exception of the "Lib#r Hera- clidis" (available in Syriac translation), almost only fragments of him have been preserved, although he

himself was not a -Nestorian- and did not believe in the formula that was soon proclaimed as orthodox in Chalcedon (p. xzq ff). He declared himself "orthodox" up to the present day - even contemporaries spoke of a -Nestorian tragedy. And in fact, he has not been proven to be a -Keizer- to this day. Well-known researchers have tried to rehabilitate him. Dogmengeschichtler Reinhold Seeberg has explained and summarized Nestorioe' faith according to the -Liber Hera- clidis", who sharply criticizes Cyril and points out his own position: -Heretical' there is indeed nothing in this doctrine ... In the result it is in complete agreement with Leo and the Chalcedonense. The difference consists only in the fact that the latter have left general accusations and assertions alone, while Nestorius has refuted his opponents just as carefully as he has developed his view. It is hardly saying much to describe his book as the most important and most astute attempt to solve the Christian problem that the early church produced.- The extent to which he really taught "heretically", writes Catholic Franze{j, "remains unclear to this day". Above all because on this side a serious error, a crime, is rarely admitted.

But the Nestorians, now publicly persecuted, fled to the Persian Empire in shame. There, where they were well received, they further weakened the already weak Catholica. q8y the heads of both churches, the Nestorian Barsumas of Nisibis and the Catholicos Babuaeus of Seleucia, hurled the ban against each other. Babuaeus was executed in the same year. However, the Nestorians, officially separated from the Catholics since the Synod of Seleucia in q86, spread rapidly. As they were also disputing the Monophysites, this led to new battles. Nevertheless, they expanded, reaching around the 6th century Ceylon and the Turks of Central Asia, in the y. century, along the Silk Road, China, where the Christian

tum for almost two centuries. Many, writes the zealous missionary Catholicos Timotheus I (y80-8x3), -crossed the seas to findim and China, taking only staff and pouch with them". In the id. century, however, the Mongolian storm caused a sudden and sharp decline. In the iö. century, numerous Nestorians joined Rome as united so-called Cha)dians and Malabarchrists. I \*7th century

many Nestorians became Monophysites (Jacobites). But still in the zo. There is a (small) Nestorian church in Iraq, Iran, Syria, there are over xoo one Nestorians in Kiirdistan, about Joan Nestorians in India and z one Nestorians in the USA. However, Nestorios remained the God-damned -Cetes-, while the Council of Chalcedon celebrated Cyril as the second Athanasius and adorned him with the title of a -saint of the orthodox and immaculate faith\*-.

In fact, the saint was completely devious, like, no doubt, many princes of the church, who, however, do not all become saints, let alone teachers of the church. But no matter how cunningly the "eSaChWalter" fought before the elimination of his opponent - supposedly for faith, not power - now that he had power, faith no longer seemed so important. He had recently threatened Nestorios with the Lord: -Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the world; it was not peace that I wanted to bring, but the sword-, so after the

Destruction of the Nestorios in Ffiiibj>- 4ai John of Antio- chia, let him be mindful of the Lord's word: 'My peace I give to you, my peace I leave to you"'. He also taught he was sung: -Lord, our God, give peace, for with it you have given us everything". Yes, after he had everything!

What had gone before no longer counted. John also thought so, writing to him: -As far as the reasons for these differences of opinion are concerned, we need not go into them in detail in these times of peace. Cyril replied in a similar vein: -The manner in wh i c h the schism occurred need not be explained. Rather, I think it is more appropriate to explain the



to think and say what is appropriate for the time of peace." And he was now able to quickly and completely confirm that the division of the churches was completely irrelevant and therefore no longer appropriate. In terms of faith, too, everything was now right. The -beloved brother and fellow minister Johannes" had given him "an irreproachable confession of faith" and after these -holy words- he could only "state that we think as you do. For it is *his* Lord, one faith, *one* baptism- (Eph. q, )-. Yes, now everything seems to be in order. Cyril, the great defender of the faith, the champion of Orthodoxy, now no longer insisted on Alexandrian school expressions, but adopted the faith formula of a moderate Antiochian Christology. He suddenly manifested -a high degree of conciliation- (Catholic Ehrhard). And the grumblers, the reprovers, -the "unintelligent", the "false teachers", the people full of - foolishness- and "Fairy tales", all -who are accustomed to pervert the right-, to - twist the Holy Spirit-, all who -swarm around like wild wasps and speak evil against me-, yes, they must -be exposed to laughter-, they must -have their mouths stopped-. They charge their **heads with** an unquenchable fire."

The union deal makes it clear how little Cyril cared about the faith. He was apparently hardly interested in the Pelagian controversy, which did not concern his lust for power, while Pope Celestine - who was not even able to prevail against the Catholic bishops of Africa in the Apiarius affair (p. 8q ff) - persecuted the Pelagians in Gaul, Bithania, to the end of the world at that time, as far as Ireland, before he himself - blessed in the Lord - passed away (Grönel."

And the -Union- trade corresponds - if you like - Smaller trickster play with the monk Viktor.

Victor, presumably an abbot, was one of the accusers of Cyril<sup>8</sup> from the "Alexandrian cluster", whose complaints were the cause of the Council, one of the most dangerous and one who enjoyed particular respect. His accusation was defeated in Ephesus. Now, after Cyril's victory, Victor feared for his existence.

On the other hand, Cyril still had to fear the reputation and knowledge of the monk, who impressed even the emperor. Viktor was now prepared to declare that he had never accused Cyril. He corroborated this incredible lie with an oath, after which he was able to return to his Alexandrian monastery. And Cyril, the holy Doctor of the Church, not only pretended to believe the oath, but also played the sworn lie - as his strongest trump card - in his own defense.

digungsschrift against the emperor. Like himself, he said, he was atich Viktor had been slandered. He had never accused him, his patriarch. So in the end, they both stood unblemished. ^

The Alexandrian had achieved a tremendous triumph through the Council of Ephesus, not so much theologically as, the real point of the matter, in terms of church politics. -The Council," emphasizes Heinrich Kraft, "had its significance in that it ultimately led to the clear condemnation of Nestorius, whereas it contributed little to the clarification of Christological dogma. Above all, it was a victory over the patriarch of Constantinople, the capital, but also over the government, which at least initially stood by Nestorius. The Patriarchate of Alexandria, which had been on the rise since Athanasius, had now reached the height of its power. Cyril became the leader of the Eastern Church, indeed, he raised

-his secular power in Egypt over that of the local imperial representatives (Ostrogorsky). ^

#### ST. Kyrill AS -CHETZER"-COLLECTOR AND INITIATOR OF THE FIRST14 -END SOLUTION -

The entire horrendous lust for power of this saint, however, is satisfied - typical of Catholicism in general, of course - under the pretext of the struggle for faith; whereby Cyril's Opera, despite various losses, fills ten volumes of the Patrologia **Gracca**, a volume that only Augustine and John Chrysostom surpass among all the old church fathers.

Cyril constantly sees the -church of God- threatened by so - many heresies-, by the -wicked and godless teachings- of arid Christians, -godless ones", who -but also very quickly rush into the depths of the underworld-, into -the snare of death-, if they do not -he echoes this- -come to an ignominious end already in this life-. It is only against the background of his obsession with power that the often so tiresome, stupefyingly informal flut of his invective becomes understandable. The demonizing of all "ndeo-believing Christ already in the first centuries (I KB}3. 3), he continues cher **massivecr**, dabci completely in the footsteps of his notorious predecessor and teacher, the h1. Athanasius, "our blessed and highly t o u c h e d father", whom he does not surpass in stubbornness but in brutality and at least equals in stylistic incompetence. Even on the Catholic side, there is not much that is attractive in Cyril's language and presentation, which may be a coincidence. Mon calls his expression -matt and verbose and yet again pompous and overloaded- (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter), in short, his writings -do not occupy a very high literary rank (Altaner/Stuiber) - to put it mildly.

Anyone who doesn't want to be like cr, is actually only a - heretic-. He accuses them of -understanding||, -overgrofie||, - ma8lose ignorance||, -wrongheadedness and depravity|| - because anyone who teaches differently is always morally bad too -; he accuses them of -resentment||, -blasphemies-, "folly-, jugglery and empty chatter-, -Folly driven to extremes. Such lente are -in the highest degree sacrilegious-, -with fug and right twisters and perverters", as it were "drunk", -dazed by intoxication", -intoxicated by the yeast of wickedness-, -very crippled by ignorance of God-, full of foolishness and teachings of -devilish origin-. -They falsify the faith handed down to us, supported by the invention of the "new dragon", that is, Nestorio.

Cyril often barely finds an end to the kind of invective that a saint is entitled to. And of course he demands - now to the Emperor: -Forr therefore with

the crusher of those people ...- -For thus with all the swagger and empty talk, with all the delusion and deception of polished words!" Just as Nestorios curiously preached to the emperor in his inaugural sermon -Destroy with me the heretics ...- and obtained an edict against all -heresies- in May 448, so for Cyril, too, the -heretic-romance- was a self-evident duty of the ruler. For, he threatens with the Old Testament, -if they do not teach themselves, the Lord will make his sword glitter against them-. The Lord was not only the emperor, the Lord was above all Cyril.

After his election as bishop on 17 October 448, he took sharp action against the previously tolerated and thoroughly orthodox Novatians. Cyril in particular was not impressed by their particularly strict morals. In an open fight against the imperial governor, he had their churches forcibly closed, expelled them himself and, in a further violation of state law, had their assets disappear into his pocket, as did the private assets of the Novatian bishop Theopemptos. Cyril, praises the "Library of the Church Fathers", gives many a sect "the deathblow", admittedly with the -pen-, his -main- weapon-, one thinks here. -O of madness!" he nibs again and again.

-O of the foolish and the insane mind. -O of the old- wisdom and of the slack spirit which can only babble ..." Ever-, heretics- have only "godless inventions-, -abominable fables", -pure nonsense-. And they always stand on the pinnacle of wickedness". -Truly, an open grave is their throat ..., Ottemgifr is under their lips".

"Sober up, you drunkards, from your intoxication!"

Cyril also persecuted the Messalians (from syr, m<sup>h</sup>allyané - worshippers, therefore called Euchites in Greek): Ascetics, apparently mostly of the lower classes, with long hair and buff hair, who abstained from work and sought to serve Christ in renunciation, in complete poverty. They cultivated the cohabitation of men and women as an expression of brotherhood, which the Catholics particularly disliked. After they had already been condemned earlier, Cyril in

Ephesus once again condemned their teachings and practices and drove them underground. Of course, many others also took part in the hunt. Patriarch Atticus of Con-

stantinople (4 -WJ), whom Pope Leo I praises, the Greek Church venerates as a saint (feast: January 8 and October ii), calls on the bishops of Pamphylia to expel the Messalians like mice and *prayer*. Patriarch Flavian of Antioch has them expelled from Edessa and all of Syria. Bishop Amphilochios of Iconium persecuted them in his diocese, as did Bishop Letoios of Melitene, who set fire to their monasteries; for church father Bishop Theodoret: -caves of robbers-. Nevertheless, the Messalians were still living in the Bogumils in the Middle Ages

However, whenever Cyril *is* attacking - this is also typical of Kletis politics throughout two millennia - there is always an abyss of madness, folly, nonsense and delusion on one side. And on the other, the immaculate orthodoxy, he himself, whose "wise and intelligent exposition is not subject to censure on any point", as he modestly attests to himself. Immer and his followers are among those who have founded their faith on the unshakeable rock (est, preserve their piety to the end ... and laugh at the impotence of their opponents. 'With us is God ...' - The -glory of truth- always shines there, and if everything there is full of -insanity and insanity", one -somewhat in sleep and in the noise, one knows

-neither the scriptures nor the power of God! Sleep therefore, as it's right to take your drunkenness out..."-

-The most beautiful testimony of his noble mind is-, Cyril praises a -special edition- published with ecclesiastical printing permission under Hitler, -that he sought to uphold the commandment of brotherly love even in battle and, despite his innate fierceness, did not allow himself to be tempted by even the vilest spitefulness of his opponent to break his self-confession. To a more recent researcher, this saint appears to be -an intellectual of a decidedly cerebral type" and his fight against -heresy- still -so backward-

holding- (Jouassard) - at least next to his attacks on pagans or even Jews!

Patriarch Cyril, who in the case of the latter "misses all understanding of the mystery" of Christianity, speaks of their -uriverstand-, their -sickness-, calls them spiritually -infirm-, -crucifiers-, -murderers", treats them in his writings even worse ... than paganism" {Jouassard). But not only in literature, like most of the old church fathers (I chap. z), he also struck in reality. Already you, the man -of extraordinary energy-, this -character in a gu8- (Catholic Daniel-Rops), confiscated all the synagogues of Egypt and turned them into Christian churches. In Palestine, too, the Jews were increasingly oppressed and the synagogues burned down by fanatical monks. And when Cyril ordered and threatened their leaders in Alexandria itself, where many Jews lived, atrocities are said to have taken place on the Jewish side, a nightly massacre that, according to sources, can neither be proven nor denied in principle. In any case, the saint now, without any authority, led a huge mob to storm and destroy the synagogue, plunder the property of the Jews as if in war and expel them himself with his wife and child, without possessions, without food, allegedly more than 100 000, perhaps 200 000 people. The expulsion was total, the Alexandrian Jewish community, which had existed for 700 years and was the largest in the diaspora, aiisrooted - the first "final solution" in church history. -It may be that this procedure Cyril-, it says in the -Library of the Church Fathers-. -s3s. -not entirely free from ruthlessness and violence. is".

When Orestes, the imperial governor, immediately complained in Constantinople, a horde of desert monks rushed to the saint, smelling the smell of blood and piety from afar (Bury), insulted Orestes, who had been dewed in Constantinople, as an idolater, a pagan, and physically attacked him. He was wounded in the head with a stone and would probably have been killed had it not been for the people

he stood up for him. Cyril paid the assassin Ammonios, who died under torture, the honors of a martyr, which not even all Christians considered him to be. Ever, he glorified the monk in a sermon - and had his troop of thugs, which an imperial decree of October 5, 468 reduced to one, already on the February 3, 418 to 600.<sup>^</sup>

After the "martyr's" death by torture, however, people were suitably stimulated to murder Hypatia.

For in the course of the Alexandrian turmoil in March 451. iRit Cyril's agreement and by him -aifgepiitscht- (Lacarrière), the

Hypatia, a daughter of the mathematician and philosopher Theon, the last known head of the Alexandrian Museion University; a teacher of the church father Bishop Synesius of Cyrene, who wrote of her as -mother, 5sister and teacher- apostrophieri, as a -beloved of God philosopher", who was known even to Christian listeners. To Cyril's resentment, the prefectus augustalis Orestes also liked to associate with her. However, after the patriarch had whipped up the people, defamed Hypatia as a sorceress in his sermons and spread fraudulent reports about her, she was attacked from behind by the saint's Munich, led by the cleric Peter, dragged into the church of Kaisarion, stripped naked, literally shredded with broken glass and the dismembered body burned in public - "the first witch-hunt in history" (Thieß).\*'

But also, yes, even more, a persecution of pagans. And Patriarch Cyril was generally regarded as the spiritual author of the crime" (Güldenpenning). Even the anthology "Reformer der Kirche", published with imprimatur in 1990, writes of one of the greatest Catholic saints: -He is at least (!) morally co-responsible for the common murder of the noble pagan Hypathia . The reverend historian 50- crates, moreover one of his colleagues who strives for the most "objectivity", also reports that the deed was committed by the people of Cyril and

of the Church of Alexandria. -Thus one can be convinced that the noble and highly educated woman actually became the most prominent victim of the fanatical bishop" (Tinnefeld). Paganism held even stronger positions in Egypt than is usually believed. There were larger pagan groups among the so-called people, and there were significant anti-Christian personalities in the ruling classes, especially among intellectuals."

However, Kirill, who continued the fight of his predecessor and uncle Theophil against them, could of course see nothing else in the Gentiles than in the Jews. They had to be beaten to the ground, as Josiah, whom he had made famous, had actually done. -who burned the idolaters together with their groves and altars, eradicated all kinds of sorcery and divination, and suppressed the wiles of devilish deception-. Cyril does not fail to add: -"In this way he secured recognition and praise for his government among the ancients; and to this day he is admired by all who appreciate the fear of God."

But this holy criminal, a man who on the one hand claims that the Greek philosophers stole their best from Moses, and on the other hand has himself copied parts of his own sutras from others, as boring as they are spread out (thirty books alone - Gegen den gottlosen Julian": ten each against each book of Julian's -George against the Galileans-): Cyril, convicted of many lies, of slandering Nestorius, of the highest bribery, guilty of expropriation in favor of the church and in his favor, of banishment, of many thousands of expulsions of the most brutal kind, of aiding and abetting murder, this devil, who repeatedly proved anew what a "dangerous risk" it is, as he himself says, "to be at enmity with God and somehow offend him by deviating from the path of duty", was soon praised as a "defender of the truth", a "fiery lover of accuracy". The initiator of the first "final solution" in Christian church history, which of course was to be followed by many more -final solutions-, became the most distinguished saint of the Byzantine church.



Orthodoxy- (v. Campenhsusen), but also one of the most shining saints of the Roman Catholic Church, -doctor ecclesiae-, Doctor of the Church. Even after Hinter's extermination of the Jews, he is for Catholics - in the full meaning of the word an extremely virtuous man - (Pinay)! But already in the I6. The Catholic L. S. Le Nain de Tilleinont sneered discreetly and with the cynicism so often celebrated on this site: -Cyril is holy, but one cannot say that all his actions are equally holy-. Just as Cardinal Newman, seemingly irritated, comically confronts Cyril's -outer acts- with -his inner holiness-."

Despite his striving for impartiality, despite his efforts to seek "the good in both camps", a researcher like Geffcken is, of course, always violently repelled by Cyril. There he finds: "fanaticism without genuine, let alone luminous passion, erudition without depth, diligence without real loyalty to the small, clumsy brawling without dialectical practice and, in the very end, no honesty in battle ..." This is not only Geffcken's opinion, but probably that of almost all non-Catholic historians. And there are good or rather bad reasons for this.

When the great saint died, the whole of Egypt breathed a sigh of relief. A letter, perhaps apocryphal but attributed to the church father Theodoret, expresses the general relief: " At last, at last this terrible man has died. His departure rejoices the survivors, but it will have grieved the dead."-- What creatures were active in the patriarch's surroundings, should show at least one example in more detail.

EaCHENUTE OF ATRirx (cx. is            !)  
AS HEAD OF THE MONASTERY

Schenute (Saïdic - son of God) was Cyril's companion at the Council of Ephesus, where he "played an outstanding role" (Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche). Before that, however, he herded cattle as a Jtinge in Upper Egypt - often the beginning of a great Christian career. He came early to the white monastery of his uncle Pgöl, was often severely punished there and allegedly soon fasted himself so thin that, according to his disciple Visa, -the

Hatit was on his bones. But since 3 5 he himself has been in charge of the White Monastery of hei Atripe in the Thebais, a double monastery where he has at times directed up to zzoo monks and 1800 nuns.

But even Johannes Leipoldt, Schenute's modern biographer, who is so fond of defending his hero and emphasizes that he was known as a "hard tyrant", sees him tirelessly harassing "pagans and sinners" with "terrible violence", a man whose "fatist is as fierce as his tongue ... a strong hero. The -great abbot-, -prophet-, -apostle- did not shy away from physical deception or murder. On the contrary, he was able to punish his monks for even the smallest

-Passing-, a laugh, a smile, a barbaric beating for decades, occasionally even a slap. Visa's "Life of the Schenute" regularly paraphrases this with the impressive sentence: -... the earth did ant, and the wicked sank into hell with lei'end body iii-

Miasma treatments are particularly popular with rheocratic groups. They are not only beaten for the sake of "improvement" or to strengthen one's own authority, but also to magically cleanse and remove harmful miasma. Corporal punishment already existed in Jewish sacral law; however

it is no more than, after all, o blows, then3 q being. (The Egyptian law refers to lashes, the Greek to yo and ioo). In the Christian era, flogging was retained,

yes, frequently practiced; although - significantly - in the case of the

Penalty takes into account the status of the persons! Also as a

church

scourging was known as a penance. The 6th Synod of Toledo (633) decreed that people of lower rank were to be punished with 100 lashes for idolatry or fornication. However, not only the (lower) laity, but even the clergy themselves, were struck from the 6th to the 9th century at the latest. The monasteries, however, were particularly hard hit. Jean Paul wrote that "the Catholic novice is beaten into a monk."

Schnute, vacillating between exaltation and deep depression, had regulated every little thing in writing, and he treated every little thing like a state action. However, it was not important to him "that the *right* commandments for the monastery were kept, but that *his* will as ruler was enforced."

Although he sometimes recognizes the barbarity of his reign, he vows that God does not advise him to wage this great war in you, he vows to rule more mildly, to leave the sinners to the judgment of heaven. But such impulses are brief. He is harsh, perhaps more ruthless, Leiboldt suspects, than the monastery rules prescribed. Every offense had to be confessed. Showing off was favored, urgently demanded. And he beat the brothers with his own hands, who often rolled on the floor in pain. When one of them succumbed to his ordeal, he talked his way out of it sophistically, no: Christianly. He was a character well aware of his position (Benedictine Engberding) and became a saint of the Coptic Church (feast: y. Abib

- i. July).<sup>101</sup>

Schenutes Rohcit also shows his behavior against those who "cut off their genitals in order to become pure". The strictness of the cloister is said to have prevented sexual intercourse or even just an "assault". The monks were forbidden to have sex in the dark, and the nuns were not even allowed to see a brother on his deathbed! Nor was a healing ascetic allowed to treat a woman or a male member. But the lustful fantasies were all the more rampant. And these -offenses- return in the register of sins.

The white monastery was constantly revisited. If the scrupulous cut off their penises -in order to become pure-, which was forbidden by the church, the holy man threw them outside the gate without further ado. -Lay them, as they bathe in the blood of their wound, on a bed and take them to the road ... And they may be a (deterrent) example or sign for all passers-by". Of course, he is not completely merciless. At least he allows - but only permits, not commands - that self-mutilators should not be allowed to die in a white monastery for the sake of their souls. For "if you want it for God's sake, hand them over to their relatives so that they do not remain in our environment ..."."

Only the abbot did not beat up the nuns himself; he probably shied away from

Temptations. A kind of permanent envoy, a -Greis-, represented him there. And the -mother- of the monastery, the headmistress, had to report all cases of punishment to him, because -father-, whereupon he decided on the number of beatings. Only girls were allowed to be beaten at any time without his consent. In both monasteries, as in others, there were children, although not much more is known about their existence than that beatings played a major role in them; children always had the privilege of being beaten a lot in a white monastery. Their misery in Christian monasteries merited thorough study. Their fate in (Christian) monasteries still today!<sup>101</sup>

A letter that is unique in the literature of Coptic monasticism reports on the beatings that Abbot Shenute inflicted on the nuns:

-Theonoë, the daughter of Apa Hermef, of whom you told us in the first time that she committed evil crimes and stole: thirty-eight strokes of the cane.

The sister of Apa Psyros, of whom you told us in the first time that she was secretly carrying something away: twenty strokes of the cane.

Sophia, the sister of the little old man, of whom you have told us that she stubbornly contradicted and answered those who taught her, and many (others) without reason, and that she

slapped the old woman in the face or head: twenty strokes of the cane.

Jenbiktör, the sister of little John, of whom you told us that her insight and knowledge were not complete: fifteen strokes of the cane.

Taese, the sister of little Pscha\_, of whom you have told us that she hastened to Sansno in friendship and fierce desire: fifteen strokes of the cane.

Takñs, whose name is Hrebekah, whose mouth has learned to speak in lies and vanity: twenty-five strokes.

Sophia, the sister of Zechariah: ten lashes. And I *wet D*, which is why she will be given it.

And her sister Apolle also deserved to be caned. But for God's sake and because of the care given to her, we forgive her this time, both because of that (forbidden) intercourse and because of the garment she put on in her lust ... Then I because she would not be able to bear it (caning), as she is very fat and thick ...

Sophia, Joseph's sister: fiinfñhn strokes of the cane. And I know why they'll give it to her.

Sansno, the sister of Apa Hello, who says: I teach others: forty strokes of the cane. For sometimes she hurried to her neighbor full of friendship; sometimes again she lied because of vain, transient things, so that she harms her soul, which the whole world is not worth, much less a picture or a drinking bowl or a little cup, because of which she lies. Ah these (blows) the old man will give them with his hands (i.e. personally) on their feet, while they sit on the ground and hold the old woman and Tabõm sic to him and other elderly people.

£rauen with him. And also those old men ... by holding their feet with sticks until he stops chastising them, as we did with some of them at the beginning. But those who oppose him in anything, let him tell us when he comes to us; we will then teach you what to do with them. But if he wants to give them more blows, fine;

It is right what he will mu. But if he wants to give less, he has to decide that. If he wants to cast someone out, fine. But if his heart is satisfied with some of you, so that he wants to forgive them this time too ... Good.

The punishment of expulsion, which often occurred, was also sometimes preceded by imprisonment and castigation. But theologian Leipoldt justifies these and other monstrosities more or less summarily: -The EJofig is *dv*: Scheniite saved his monastery as best he could through the dangers of overly rapid growth. The followers were accustomed to the rule and its hardships ...-'o'

#### DERHL. ScHENUTE AS HEAT FIGHTER - ROBBERY, RuINING and MctRDEN

Schenute's work was not limited to beating, however intensively and extensively he practiced it. Rather, his terror is closely linked to the downfall of paganism in Egypt. And this happened there - where Clemens Alexandrinus already found the people worse than apes because of their worship of the gods (cf. I x96 ff) - even more violently in the late 9th century than elsewhere.'o'

The extermination campaigns, however, were almost always led by bishops and abbots who saw even the most glorious temples as foci of infection, strongholds of Satan. And the worst destroyers were those "swinish blackcoats", as the Greeks said, who looked like men but lived like pigs. As ascetics whose repressed instincts tended particularly towards aggression, destructiveness, they were as it were made for the business of ruination, especially as their ranks were filled with all kinds of eccentrics, tragicomic existences. The origins of some of their most famous are almost typical. Zhenute was a herdsman, Makarius a smuggler, Moses a criminal, Antonius a school failure.

Their disciples and like-minded people had chosen the "e@\$jtf-culture" and, not least because of this, had gained recognition in the Christian world, -because they faced the devil almost like "professional bo- xers" (Brown).<sup>o</sup>-.

In agitated hordes, dressed in animal skins, they roamed the land, ravaging temples, burning, dragging down even the most magnificent works of art, seeming to depict only gods. Since the state officials became more relaxed in their persecution of paganism, they took the monks into their own hands. They were almost never absent wherever an old sanctuary was burned down, a

-The "heretic" church, a synagogue was burned to the ground, or where money was to be taken. And flocks of greedy looters plundered villages suspected of being unlawful. -The monks commit many crimes," even Emperor Theodosius I had dared to complain to Bishop Ambrose, who was expelled from the cities in September 390.

(although this was already revoked on April 7, 3Pz). Perhaps he had recalled a text by Libanius, the highly esteemed, the enlightened pagan (of whom we have many speeches,

The monks, who are so fervently admired by the Christians, yet -eat more than elephants, empty numerous cups- and themselves only -skilfully conceal their own way of life under artificially pale paint-. So they, complains Libanios 38q in his step "Pro templis" directed at the ruler, rush ahead in pale torrents and devastate the country by destroying all the temples. -They storm the sanctuaries, emperor, although your law still exists, loaded with logs or armed with stones and sisters, some even without these things, merely with hands iitid feet. Then, as if it were ownerless property, they tear down the roofs, overthrow the walls, smash the images of the gods, shatter the altars. The priests only have the choice between silence and death. Once the first temple is destroyed, they rush to the second and the third, heaping trophy upon trophy in mockery of the law.'<sup>^</sup>

The temple dismantling required state approval.



For Syria, the extermination ac ---- 399 @legal  
in the west, however, where the Roman aristocracy had replaced  
the old

In the same year, the temples were legally closed, O7 but a  
constitution under Stilicho confiscated all pagan sanctuaries in  
the territory of Rome. lui East, 43d Theodosius 11 decreed the  
final destruction of the temples, exorcism, destruction. But even  
this was to be accomplished without much

turmoil (*sine turba ac tumultu*). And since the authorities,  
officials and soldiers tolerated paganism more than the decrees  
issued under clerical pressure allowed, the clergy and the people  
also went over to unauthorized temple evacuations - anti-ken  
"crystal nights" - or, as the euphemistic term of *art* goes, to  
"Christianization"; often, as Jesuit Grisar would have us believe,  
or even mainly as a result of the tumults caused by the pagans.  
At times in the eastern provinces, where Christianity prevailed  
and pagan resistance, in the double sense of the word, was still -  
academic- (Jones), more and more Teaipas were already being  
established in the second half of the 4th century. In the second  
half of the 4th century, more and more Teaipel miners were  
killed, with the fanatical masses not infrequently taking bloody  
revenge on the Old Believers. It is known that they occasionally  
fought back; but Brian does not know much about it."

But the terror had long been literarily prepared, also by  
Schnute.

According to tried and tested patterns, he transcribes the  
following in cut-outs

- The worshippers of wood, stone, birds, crocodiles, wild  
animals and cattle. He mocks the lighting of lights and offering of  
incense, which still flourishes today in Catholicism, only no  
longer for -gods-, but, oh great difference, for "**GOD**" (12ft his -  
holy ones"). In doing so, Schnute used a tactic that is still  
practiced in ecclesiastical circles, especially in Catholic ones: in  
front of the masses, he denigrated and blasphemed coarsely and  
primitively, thus increasing hatred and fanaticism. In more noble  
circles, he struck a serious tone and, however difficult this might  
be for him, sought to win over his opponents through fairness.  
-And how Schnute for the Hcidcn and their service hardly

has other feelings than mockery and derision, he rejoices in the often bloody persecution that the Christian mob waged against the learned Hellenic priests in his time. He praises the 'righteous kings and generals' who destroy the temples and overthrow the images of the gods. He rejoices that the statues ... are dragged away. He is amused by the mocking songs of the Christians about the pagans and their temples" (Leipoldt).<sup>1\*</sup>

At that time and later, however, Schenute, the -great abbot-, also devastated the country - an enemy of science, the worst hater of the Hellenes, a Catholic zealot who destroyed all the powerful, the temples, the statues of the gods (and lenteres at least since Julian's assassination -at the order of the day-: Spark), laiithals lobn ftu def Spitze already (ast soldierly gedilltei, by him appropriately boosted, sufficiently aiis starved Aske- tenhaufen - Flgisch, fish, eggs, kisses, Wein were forbidden, almost uur bread and blo8 a meal daily trlaubt - he invaded the temples, plundered, demolished them and threw the -goddess images" into the Nile. But *he took* everything that was valuable and promised money to his monastery. A year before he supposedly died at the age of xz8, he visited a temple in the Thebaid in this way. And so theologian Leipoldt can't resist calling it an undeniable merit of Schenute's, -as IJ' according to

4s in Upper Egypt all the gods were no longer worshipped."<sup>o</sup>

Wicderholt removed the temples of his homeland with his own hand. -The example of his archbishop Cyril inspired him to achieve great success in this easy and convenient way", writes Leipoldt and reports Schenute's burning of the pagan Hciligium in nearby Atripe. Or that of the temple in the village of Pneuitt (Pletiiit). - The pagans who witnessed his deed did not dare to defend themselves. Some hurried away like foxes fleeing from lions. The others confined themselves to **p l e a d i n g** :

'Take care of our places', i.e. spare the holy temple! Only a few found the courage to threaten Schenute: if he

If he had a well-founded claim, he could submit it to the court and send it through. Indeed, at the last moment, voices were raised among Zhenute's followers who, probably fearing possible evil consequences, called for peace. But Shenute believed he had to ignore them. He relied on the favor of his archbishop and the Christian government and was determined to complete the planned work. He stole all the portable objects from the temple, the sacred candlesticks, the spell books, the sacrificial gifts, the bread vessels, the ritual implements, the votive offerings, even the sacred images of the gods, and returned to the monastery with rich booty: perhaps it was not without reason that Shenute was later accused of having appropriated the rich temple treasures in order to provide the monks with an extraordinary income in the bad economic times. Of course, the evil consequences of this act did not fail to materialize. When a pagan Htge- mon came to Antino<sup>9</sup>, Shenute was sued there by the priests of the plundered temple. But if they had thought that the pagan official might agree with them, they were mistaken. They had forgotten how *she* was hated by the people and worshipped by Zhenute. In short, on the morning of the day of judgment, Zhenute did not appear alone in Antinoi. From all the villages and towns in the surrounding area, Christians, men and women, flocked to the town in such numbers that the roads could hardly contain them. Their numbers *grew* from hour to hour. Soon they were masters of the whole of Antinou, whose inhabitants were still largely pagan. And when the trial was about to begin, the whole assembled crowd shouted like one man: 'Jesus! The roar of the people drowned out the voice of the judge: the trial was thwarted. But Shenute was led into the so-called water church amid loud cries of triumph, where he preached a powerful sermon against the Gentiles.'"

To rob, to ruin, to incite the people, to fleece before  
But the murder came mainly from the wealthy Greek landlords,  
the economic ruling class."

Thus, when the great temple of Panopolis was burned down, the rich rebel of the pagans was liquidated. And since the abbot also entered the houses of the other notables to destroy all kinds of gods and devilish things and to cleanse the area, they were also slaughtered there. And one night in Akhmin, after Zhenute had raided the house of Gesios, who had just been away, smashed his "idol" and hurled it into the river, but the robbed man had complained to the governor.

-The "Life of Schenute": since J- us took his riches from him, no one has heard from him again - the standing formula apparently for the saint's murderous deeds. Even when he, like he himself confesses to have smashed a much-visited pagan statue of Akhmin with his monks, robbed the town, set it on fire, massacred the inhabitants, then, says Zhenute, they met the fate of Gesios, -they were never heard of again, and after the massacre their legs were scattered to the wind ...- -A hard, rough, haggard, but also captivating and rousing ... Character", for whom "only the practical was important: -Obey God and do his work- (Lexicon for Theology and Church)."

In Altaner's -Patrology-, also a standard Catholic theological work, Schenute (with imprinature

\*97 ) eldest or most powerful organizer of Egyptian monasticism", "the most important writer of national Coptic Christianity". Ernst Stein also praises the abbot as the spiritually most outstanding man of his people, the "hero of Coptic Christianity".

But he adds that he gives us a yardstick by which we can measure the spiritual misery of his nation - in his intellectual drive and his brutality, which does not shrink from murder and manslaughter. "\*.

## PER EUTYCHIANIS CHE DISPUTE

A few years after the Union trade (433)', a monstrous scandal, Nestorios died in the desert, and his antipodes, the frenemy and traitor John, the h1. Cyril, were no longer alive. But the opposition continued and also brought down Alexandria. The Monophysite controversy, however, ini

The "Arianism" that took the place of the Arianism in the 5th century divided the Church and Christianity even more deeply. However, grotesquely enough, the monophysite "heretics", the followers of the

-mia-physis -formula, essentially referring to h1. Cyril, since he largely taught -nothing other than the Cyrillian-Alexandrian Christology- (the Jesuits Grillmeier/Bacht). Thus, this Doctor of the Church moves into close proximity to the most popular "Catholicism" of the East in early Christian times, if he was not, as some researchers believe, its most influential promoter."

In Constantinople, NestOfiOS 43i had the -Null- Maximian (p. 18 ). 4i4 was followed by the ambitious Proclus, who had run for the episcopal chair three times in vain, and finally, after his death '4 , by the rather honest but weak Flavian.

In Antioch, the clerical Nepotis-

At the death of John aaz, his nephew Domnos became patriarch, advised above all by Theodoret, the most important theologian of the school there, but of somewhat shaky orthodoxy. In Alexandria herrscelite after Cyril's death on ay. June a a his successor Dioskor, who pursued the traditional power struggle against Constantinople and championed an ultra-Cyrillic theology - unrestrainedly ambitious and ruthless to the point of brutality, supported in this by the imperial military and fanatical, powerful monks (Schwaiger). The Catholics almost unanimously considered Dioskor to be one of the most unpleasant bishop figures of the yth century. Century. However, it is not a coincidence, but rather consistent that Cyril appointed him as his archdeacon and placed special trust in him. They were both cut from the same cloth. Which makes it quite fitting that

Dioskor accused his patron Cyril immediately after his death of embezzling the church treasury (cf. p. 18a ff), confiscating his estate and excluding several of his relatives from the clergy. "\*.

Moreover, in his fight against Constantine Pel, Dioscorus, like Cyril, attacked both the patriarch of the capital and Antiochian theology. But in the end he tightened the noose he had laid for both opponents himself, above all because he had not, like Cyril, laid it in alliance with Rome, but believed he could also win against Rome.

Two influential figures in Constantinople, the court eunuch Chrysaphius and the archimandrite Eutyches, fought on the side of the Alexandrian.

Since Chrysaphius QI had enforced the banishment of the empress Eudocia and the elimination of the emperor's sister Pulcheris, he had steered the policies of Theodosius II. However, the powerful eunuch was at enmity with the patriarch of the city, Flavian. In recognition of his election, Chrysaphius did not receive a corresponding gift, but only consecrated bread, which he immediately returned with the wish that he had an appetite for gold. Third in the alliance: Archimandrite Eutyches, head of a large monastery near Constantinople, highly respected in the East and godfather of the all-powerful eunuch. The illustrious Kleeblatt sought to liqUidate the -Union" of d33 and to use the infamous -Twelve Anathematisms- of Cyril as a guideline against the then - admittedly shameless - Antiochian theology. string of the "right faith". Patriarch Dioscor of Alexandria was to regain precedence over Patriarch Flavian of Constantinople."

The maneuver was initiated by the old Abbot Eutyches.

Catholics like to portray him as dogmatically unfounded, as a theological fool. But of course, when it comes to the question of God, some know and know as little as others, even if some are more tongue-tied, more cunning, more certain and for some reason that cannot be reconciled with logic, honesty or even the slightest empirically based knowledge - from where?

because! - have to do with -right-. -In any case, there is *nothing* "finalized" here. The whole thing hangs in the air, a pure game of nomenclature, a -mere idea-, with Kant, a mere groping around, and, worst of all, under mere concepts-. Is there anything more philosophically shameful than the necessity of still having to say this?"

According to Eutyches, the new theological spectacle that now broke out, which was soon to shake half the world, was called the Eutychian controversy, whereby the traditional alliance between Rome and Alexandria broke down for the first time."

Eutyches, a monk from his youth and with a reputation for piety, was suspected of "heresy". And Pope Leo, who had initially praised his zeal, finally threatened him with the fate of those whose "false teachings" he had followed if he remained "in the filth of his folly". Euty- ches denied the faith that was accepted in Christ -two natures after the union. He took the doctrine of the union of divine and human nature propagated by the Alexandrian school to the point where it became a complete mixture, monophysitism. This Christological variant went back to the heretical Bishop Apollinaris of Lao- dicea (d. after 360), who restricted the human nature when he argued about the union of both natures in the Lord, which did not yet drive the Orthodox to the barricades. A whole series of writings by the "heretical" bishop could be copied and disseminated under the names of "orthodox" church fathers, which today seems comforting to the theologian Heinrich Kraus, because it shows (among other things) how little the ancients understood about the things they argued about with such passion! In reality, that which makes a mockery of all experience and is based on nothing but fictions, in other words fantasies, cannot be understood. In short, monophysitism, in order to secure the unity of the Lord's person, denies the completeness of his human nature, either - according to the more moderate heretics - since the resurrection or - according to the radicals - since his incarnation,

what in the difference of his human nature from ours out.

While I'festorios allegedly insisted on separating the divine and the human in Christ, on distinguishing the divine personality from the human, Eutyches taught that the divine and the human were inseparably mixed, that the human was absorbed into the divine - in other words: "one nature after the union", the mia- physis formula that Eutyches had borrowed from St. Cyril! The whole of Eutychianism, Ca- melot concedes, -lives from the undul&am true to Cyril's fórmulations, especially cii the forinel of the -one .nature'. The Monophysites recognized Christ after the incarnation only rise, the divine nature (mia kai mone physis). Eutyches therefore denied the humanity of Christ. He declared that he was transformed into the Godhead, -as a drop of honey is absorbed into the water of the sea. On the other hand, the - 433

at the -Union- so fallen over - Antiochians. Your netier

Patriarch Doinnos, the nephew and successor of John, protested to the emperor against the heresies and slanders of Monciis Eutyches."

Now Patriarch Dioskoros I of Alexandria (+t4\*45\*) intervened. The successor of St. Cyril, who simply called himself

-Emperor of Egypt, forced the nepotes **sénes**

He was the first to call on his predecessor to surrender the property under his control, but did not do otherwise. Like the latter, he led

-a veritable regime of terror-, yes, was -sognr (!] not impeccable in moral terms (Ehrhard). Like Cyril, he had his informers and Hellershelfer at the imperial court. And like Cyril (and like many bishops), he made particular use of the monks for his power-po)itical goals, i.e., curiously enough, the very Christian community that had emerged as an escape from the world! After all, all the original ideals of Christianity turned into the opposite sooner rather than later. Protected by his bodyguards, Archbishop Dioskor, a saint to the Monophysites, ruled by naked force and, if necessary, assisted in the exercise of his spiritual jurisdiction by hired murderers.



after. His own clergy, ruthlessly tyrannized by him, finally accused him of wanting to rule the country himself instead of the emperor (Marrian)."

The patriarch soon found himself in an increasingly heated feud of letters with his Antiochian colleague, behind which, of course, stood the old rivalry between the two patriarchates, and all the more so as Flavian Safi, an Antiochian, now occupied the chair in Constantinople. "-Dioscor", writes the church historian Theodoret, Bishop of Cym, on behalf of the Antiochian Patriarch Domnos, "refers us to the chair of St. Marcus in one go and yet knows that the great city of Antioch has the chair of St. Peter, who was the teacher of St. Marcus and, on top of that, the first and head of all the apostles".!\*

The protest was addressed to Flavian, the chief shepherd of Constantinople, urging His Holiness "not to allow the sacred canons to be trampled underfoot with impunity, but to fight courageously for the faith. But Flavian, a rather modest and timid man - whom ecclesiastical historiography calls "irenica", all the more so because a prince of the church cannot honestly be called such - did not want to have to deal with the powerful monk head of his diocese. Eutychei nevertheless, co wrote Nestorios, still attentively following the battlefield in exile, +like a servant-. It was only when Bishop Eusebios of Dorylaion (Phrygia), a feared hothead who smelled heresy all around and who had once denounced Nestorios, a man who, as Flavian moaned, -in his zeal for the faith the fire itself was too cold-, came out against Eutychei that he had to attack him and summoned Eutychei to the Synodos endemousa in November jd8.\*'

Eutychés was initially prevented by a vow, then by illness. Only after the third summons - a c c o r d i n g t o canon law, the summons to a synodal court had to be issued three times - did he appear at the seventh and last session on az. He appeared at the seventh and last session on November 13, 1838, accompanied by a group of monks, the military and the prefect of the guard. The man, who claimed to have lived in his cell as if in a tomb, wore a mask during the

Processes -the appearance of a cloistered man withdrawn from the world", who "could not leave his cloister for professional reasons", so to speak, but was "in reality closely connected with current events in church politics for *decades*. This is how Jesuit Bacht characterizes his behaviour, which is almost classic for the hypocrisy of countless church leaders in the old and new times."

Eutyches referred to the faith of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril and took a clear, indeed extremely monophysical position. Cyril and held a clear, indeed extremely monophysical position: Christ was certainly true man, but his flesh was not of the same nature as human flesh. He may have consisted of two natures before the incarnation, but not *afterwards*. Rather, his two natures had become one divine nature (monon physis) at the moment of incarnation. He tirelessly repeated his confiteor: -I confess that before the union our Lord consisted of two natures, after the union I confess ntir one nature-. Even Pope Leo I, by his own admission, did not for a long time understand the "iniquity" of Eutyche's teaching! At first he even seemed to side with him, especially as he had already been his benevolent ally in the fight against the Nestorians. Patriarch Flavian, however, took courage and dismissed Eutyches as a blasphemer of Christ with the obligatory tears. He stripped him of his abbacy and priesthood, banned him and sent the records (gcsta) of the trial, v"> 3\* bishops and (subsequently!) \*3 Afchfintan- and abbots, to Rome. Everything, his -burden of Grief and the multitude of tears, he laid down before Pope Leo. The latter initially had little sympathy for Flavian - if only because of the Roman bishops' chronic suspicion of the ambition of their colleagues in Constantinople. Flavian had probably also delayed sending the documents to Rome. In June 648, however, 1 Co I also condemned Eutyches and his unnatural and foolish errancy. He now called the monk's head, who was already almost seventy years old at the time (such a fierce anti-Nestorian and friend of Cyril that Cyril was an exemplar of the Council of the Holy See), a "great saint".

sent from Ephesus) not only "senex imperitus", but also "stultissimus-, a stupid man who knows neither the Scriptures nor even the beginning of the Creed".

But the "wolf of heresy" did not give up. He sent letters all over the world, to the bishops of Ravenna, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, to the -defenders of religion- - only the epistle to Pope Leo I has survived, in which Eutyches calls it all a tricky game and also says: **-even** my life would have been in danger if I had not been snatched as quickly as possible from the raging mob by God's help through your holiness's prayer (probably a deliberate misunderstanding). He compiled a florilegium of quotations from the -fathers- with nothing but condemnations of the duality of natures. Indeed, he tried to influence the population by putting up walls, which Patriarch Flavian freely ordered to be removed immediately. But Eutyches found support in Emperor Theodosius II, whose ear he possessed through his bishop's child, the all-powerful eunuch Chrysaphius. And together with the Alexandrian archbishop Dioscorus, they also managed to push through the enormously expensive organization of an imperial council in Ephesus - to strengthen the true faith, as the regent emphasized in his decree of convocation on 30 March 449. March 449 emphasized. In vain, the prescient Flavian, now allied with Pope Leo I, who also received an invitation on 26. May, also received an invitation to push back the *Izomme* assembly."

## THE "robber's SYNODE- OF EPHEBUS 449

The imperial synod of Ephesus convened by the emperor on i. The Imperial Synod of Ephesus, convened by the emperor on August i, was not constituted with around 130 bishops until August 8 j q.

As in q3i (p. \*7\* f9, the meeting was again held in St. Mary's Church, the strength of the Cyrillic victory. In accordance with imperial orders, the - according to established practice with twenty vassal bishops - presided over the meeting.

The Alexandrian Dioscor, with whom Pope Leo I initially maintained good relations, to whom he expressed his respect and affection, combined with the hope of further prosperous relations between Rome and Alexandria. -We wish", he had written to him on July xi. July dy,

-to establish your beginnings more firmly, so that you may lack nothing for perfection, since, as we have proved, the merit of spiritual grace is at your side. However, when spiritual grace was with the devil, he mocked him as a "new Pharaoh", as Cyril was already called. The only nature in Christ, the rehabilitation of Eutyches - the revenge for his damnation in the last year -, the deposition of Flavian, the elimination of all

-The "Nestorians" were a united cause. Two imperial commissars, the Comes of the Holy Consistory Elpidios and the Tribune Eulogios, appeared with a fixed synodal marching route and a strong military contingent and supervised everything. Theodoret of Cyrus, the most important theological power of the opponents, was banned from attending. And the council fathers of the -endemic- synod of the previous fall, together with all the other bishops, were not allowed to vote. Dioscor himself appeared with his monks and his armed bodyguards disguised as nurses (parabolans), who were "ready for any violence" (Caspar). As a precaution, he had also brought along the Syrian archimandrite Barsumas (Bar Sauma), a well-known anti-Nestorian, whom an imperial letter had appointed as representative of the oriental abbots at the council on account of his virtue and orthodoxy. Barsumas, however, who, although not a bishop, was given a *sirz* and a vote contrary to all tradition, was a friend of Eutyches, and both accompanied him.

The monks were a considerable number of sturdy monks armed with shakes - Batsumas allegedly numbered a thousand. In any case, the monk hordes proved to be extremely useful in the *various* phases of the council."

The three legates of Leo 1, Bishop Julius of Puteoli, Deacon Hilarus, the post-Irish pope, and the secretary Dulcitus (who did not know Greek and had to rely on the interpreter Bishop Florencio of Sardis) were undoubtedly much less useful. (A fourth legate, the priest Renuat, supposedly the most important man, had died on arrival in Delos). Leo's envoys had sent letters to various prominent figures in Constantinople, including the emperor, whom he tried in vain to dissuade from attending the council. Finally, among Leo's mail was the "Epistola dogmatica ad Flavianum", the so-called Tomus Leonis, a dogmatic declaration by the Roman which defended in the strongest terms the permanent difference between the two natures of the Incarnate One; -unity of the person and "twoness of natures" - whereby the Pope contrasted with the Doctor of the Church, Cyril, who often spoke of "two natures" before the union and of "one nature" afterwards, indeed, who expressly spoke of the "one nature of the incarnate Logos" (*mia physis toy logoy se- sarkomene*), a doctrine that was confirmed by the Roman bishop Damasus (357 and 382) and by the Council of Constantinople. (381) had been condemned as heresy'."

Leo's Tomus - through the "heretic" Nestorius, who studied it in exile' saw his own doctrine confirmed - was, according to sparse legend, laid down on the tomb of St. Peter and miraculously completed, but was not read at all at the conference, which was dedicated to the doctrine of the two natures in Christ - after the Incarnation. Dioscorus rejected a corresponding attempt by the papal legates right at the beginning, and Juvenal supported him. They wanted to banish anyone who spoke of two natures after the Incarnation. The Nestorian doctrine was considered worse than that of the devil. The mood was B-\* for Dioskor and Alexandria. -Cyril immortal! Let Alexandria endure,

the city of the Orthodox," cried the congregation fathers. And the whole world has recognized your faith, you, the only Dioscurus in the world."

Leo's men, on the other hand, did not make a very happy figtir. After their first speech, which was not exactly warmly received, they did not get a chance to speak at all. When under the

Four-fifths of the synod members - xi j of the approximately \*4 participants - attested to Eutyches' orthodoxy in accordance with the program, Bishop Julius of Puteoli abstained from voting. And in the vote against Flavian, as a result of divergent opinions

The papal lęgatch even conceded to these misunderstandings! Only when, after Flavian's condemnation (and that of the obsessive litigator Eusebios of Dorylaion, a former lawyer from Alexandria, who was full of wild interjections), Flavian loudly protested and denied Dioscorus' "jurisdiction", did Legst Hilarus also risk a brief condemnation by belting out a "-contradicitur" into the assembly - the highlight of the papal delegation's performance,

But the workings of the Holy Spirit now took on strange forms. There was a great deal of noise and confusion. At Dioscorus's hint to the military authorities, the doors were opened, soldiers entered with drawn swords, along with his bodyguards, the Alexandrian parabolani, raving monks and the screaming crowd. Shouts echoed through the great church of St. Mary: -If one speaks of two natures, let him be under a spell!

"Hgraus with Eusebios! Burn him, burn him alive! Let him be cut to pieces!"- In pieces, because he -spaltd- Christ. It is remarkable that the exclamations and

-The more unanimous and louder the rituals were, the stronger the influence of the Holy Spirit was at work (Franciscan Goemans). Bishops crawled into dark corners or under the sins. Abbot Barsu- mas threatened Flavian, who wanted to flee to the altar, shouting:

-The Archbishop of Constantinople - who was later able to appeal (by secret **mail** through Legate Hilarus) to the seat of the Prince of the Apostles: "Necessity is calling - so

began his letter, -as I duly refer to Your Holiness (sanctitatem vestram) - by quickly calling for help for the -threatening pious faith of the Fathers- - the Constantinople prince of the church first sought to reach the altar for his protection, was allegedly pulled to the ground and kicked by Archbishop Dioscor, whereupon other synod members, but especially monks, spontaneously joined in and the maltreated Flavian - the circumstances and date of his death are disputed - perhaps succumbed to his injuries a few days later on his way into exile in Hypaipa (Lydia). (If he was injured at all, which has also been doubted on the Catholic side, and was not, as Chadwick attempts to justify, eliminated by St. Pulcheria, who was responsible for his death. At the following council in Chalcedon, it was also said that Dioscorus had murdered Flavian or that Barsuoias had strangled him. Either way, the council fathers declared Flavian, perhaps himself the victim of a saint, to be a holy martyr (feast: 18. February). - And anno domini 1984 Frits van der Meer instructs us in his introduction to "The Early Church": -"For today's Christians, the early church landscape is attractive because they find in it a divided church: a bipartite one, to be sure, but one that is united, self-assured, unfailed and therefore convincing."

The Pope's legate, however, Deacon Hilarus, recommended himself

He left all his luggage behind {-omnibus suis-) and then, in gratitude for his miraculous rescue, consecrated a chapel in Rome to St. John the Apostle, patron saint of Ephesus, which can still be seen today in the Lateran: *Liberatori suo beato Johanni evangelistae Hilarus episcopus famulus Christi.*"<sup>o</sup>

Euseb of Dorylaion - deposed and betrayed - had also escaped and turned to Leo, -the only help left to him amidst the Herra-.'<sup>13</sup>

And Bishop Theodoret, who was also fired in Ephesus, had three highly flattering letters delivered to Rome, a downright salacious epistle to the pope himself, a

to Archdeacon Hilarus, Leo's successor, and one even to the already dead presbyter Renatus (p. zz i), whom he asked: - Overrule the most holy (Roman) archbishop, that he use apostolic power-, whereby he praised his most holy chair -above all- that he -has (always) remained untroubled by heretical stench'."

The Imperial Synod of Ephesus was a tremendous triumph for the Monophysites and Dioscorus, who had the Council even more securely in his grasp than his predecessor, St. Cyril, had Ephesus's almost two decades earlier. Dioscorus no longer needed the support of the Roman bishop, as Cyril had, but rather put him in his place and, with the help of the emperor, who confirmed the decisions of the synod, he himself was now - actually master of the church" (Aland). ii 3 of the -yetts" present had declared Eutyches to be of the right faith and rehabilitated him, but Flavian had been deposed and the "union" of '33 swept away. Pope Leo, of course

banished Dioscorus, scolded his actions -in judgment", son- The Council was "non iudicium, sed latrocinium", a "robber synod", an assembly which, under the cloak of religion, was concerned with private interests (*privatae causae*), which could be said of the whole history of the Church, indeed of every single believer. Not only the Patriarch of Constantinople, but also the Patriarch of Antioch, Domnos II (litz- §q), Eusebios and Bishop Ibas of Edessa (although restituted in Chalcedon, but condemned again a hundred years later, in the -Dreikapitelstreit-, 3y3), kun, all the leading Antiochian priests, including Theodoret, were deposed and condemned and went into exile. The chairs of the most noble Eastern churches, however, were occupied by Dioscorus's partisans, who also excommunicated Leo I, albeit with the support of only ten Egyptian bishops - a victory the likes of which Alexandria had hardly ever achieved before.'^

The pope now sent a letter dated October 13, qin to the -mild majesty-, the -most Christian and honorable emperor- Theodosius, at first boldly claiming that everything would have been different if his directives had been followed.



followed. For if the reading of his letter to -the holy Synod- (which he also called -the Robbers' Synod") had not been expelled, the clashing of weapons would have ceased through the exposition of his -unadulterated faith, which we owe to the inspiration of heaven and which we faithfully adhere to-, theological ignorance- -as if there were anything else in theology! - would have been chased away, and clerical zealotry - which still flourishes today - would not have found a pretext for its harmful work". Indeed, the Pope acknowledged that "not all the participants in the Council were present when the judgment was passed". As already 43I in Ephesu5 (p \*7J

-We have been told that some are simply not admitted that others had been smuggled in with a "slave-like willing hand" - they must not have been bishops! -surrendering to arbitrariness ... .. put down their godless signatures, knowing full well that their position would be over if they did not submit to his (Dioscor's) command - as if that were any different in Catholic-led councils!'^

Pope Leo therefore insisted on reversing this wicked false judgment, which transcends all sacrileges. After all, the devil plays along with certain unwise people so much that he advises them to take poison where they are looking for a remedy". Alas, I-Co's heart sinks. He asks His Majesty for a council - on Italian soil - to settle all disputes and restore brotherly love. The Roman also wants to generously accept the bishops of the Orient; even those who have strayed from the right path of the truth of the laity, to *restore them* to health with healing medicine, even if they themselves have fallen into persistent offenses - they should not lose their unity with the Church if they accept better understanding. If not, of course, he must swallow the Catholic poison, and it is at the same time "out of his position". One side is not inferior to the other in corruption and lust for power."

The extent to which the pope, however, also dammed up the Council's conclusions, regarded them as a crime, fatally



ner Frau Licinia Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius II, and his, Valentinian's, sister, tried to persuade the -mild majesty- in Eastern Rome to revoke the imperial synodal judgment of Ephesus, -mixing the words with tears-, as the high ladies write, -powerful of speech due to sadness", Theodosius remained firm. The epistles of the court - Leo had skillfully contrived this - were dripping with devotion to *the* Roman See, which had the dignity "above all" - they were more papal than the pope. But Theodosius forbade any interference by the patriarch Leo in the affairs of the papacy.

East, the Synod called the -divine! i judgments and their result - the pure truth-. Flavian, -shy of innovations-, had received the punishment he deserved. -After he peace and complete unanimity reigned in the churches ...- The successor of the -sely Flavian-, whom a consolation cry of Leo had no longer reached, became a creature of Dioscorus, his own presbyter, the Alexandrian apocrisiar at court, Anatolius, who in turn re-enthroned the partisan Maximus in Antioch.'<sup>13</sup>

But now that Dioscorus of Alexandria was poised to command the entire Church of the East, he fell from all heights of triumph. A simple accident led to a complete change in imperial and church policy.

On 28. July 40, the Emperor Theodosius II, the stubborn opponent of the Pope, who was only 14 years old and supported the Monophysites to the end, succumbed to a fall from his horse while hunting. He left no son behind. St. Pulcheria, his sanctimonious sister, once ousted from the political stage by Chrysaphios, seized the reins of state and had the all-conquering eunuch, who was toying with your Alexandrian patriarchy, thrown over the sword - the first act of the new government - and Eutyches dragged out of his monastery and interned near Constantinople. And Pope Leo suddenly saw the freedom of the Catholics "increased considerably by the grace of God".

In fact, under the command of Army Master Aspar, the

strong man in the East, on zy. The wind changed completely after the new general Marcian (qi--457), who was brought to power in August, was married by the year-old, still and still virgin St. Pulcheria in August and made co-regent. As Prosper writes, the new man, who was also closely connected to the Church and a declared opponent of monophy- sites and little more than the empress's willing creature, offers the pope a council that "serves the peace of the Christian religion and the Catholic faith". But Leo, who now has the ruler on his side, no longer needs a council. God has chosen him - in defense of the faith", he writes to Marcian, but implores him by the Lord Jesus Christ not to allow this faith to be discussed by a council in the first place. Now Flavian's body was solemnly interred in the Cathedral of Coristantinople, Abbot Eutyches was excommunicated at a local synod, the previously successful Alexandrian Patriarch Dioscor was accused of being a "depraver of the Holy Trinity, a heretic", a desecrator of relics, a thief, a murderer and so on, and Alexandria "was once again the scene of bloody battles born of intolerance" (Schultze). And the bishops immediately turned away from Dioskor like one heart and one soul, blaming him for everything and claiming that they had only given way to violence.

Ariatolios ('4W4i8), who was appointed patriarch by Dioskor Con-

stantinople, crawled to his cross under the strong pressure of the married "nun", this time to the Roman one, gave up his cig,en promoter Dioskor and sent a bunch of reiie declarations of Ephcsinian synods to **Rome**, but nevertheless **played** a double game. The anti-Chenish patriarch Maximus also collected statements of condemnation against Nestorios and Eutyches. Even Dioscorus' own archdeacon fell away from him and, as mentioned, became patriarch in Alexandria." However, the patriarchate, which had g o n e from triumph to triumph in the battle for the Eastern Church for three generations, had lost its dominant position; indeed, its lust for power had finally failed. From now on, the competitor in Constantinople led unchallenged, with a constituency of several

hundred bishoprics to the Osteii. He far surpassed Alexandria and Antioch, but also the bishop of Rome, who only ruled the greater part of Italy and Illyria, although he was also eager to extend his fiefdoms to the east, although not everything went as he would have liked.

**The coNziL OF CHALKEDON OR:  
" CREAMING FOR THE Sake oF FnEuMIGKEt -**

As late as q. JuRi 45- Leo asked Emperor Marcian to postpone the council in view of the unrest. But Marcian had already changed his mind. And so it came to the famous fourth ecumenical council, which lasted for centuries.

Council, no less abLarret than the previous one

"Robbers' Synod- and, at least occasionally, no less turbulent.

As usual, the Emperor had appointed it and issued his invitation.

letter of \*7 May dy i to all metropolitans with the sentence: -All matters are to be put before divine things-. The monarch had also, without asking a bishop or pope, chosen the time and place (first Nicaea, then Chalke- don, today: Kadiköy, on the Bosphorus, opposite Constantine- pe1) - a matter of course at the time. And it goes without saying that Pope Leo I, "the Great", complied without any objection, even though he did not want the synod at all, but rather repeatedly expressed his disapproval and constantly emphasized that he would have liked to hold a council in Italy in quiet times. But faced with a fait accompli, he wrote in his epistle to the assembly of bishops (June 6, i): -The pious counsel of the most illustrious Lord, by which he deigned to call you together for the destruction of the snares of the devil and the restoration of ecclesiastical peace, is to be commended, while preserving the right and honor of the blessed Apostle Peter, in that he also, by his letter, calls us to it.

to give our presence to the venerable Synod. Of course, neither the necessity of the time nor any ancient custom permitted **this**; but in the brothers ... who are sent to your apostolic see, may your brotherhood consider me as always presiding (praesidere) over the synod."<sup>1</sup> "

Now Leo's legates arrived: the bishops Paschasinus of Lilybäum (Marsala/Sicily), his special confidant, for whom he demanded the "presitice -vice apostolica", and Lucentius of Ascoli, the Roman priest Bonifatius and a scribe, as well as Julian of Kios, the Eastern Expperre, as advisor. But they were only able to read out the papal letter of greeting at a special session towards the end of the council! And when they met in the Basilica of St. Euphemia on October 8, the emperor's plenipotentiaries, consuls, senators, prefects, no fewer than eighteen, indeed the emperor himself intervened in the sessions several times from his "divine palace". He also presided over the meeting with the Empress herself on October 13 and approved the resolutions, making them valid. And Pius XII. assertion in his encyclical -Sempiternus Rex Christus- on the occasion of the *i boo*)ähriges Jubiläum iq x that the church assembly met under the presidency of the papal Lcgateri and that all council fathers had recognized this prerogative of Rome is just as untrue as Pius XI's assertion in his en2/clical "Lux

veritatis- in the year -93\* \* \* \*yoo-year-celebration of the Council of Ephe- GuS (p. 122.) - from many other tendentious distortions and misrepresentations in the service of Roman claims to primacy.

to the falsification of the history of the Pacelli-Riindschriben.'--.

But Catholic theologians lie from the top to the more modest ranks, up to - with -Imprimatur- - the Jesuit Jacob Linden: -At the general councils the popes or their deputies stcts [!] presided-. Or up to the - with -imprimatur- - Catholic Apologets Kochf Siebengartner: -hfi e a nIfg "mein" Kirrfieircnmmmfuag has been held without the pope or his deputies

had the chairmanship". Until the Catholic J. P. Kirsch (with imprimatur): -The presidents of the synod were the papal legates". Until the Catholic "Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche": -the presidency was held by a papal legate-. No plan, as the legate Lucentius himself claimed in Chalcedon against Dioscorus: -He dared to hold a synod without the authority of the Holy See, which was never allowed and never happened." This is how Catholics - cf. p. 88 f - have been lying to the face of the whole world for two millennia.<sup>1</sup> \*'

Pope Leo I claimed the right to preside at the Council of yi - but did not have it! He asked Emperor Marcian that Paschasinus preside instead of him (-vice mea"), and also wrote to the bishops in distant Gaul, 'let *his brothers* preside in my place at the Oriental Synod'. Of course, they were only allowed to do this on a single day! Even the Dutch Franciscan Moaald Goemans, who thinks that a reader of the Council Acts -might get the idea that the actual presidency of the Council was in their hands, given the overwhelming size of the imperial *council*," repeatedly states that it was precisely they who were responsible for the Council.

-present-, -present-, in the i. - . 4-. y. In the 6th (\*5- October) session, which solemnly confirmed the formula of faith of Chalcedon, the Emperor and Empress Pulcheria themselves were present - and that their commissioners also "preside in the 8 -\*7 session ...-. In fact, they had the council firmly under control. And they - and no one else - saved it again and again in its critical phases."

Certainly, the Holy Spirit also spoke through the representatives of the Hetscher - as he always speaks, it is in favor of the Roman Church. And if it is otherwise, then the devil is speaking. (Why the Holy Spirit allows the devil to speak at all, to speak and decide in favor of the Roman Church - even at councils recognized by Rome, even at ecumenical councils, such as the Council of Constantinople [38i], and even, as will be shown, at the Council of Chalcedon - is the mystery of the Holy Spirit).

Leo I did not want the question of faith to be debated in the slightest. Such debates, real disputes, even in dogmatic matters, are never acceptable to popes. There can be no doubt about it, Leo wrote to the Council Fathers in his welcoming letter, -what I desire. Therefore, dearest brethren, the audacity to argue against the divinely instituted faith is utterly rejected, it is the vain unbelief of the erring and it is forbidden to defend what one may not believe ... - And in his last letter of July he implored Emperor Marcian: -Not even the slightest disputation of any resumption of the proceedings!""^

But as little as the pope's view after the Council of presidency, his demand was not obeyed: no discussion of faith! On the contrary, the imperial commissioners expressly insisted on it. However, the credo drafted by the Council Committee itself was passionately rejected at the y. session (i.e. October) was passionately rejected. The papal legates threatened to return and hold a council in Italy. The emperor put pressure on the synod: either a new formula of faith or a transfer of the synod to the pope's country. Now Oian preferred a new formula of faith. The bishops complied and drew up their own definition of faith, in which they incorporated Leo's doctrines. However, this was not accepted because they recognized the Roman's teaching authority, but because they were convinced that his -tonios-agreed with the orthodox faith.'^

The Council, a triumph of orthodoxy, was one of the most pompous assemblies of the ancient church, supposedly consisting of äoo bishops. Cardinal Hergenröther gives a figure of ej to 3 - participants. However, the council records - which do not always record the meetings (praxeis, actiones) in chronological order and usually in different numbers - only contain qyz signatures. And in reality -were ntit 3yo to 3do fathers present (Franciscan Goemans). In the first session (October 8), Patriarch Dioskor was indicted,



dethroned in the third session (October 13), but did not condemn his teaching! Dioscorus cautiously did not appear again, but in turn excommunicated the pope. The council deprived him of his episcopal see and all spiritual dignities (the emperor later exiled him, first to Cyzicus, then to Heraclea, and finally to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died in exile a few years later). A tlbeltäter, so as not to lose any more - the tactic already used against Nestorios. Moreover, for fear of reprisals, the assembly recognized the very formula that the Emperor Marcian, who presided over the council - acclaimed as -Novus David-, -Novus Paulus", -Novus Constantinus-, indeed, as -Priest- and -Teacher of the Faith" (!) - which the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anatolius, desired: the Diophysite doctrine that had become the basis of all Orthodox theology, Greek, Catholic and Protestant: one Christ in two natures."

For just as the Nicene Creed at the Council of Nicaea was only brought about by Emperor Constantine, which is why Johannes Haller derided it as Constantine's, so too was the formula defined in Chalcedon.

-It was only a threatening ultimatum from the emperor that made it possible for the question of the relationship between divine and human nature in Christ to be decided unambiguously and definitively and set down by the Synod in the form of a formulated confession" (Kawerau). Even Leo I himself acknowledged the emperor's main merit in the synod's victory over the new -Christianity-, since through the holy ... zeal of your clemency, the most pernicious *liscence* was destroyed ...-  
'^.

The ruler later stood behind the symbol decisively, and the Nestorian metropolitan Elias of Nisibis (qy5-ioçq) was probably not so wrong', he writes in his book on the -Proof of the Truth of Glatibens-: -But the emperor said: 'Neither two persons are to be assumed with Nestorios, nor one nature with Dioskoros and his comrades, but two natures and one person.' What he had thus commanded,

He upheld them by force and killed the opponents with the sword, saying: 'One evil is less than the other' ... Our people ... deny that the view put forward by the emperor is reprehensible and corrupt, that he does not stand in the truth, and hold fast to their old, orthodox faith, which has not changed, which has not given rise to any acts of violence, for which no mediation, no donation of gifts has taken place, whereby no expenditure of money has taken place. . .'"\*

However, the majority of the Council Fathers hardly understood what was at stake theologically. The spiritual caliber of many of them is strikingly illustrated by the fact that at the Synod of Antioch

13\*Ü3\*s) according to a clerical document, most bishops were not even "knowledgeable" in matters of ecclesiastical faith! That q at the Synod of Ephesus several bishops could not even write their own names and

had their signatures given by others! That forty illiterate bishops also met at the Council of Chalcedon! Even a modern Catholic emphasizes the extremely low level at which the Eastern Roman episcopate stood at that time (Haacke). But was it different with the Western Roman one! Recognizedly worse still!"-

Of course, no one could understand the formula - one Christ in two natures. A distinction without separation, a union without mingling! Certainly a great mystery. Even today, no one understands it. One can sense this in the explanation of the Benedictine Haacke (who compares the Monophysites with the National Socialists): -Over the monophy- sitic mixture one emphasized the admixture, over the distorted intimacy the intimate Ineinandersein"! But an absolutely divine Lord was needed! And one

"bsolutely human! And above all a bishop's see!"

The loss of Leo's doctrinal letter - epistola dogmatica, known in the East as Tomos Leo, also known in Coptic historiography as the "Tomos of Evil Leo" and entirely fixated on an anti-ex-Andrinense Christology - accompanied the second sit-

day, io. October, enthusiastic acclamations: -This is the faith of the fathers, the apostles! We all believe like this, the Orthodox believe like this! Anathem then, who does not believe so! Peter spoke through Leo! The apostles taught like this! Leo taught piously and truly! Cyril taught like this! Eternal memory Cyril! Leo and Cyril taught alike! Anathem then, who does not teach like this!" Not even the time for reflection until the next meeting, three days later, would the high fighters for the faith accept: - None of us doubts, we have already signed," they cried - a triumph also of papal authority, which f o r four centuries, until 86q/yo (Constantinople) on -ecumenical councils was no longer surpassed."°

Mormel - Peter spoke through Leo!" Catholic dogmatics and apologetics could no longer ignore it, all the less so when it came from the mouths of oriental bishops. Whenever historical evidence of papal teaching authority was presented, it was also served up. But, according to the Catholic theologian and church historian Schwaiger: -When carefully studying the sources, the Council of Chalcedon never refers to any unconditional doctrinal authority of the pope to justify the acceptance of the Tomus Leonis ... Some of the bishops obviously only a c c e p t e d the Tomus Leonis under massive imperial pressure."

The leonic "masterpiece" - today undoubtedly far more suitable for remedying even the most serious sleep disorders than even the mildest twists of faith - can be read, at least to give an idea of it, in broad strokes like this: -The birth according to the flesh is the manifestation of human nature, but the birth of the virgin is a sign of divine power. The childlikeness of the infant is revealed in the lowliness of the cradle, the greatness of the Most High is proclaimed by the voice of the angels ... Whom the devil's cunning tempts as men, the angels serve as God. To hunger, to thirst, to grow weary, to sleep is apparently human nature, but to feed five thousand with five loaves of bread, to give living water to the Samaritan woman

to drink, never to thirst again, to walk on the back of the sea with unsinking feet, to smooth the swelling floods by calming the storm, is undoubtedly of a divine nature. Just as, to pass over many things, it is not of one and the same nature to prove the dead friend with lamenting love, and to raise him to life again by his voice's command, who lay four days under the grave-clothes; or to hang on the cross, and to walk day in night, to make the elements tremble; or to be pierced with nails, and to open the gates of paradise to the believing thief, so it is not of one and the same nature to say: 'I and the Father are one' and 'The Father is greater than I.'""

Well roared, lion, you can hardly say that.

It is not surprising that critical historians of dogma such as Harnack or Seeberg were very dismissive of Leo's "tomos". It is more surprising that Erich Caspar attributed to him "persuasive power"; a "persuasive power for the widest circles" - certainly. For what on earth would not have convinced the widest circles!""

Perhaps there is no better way to comment on the papal attempt to explain this embarrassingly spiritual exaltation, to explain something inexplicable per se, to concretize something plucked out of the air, than with the advice that St. Jerome gave the priest Nepotian against declamators and babblers. St. Jerome's advice to the priest Nepotian against declamators and loquacious tongues: "Let us leave it to the uneducated to throw around empty words and to draw the admiration of the inexperienced people to themselves by their glibness. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon to explain what one does not understand oneself; and in the end one considers oneself a light when one has made others believe something. Nothing is easier than to deceive the common people and a simple assembly with a bunch of words; because the less they understand, the more their admiration grows.

Spiritually, the majority of the Council's glittering history was

society - even if not one in ten of the most reverend gentlemen could neither write nor read - certainly a -simple assembly-. But their mouths often worked all the better for it. They did not always discuss dogmatic problems, where they could remain silent for various reasons. Scandals were also dealt with, such as the disputes between Bishops Bassanos and Stephen of Ephesus. There were real tumults, such scenes of fathers driven by the Holy Spirit, that even Catholic Georg Schwaiger compares the famous fourth ecumenical council - for long stretches - with the - Robbers' Synod - of Ephesus! Reinhold Seeberg, who gives an extremely positive impression, even emphasizes that "things were no less stormy than at the Robbers' Synod"; almost literally: Caspar. The minutes of the meeting make it clear that the synod members were immersed in their own racket, that they would have quickly failed if the state had not imposed its judicial procedure on them." The imperial commissioners reprimanded the "rabble-rousing" cries of the bishops. The bishops screeched: -we are shouting for the sake of piety and orthodoxy".

And while Dioskor - his situation was like this from the outset as hopeless as that of Nestorios<sup>43\*</sup> in Ephesus - at least remained true to himself and stood by what he had advocated, the bishops, who had acclaimed him just two years previously, now fell away from him almost like a man. At the very first meeting on

In the evening, by candlelight, it was decided that he should be deposed. -"Out with the murderer Dioskor!" they shouted and scolded him at the third session, on 13. On October 3, when he was deposed in absentia, he was called a heretic, an Origenist, a Trinitarian, a voluptuary, a thief, an arsonist, a murderer, a criminal against the majesty and so on.

At the appearance of Batsuma, an avowed Nestorian, the same storm of indignation arose: -"Out with the mortar!" The bishop of Kyzikos shouted: -He has killed the blessed Flavianos. He stood there and shouted: Beat him to death!"

Andre's chief shepherds shouted: -Barsumas has ruined all of Syria." Barsumas remained completely unshaken by this. When the church historian Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus appeared, a loyal friend of Nestorius and opponent of Cyril, but undeniably one of the greatest figures of the time (Camelot), even a kind of Augustine of the Orient (Duchesne), the fathers from Egypt, Palestine and Illyria filled the church with deafening roars: "Throw out the Jew, the adversary of God, and do not call him a bishop". He is a heretic! He is a Nestorian! Out with the heretic!" But even the "Augustine of the Orient", Bishop Theodoret, the enemy of Cyril, the friend of Nestorius, betrayed him after some reluctance. First he explained: -"Above all, I assure you that I am not after a bisrum ..." Because, of course, that was what Theodoret was after too. And when he was threatened not to testify, to condemn him again, he went on record: -Nestorius be under the ban and anyone who does not **say that** the holy virgin is Theotokos; as well as anyone who splits the only son in two ... And after all of this, be well!

After all, greetings!

Only thirteen Egyptian bishops, who had appeared with Dioscor, joked. They did not find Eutyche<sup>8</sup> guilty and stubbornly refused to accept Leo's teaching; -We will be killed, we will be killed if we do it". No amount of urging or threatening helped. At least they wanted a respite until the election of a new patriarch, yes, they wanted to stick to the faith of their fathers and would rather die on the spot than be stoned to death on their return to Egypt - all with much pathos, with the imperial authorities finally granting a respite until the new appointment to the Alexandrian see and with the bishops whining. However, as will soon be seen, the "two nations" formula actually led to wild excesses in Egypt and Palestine.

## THE 28th KAxox

\*7 canons had almost all passed happily for Rome (leaving aside canons q and -7, which had already extended the rights of the Constantinople patriarch), since brought in the meeting of aq. October the last, the -z8. Canon, the "great" Leo and the papacy, the dogmatic victor, suffered the worst kind of defeat in terms of canon law and politics. This canon remained -the deepest cause of the coming discord ... to this day" (Dölger).<sup>159</sup>

The bishops' assembly thus apparently took revenge for the dogma imposed on it by Rome via the emperor and codified the supremacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the East. With reference to canon 3 of the Council of Constantine I (381) - which had conferred the honorary primacy on the bishop there, albeit "after the bishop of Rome" - the bishop of Rome was given the primacy.

the Council of Chalcedon now recognized the Patriarch of New Rome (Constantinople) -the same prerogatives- as the Patriarch of Old Rome anyway the right of ordination in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus and Thrace, and this according to a

-This means that the bishop of Constantinople was allowed to consecrate metropolitans in these dioceses. This meant that the Bishop of Constantinople was allowed to consecrate the metropolitan in these dioceses. This gave him not only an honorary primacy, but also jurisdiction over a large area in the Orient. **Although** the primacy was granted to the old Rome, the new Rome was granted the same prerogatives. The papal legates - apparently unprepared for the pope's discussion of constitutional issues - had deliberately but unwisely avoided the decisive session, but protested strongly against it at the next one. After the commissioners' request to present the canons, which both parties jumped at, Paschasinus quoted the 6th canon of Nicaea, admittedly in

-- - -" - do Roman version. After all, this canon has borne the following inscription in a Latin text that has been traceable for years

-De primatu ecclesiae Romanae" and claims in the first Satz: aThe Roman Church has always possessed primacy (primatum). But this was an interpolation which is missing in the same canon of the Constantinople version. Legat Lucentius, Bishop of Herculaneum, doubted the voluntariness of the sub- sessions, claimed that the fathers had been duped, that they had been raped, that they had been deceived, that they had signed under pressure. But a much, if not unanimous: -No one was forced!" answered him. Individually, the chief shepherds testified that they had signed voluntarily and had no objections to the decision. The imperial leaders recorded everything correctly, put it to the vote and declared the a8. Canon against the votes of the Roman delegation: -What was presented was approved by the whole Synod.

Leo I was of course in explicit agreement with the Council's decisions, insofar and only insofar as they concerned the faith, in sola fidei catisa-. Otherwise, however, the Roman did not want what applied to Old Rome to apply to New Rome, the new imperial city. After all - as he wrote to the emperor, confessing his "painful astonishment" at the fact that the spirit of honor-seeking was once again disturbing the newly established ecclesiastical peace - other principles prevailed in divine matters than in secular ones, -alia ratio est rerum saecularium, alia divinarum-. In fact, however, it corresponded to what had already been agreed at the Synod of Antioch (3\* or 3aq) that the civil status of a place also determines its ecclesiastical rank.

Leo kept a measured distance from your emperor. Towards others, St. Pulcheria, Anatolius, Julian of Kios, he seethed. Himself brimming with imperiousness, the

-The Archbishop of Rome, as the synodal delegates apostrophized him after the conclusion of the Council, described Constantinople's supremacist ambitions in the most tame terms as "unrestrained insolence", -mouthless competence-, -cheeky insolence-, -unheard insolence-, as an attempt, as he meant to the Constantinople Patriarch Anatolius, to whom he probably wrote



most sharply, -the

to enter the most sacred canons; it seemed to you a favorable time, since the Alexandrian See had lost the privilege of the second rank and the Antiochian Church had lost its own position as third in the rank of honor, in order to deprive all Metropolitans of their honor after the subjugation of these places to your sovereignty."''

The Alexandrian fapsrtum had destroyed Rome in alliance with the emperor. Now Leo obviously feared a -pope- tum- of Constantinople, the imperial capital, and all the more so as Rome was no longer the capital of Rome in the west, but Ravenna. While Leo therefore celebrated the Council of Nicaea as a -divine privilege-, he belittled the "ecumenical" Council of Constantinople 38x by dragging the Constantinople Patriarch Anatolius -lowly greedy for power- and angry that it did -nothing- in his favor.

Jenes -writing", -which some bishops allegedly wrote sixty years ago-, a paper that was never brought to the attention of the Apostolic See by its predecessors. -To this document, which is obsolete from the outset and has long since perished {!] You now, late and in vain, want to underpin this piece of writing by eliciting from the brethren (of the Synod of Chalcedon) the semblance of agreement . " And while the Greek church in general constantly adhered to the 28. Canon, Leo declared the consent of the bishops - in a letter to Empress Pulcheria - to be "invalid" and "by virtue of the authority of the blessed Apostle Perrus, by general determination, completely and utterly" (in irri- ttim mittimus et per auctoritatem beati Petri apostoli, generali prorsus definitipne cassamus).'^

Even Jesuit Alois Grillmeiei freely admits that the 28. Canon - obviously- attracted more papal attention than the dogmatic decision of the Synod. Yes, he admits that Leo -less or not at all to the factual situation of the Eastern churches entered". ""

And yet this pope acted very caring, very self-centered. -I confess myself of such love xur Cesamrheir

of the brothers," he wrote to his rival in Constantinople, "that I cannot grant anyone a request that harms himself ..." And not only once did Leo I hide his colossal ambition behind such fraternal charity. For example, when he fought St. Hilarius in Gaul - once again one saint against the other (p. Ryo ff) - he concluded a letter to the Gallic episcopate: -Not we advocate for ourselves the ordinations in your provinces, as Hilarius perhaps {!} mendaciously after his own fashion, in order to seduce your minds, but we preserve them for you by our care, so that no freedom may remain for innovation, nor opportunity for the presumptuous to destroy your privileges."

Who was this pope who, by accusing other bishops, even saints, of arrogance, whether rightly or wrongly, himself used arrogant language like hardly any Roman hierarch before? Who seemed to preserve the prerogatives of other bishops by taking them away from them, and even concealed this with aliruisism\*?

## J. CHAPTER

# POPE LEO I. (440–461)

- ... rine Piihrerprrsönlirhkeit-. Ooniel Cops'
- until Leo I, there was not even one on the Chair of Peter.  
Bishop of healthy boclcutung and c ge-.  
Ferdinand Grcgoroviuue'
- He roared, and the cowardly hearts of the animals began to  
tittcm-. Founding script for Leo t.' set by **Pope** Scrgius I in 688.
- Playing with 6a name, he has been praised to this day as the lion  
of the tribe of Jud, a Scfimeic/sc/ei,  
It could rather be compared to the puchs.  
johannes Haller'
- Len is the first early Christian pap8t of whom we know that  
et a clear and certain popsfidce begsg ... It was based on the fact  
that the Roman bishop was the successor of the Apostle Peter.  
From this Leo drew the conclusion that he possessed the same  
authority that Christ conferred on the apostle.  
The lithologist Albert Ehrhard'
- This doctrine of primacy ... Leo the Great delivered excellently,  
dag she remains the backbone of the papacy to this day  
has remained -. Walter Ullmsnn'

Nothing is known about Leo I's homeland, his parents or his course of study. "The best that can be suggested cannot be more than a guess- (Jalland). Older Catholic writers like to attribute his origins to very distinguished circles - in uncertain cases, "heretics" are said to have lesser- origins. Leo was presumably born towards the end of the 5th century, and most manuscripts of the *Liber Pontificalis* call him a native Muscovite. Volterra in particular claims to be his birthplace. As late as 1141 it imposed a fine of 18 solidi! on anyone who did not celebrate Leo's memorial day there, 11 April.

However, Tiro Prosper of Aquitaine, a curial under Leo, called Rome his home, and he himself called Rome "my fatherland", which can of course have other meanings. What is certain is that Leo was already a deacon of the Apostolic See under his predecessors Coelestine I and Sixtus III and already had great influence. Even Cyril of Alexandria sought him out. And the regent of the West, Galla Placidia, sent him to Gaul in the 500s in order to break the enmity between the commander Aëtius and the governor Albinus. During this mission, the archdeacon Leo was elected pope and consecrated after his return on September 29. September Edo consecrated.°

Leo I. rREDIGES HIS PRoVeNCE - U1'4D THE  
LAY DEMUT

This pope became historically significant through his expansion of the Roman primacy. With little support from tradition - The papal claims to power were consolidated and expanded all the more naturally, systematically and consistently.

He used the Petrine doctrine in particular to justify and propagate it. It had already been imposed on the whole of the West, including Africa. Leo, however, put particular strain on it and elevated it to papal plenary power (*pleni- tudo potestas*), to -Petrinology-, not without combining it with elements of the pagan ideology of Rome and empire and a corresponding -court ceremonial". Leo speaks incessantly of Peter. Again and again he places him at the center of attention. He then equates the Roman bishops with Peter. He makes them -partakers- of Peter's honor, and furthermore his -heirs". The concept of Peter's deputy also appears around this time. And Leo also identifies himself juridically with Peter with the concept of the -deputy representative-, the -heir-, claiming all of his supposed powers. With all sorts of bold exegetical tricks, he also equates Peter, "the trumpet of the apostles", with Jesus, allowing him to share in the power of God, in order to let the pope share in it again. Everything is there -in unchangeable partiJiiabrship-. For Perrus speaks through the mouth of the pope. Whoever hears the Pope hears Peter, hears Christ, hears God! -So when we lower our exhortations to your ears in your holiness, believe that he himself, as whose representative we act (*cuius vice fungimur*), is speaking.

Whereas in Cyprian Peter had a primacy only *inter pares*, Leo now elevates Peter high above all others. Again and again he invoked Peter's primacy, the popes' claim to leadership, Rome as the chair of chairs - the *sedes apostolica*, the head of the church, bending and increasing the tradition, even making completely new claims, even making use of Valentinian and the

He used the services of the ladies of the imperial household to write letters to Constantinople (p. 246 5, which go beyond anything that had previously been established about the Roman primacy. Only the bishop of Rome and no one else is "deputy Perri", a phrase probably first created by Leo (but perhaps already used by the legate Philip in Ephesus); Peter, "in whose place We regiate- - the first pluralis majestatis in papal history. Thus the Roman bishop is not only the bishop of this see, but the primate of all bishops. All owe him obedience, including all maiores ecclesiae, all patriarchates. He is called -to lead the whole Church-, to be -prince of the whole Church", of all the churches of the whole world". Only "an antichrist or the devil" would deny this. And whoever denied his supremacy (primicatum) could deny his dignity.

-The "puffed up spirit of pride plunges itself into hell". Who is puffed up here is clear - no matter how often Leo emphasizes his lowliness, his dignity, his incompetence, in short, the "indignus haeres". This man, who had been washed with all the waters of Roman jurisprudence, who also created a close legal connection between the Pope and Peter through the concepts of participation, of inheritance, an indivisible unity of theology and law, Bible and jurisprudence, nevertheless already coined the notorious formulation as a precaution - there had long been reason enough and soon more and more - that Peter's dignity was not lacking even in the unworthy heir (etiam in indigno haerede). But in this way, commented the Catholic Kühner, -everything could be justified, right up to crime.

Pope Leo never tired of emphasizing the (omnipotent) power of the popes and thus of himself. Again and again he wrote and preached about it. -In the whole world, only Peter was chosen to be the head of all the apostles, all the called peoples, all the fathers of the Church." -From all over the world, people take his place in the chair of St. Peter". St. Peter is groomed by Leo as the "rock" and foundation, -gatekeeper of the kingdom of heaven-, -arbitrator of the reproach and remission of sins-. It is true that

All bishops, he admits, had a -common dignity-, but by no means -equal rank-. It was similar with Peter, with the apostles - "and although all were chosen in the same way, only *one* was given that he was superior to the others.- Indeed, Leo not only goes so far as to assert that Peter's judgment "is also valid in heaven", but that he, the pope, in the exercise of his office, "enjoys the everlasting favor of the almighty and eternal High Priest", who is "similar (!) and equal to the Father".<sup>10</sup>

It is hardly possible to push the mantra any higher. Yet in his first papal sermon, on ap. September 9 0, the oldest recorded sermon by a pope, Leo had not exactly rejoiced modestly with the psalmist: -He has blessed me by doing great wonders for me ...". Or soon afterwards, he rejoiced that God had made him - honorable- and led him up to the highest level."

But he preached humility to the sheep all the more urgently -The whole victory of the Savior, who conquered Satan and the world, had its beginning and its end in the Deiiiiit. (Leo often and vividly conjures up the devil and hell, much less often, as usual, heaven; it simply gives less away). Yes, Leo claims: -So then, beloved, the whole [!] doctrine of Christian wisdom consists not in prolix words and sophistical discussions, nor in striving for fame and honor- -that was only for his equals- -but in true and voluntary humility" -that was for the subjects, the dependent, the exploited: remembering only that the Roman bishop was already in the . century the largest landlord in the entire Roman Empire."



## WHO WAS THIS LEO/

He left behind a larger body of writings than any previous pope, 90 sermons, sermons on festivals, Lent and the Passion. (No sermons have survived from either his predecessors or his immediate successors). Furthermore, we have almost twice as many letters from him (izq of which concern his Ostpolitik). But from sermons,

-Geliebteste-, it is not so easy to deduce a character.

I-cos sermons were also consistently short, some (i, . 7. \*3- 80) extremely brief, as if he had emulated the example of Flavius Cyrus (S. Ivy). And SeiRe 173 letters (including about 20 spurious ones as well as some addressed to him) are, moreover, probably mainly products of the chancery, above all of Prosper of Aqtiitania, a zealously theologizing southern Gaulish author, Augustin-

friend and fierce Pelagian warrior. The theological content of those "great state writings that made Leo's name famous in the West and the East", as Johannes Halter writes, ztivorously emphasizing, also came from Prosper: -At least the artificial form that was so dear to this time of decay, the resounding pathos that says so little with many big words, the rhythmic tone that captivates the ear with its melodiousness and deceives about the poverty and weakness of the thoughts, they can just as well belong to the servant as to the master.""

In any case, Leo, who appeared so autocratic, who loved -apostolic- (!) court ceremonial, who propagated the Roman primate so pointedly and called the -chair of Peter- a -stand of trembling- (*materia trepidationis*), was a typical

-Lord", a spiritual ruler, whom one of his most remarkable successors, Nicholas I, *compares* in a letter to Emperor Michael with the "Lion of the tribe of Juda" (*Acts § Sj*), who "opened his mouth and shook the whole world, even the emperors themselves". However exaggerated this was and how cleverly, not to say hypocritically, he embellished his quest for power, his constant rigorous demands for obedience with biblical sayings, for example by calling himself the -disciple

of a humble and gentle master", -who says:

-Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am kind and humble of heart ... My yoke is not burdensome, and my burden is light' - in reality, Leo was a ruggedly unevangelical man. In a letter of 10. October 535 to the bishops of Campania, Picentim and Tuscia, he was upset by the fact that slaves were being ordained presbyters "for all intents and purposes" (passim), and he firmly forbade the appointment of clergy who were "not of suitable birth". Christianity had once largely consisted of such circles! Now the pope forbids the elevation of a -shabby slave- (servilis vilitas) to the priesthood, as even those who could not even prove themselves with their master were not tested before God. Leo I, the Doctor of the Church, the Great, thus makes the dignity of birth a prerequisite for a clerical career. He condemned the slave order as a violation of the sanctity of the priestly office and the rights of masters! The church thus adapted to the late Roman slave-owning society, which it itself represented like hardly anyone else. The Christian state was happy to take note of this. Only a few years later - the connection is tangible - Valentinian III declared a ban on the ordination of slaves, colons and members of **forced** corporations!\*

Leo I is also arrogant towards his fellow bishops. He commands. He must command. For one is superior to all. Thus he makes them feel that he is more, superior to them, that he "stands on high warie- according to the will of the Lord. He also commands prelates independent of Rome, such as the Metropolitan of Aquileia; indeed, he threatens him. He also commands the Spanish bishops. The Gallic Bishops no longer call him -your brotherhood- as before, but -your apostleship- (apostolatus vester). He is also apostrophized as "corona vestra". In addition, the plural is now used in the form of address." Leo acted accordingly against his colleagues; for example in Gaul, where the bishops of Arles and Vienne fought for the dignity of the  
Metropolitans argued: we will only touch on the prehistory.

---

## ST. LEO AGAINST ST. Himnius

In the early y. Heros occupied the episcopal see of Arles, the "Gallic Rome" (gallula Roma), one of the leading cities of the West at the time. According to Zosimus' testimony, Heros, a disciple of St. Martin of Tours, had forced his episcopate through threats and violence and was only able to maintain his see with the help of the usurper Constantine III, who resided in Arles from Coq to CII Æll. It is therefore quite plausible that Heros, as the Historian Sozomenos writes, gave the imprisoned usurper shelter in his church and even ordained him as a priest, without of course being able to prevent his execution (p. z8). Soon after this, Heros, together with the heavily incriminated Bishop Lazarus of Aix, found himself in Palestinian exile as a result of their political and other upheavals, where they agitated against Pelagius, whom they also formally sued in an extensive pamphlet (I q6)."

A successor to the Hero, the influential, later murdered Patroclis of Arles (zz-ŝnö), likewise -Un personnage assez suspects (Duchesne), had then, covered by the government of his friend Flavius Constantine (S. by), who himself had brought him to the bishop's throne, enforced the elevation of Pope Zosimus. And Zosimus (I 497 fi) immediately considered Bishop Patmclus with -a series of conspicuous privileges- (Katholik Baus), be- he had already established "extensive metropolitan authority" for Patroclu5 by his first decree of March qzy - four days after his accession to the throne! - for Patroclu5 "an extensive metropolitan authority", and even gave him the right of supreme supervision over the entire Gallic church (Catholic Lang;ärrner) - possibly a kind of prompt receipt for the papal election assistance he had provided."

Bishop Patroclus also promoted this development - in terms of church history - by creating a Petrine foundation for his see. The irony of history is that Rome itself, namely Pope Innocent I, spread the lie that all the churches of the Well had been founded by Peter or his disciples (p. xz5 f). Rome's primacy did indeed allow this, but it brought the popes in

Conflict with other power-hungry priests. Bishop Patroclus of Arles invented a disciple of Peter, St. Trophimus of Arles, elevated him, who had never lived, to missionary of Gaul and founder of the Arelater Church and thus, with Pope Zosimus' support, to metropolitan. The bishops of Marseille, Narbonne and Vienne immediately protested and refused to obey Rome, despite summonses and harsh rejections. Proctilus of Marseille was deposed. And a few decades later, this led to a serious quarrel between Pope Leo I and a successor of Patroclus, St. Hilarius of Arles, from whom Leo took back the metropolitan rights already restricted by his predecessors.'-

Archbishop Hilarius of Arles (Jz ç d q), a true saint of the Catholic Church (feast: . May), came from old political leadership circles. Initially a monk of the island monastery of Lerinum (Lérins), he had himself come to episcopal honors through a relative, his predecessor Bishop Honoratus - however much he resisted, if one may believe his biographer, who also reports that St. Hilarius was always, even in winter, in a state of awe. St. Hilarius always went barefoot on his many journeys, even in winter, always wearing only a single, miserable garment and a tormenting shirt underneath, that he ransomed prisoners, founded monasteries, built churches, often preached for up to three hours in a row on fast days, and also wept bitterly if one of his own met with misfortune. On the other hand, St. Hilarius, according to St. Leo, marched with armed force into cities whose bishops had died in order to force a successor on them at the behest of his followers. Even while Bishop Projectus was suffering, the saint appeared and consecrated a new head of the church, Importunus. -The death of his brother did not seem to come quickly enough for his impeachment," sneered the pope. Contrary to expectations, Projectus recovered, and the citizens of the city complained about **Hilarius**: -He was already fon' again before we even knew he had come. Excommunications also came quickly to the metropolitan. Such things set St. Leo against St. Hilarius, who -his

---

Ruhiit more in whimsical speed than in a moderately pious attitude. One saint stood here against the other, which is not uncommon, even with two church teachers occurs (I \*74 ff). And as in non-sacred circles, in sacred circles the superior also stings the inferior."

The Romans feared their eloquent colleague, the emerging patriarchate of Arles, and even an independent Gallic church, especially as the Gallic aristocracy, related to Hilarius, stood behind him and against the Italian nobility. So when Hilarius clashed with Projectus and the bishop Chelidonius, whom Hilarius had deposed because he was said to have been married to a widow, Leo launched a frontal attack. "He desires to subject you to his power (subdere)," Leo wrote to the Bishops of the province of Vienne,

-and will not suffer himself to be united (subiectum) to St. Peter, -and offends the reverence of St. Peter with most insolent words ...- St. Leo *with* St. Hilarius

-ambition for new ambitions". He claims -that he indulges his desires-, that he "believes he is not subject to any law, is not restricted by any rules of divine order", that he commits -unlawful acts- and disregards -what he should observe ...". When the Arelater tried to discuss the matter amicably with Leo after crossing the Alps on foot in the middle of winter - he entered Rome without horse, saddle or cloak (Vita Hilarii) - Leo placed him under guard and before a council. Hilarius, however, hurled furious insults into the assembly, -which no layman may utter, no bishop may hear" (quae nullus laicorum dicere, nullus sacerdotum posset audire), and departed again. The archbishop, whose asceticism was admired in Galilee, who was also popular with most of his colleagues and whose ambitions were almost undisputed, now fell victim to the even more domineering Leo. Only the right to his own diocese, which he actually also exercised, was left by the Romans to the one who -by abusively fleeing and -in an evil manner claiming the force-

After all, Leo had not deposed the popular Hilarius (as a late Viennese forgery then claimed). But in order to emphasize his measures, he assured himself of the authority of the state, as was already customary for him. Informed by a faithful report from the venerable Roman bishop Leo about the "abominabilis tumultus" in Gaul's churches, Emperor Valentinian III. on July 8, 4's -for all time- under penalty of ten pounds of gold obedience to his orders as well as to the authority of the Apostolic See and commanded the provin2- governors to bring rebellious bishops before the court by force. of the Roman bishop - "in preservation of all the rights which our ancestors conferred on the Roman Church".<sup>10</sup>

Leo I particularly emphasized the duty of protection of the ruler, who often acted as -custos fidei-, and declared it to be an essential characteristic of imperial power. The monarch has his power from God, thus not only to govern the world, but above all {maxime) to protect the churches - this will be by far the most important task of state power for the popes *in the future!* And this always involves, if at all possible, the annihilation or at least suppression of those of other faiths.<sup>11</sup>

Leo now ruled the bishops of Gaul, but only in the southern part of the country, where for the time being, through Aetius, the emperor still ruled; but disaster was approaching there too.

However, Hilarius contracted a serious illness during his winter return march across the Alps, to which he succumbed<sup>4</sup> dp. It is said that the whole of Arles mourned and wanted to touch his holy body. that the corpse was in danger of being torn to pieces. And Leo now remembered the dead man as -sanctae memoriae-.

**OAPST LEO S P DIRECTS THE KAI SER**  
**UxPEALABLE IN THE FAITH AND S ICH THE**  
**DUTY,**  
**TO PROCLAIM THE IMPERIAL FAITH**

But the pope knew how to behave in a characteristic manner even towards those of higher rank. When Emperor Valentinian III, a weak man who was a benefactor of the Church and very much under the influence of Leo's Petrine doctrine, visited Rome in February 50, Leo apostrophized him in a sermon with that typical clerical pseiiido humility which in truth bristles with arrogance and imperiousness: "Behold, to a poor little navy like Peter the first and greatest city in the world has been given by Christ to govern. The sceptres of kings have submitted to the wood of the cross; the purple of the court is subservient to the blood of Christ and the martyrs. The emperor ... comes and a s k s f o r the fisherman's pardon.

The Pope's ecclesiastical empire is now on an equal footing with the imperial one, but the seeds of supremacy are already present (Klinkenberg)."

Schieri it was appropriate, of course, even the -grofie- Leo could hump upwards, especially when the potentates were fighting heretics and pagans - an activity he demanded and liked to call -labor- (effort, work); he also called his own work that. Yes, when it was opportune, he celebrated the emperors - who at that time (hardly noticed) called themselves '-pontifex- - as - keepers of the faith-, -sons of the churches,

• Herald of Christ. He then granted them the most astonishing rights in the ecclesiastical sector, authority in the religious sphere, priestly sanctity. More than fifteen times in Leo we find praise of the royal and priestly (episcopal) disposition of the prince."

-I know, writes Pope Leo I to Emperor Leo I, "that you have been instructed by the Spirit of God dwelling in you". He certifies to the ruler "that our teaching also **agrees** with the faith **given to you by God**",

He even sent him a doctrinal inspiration. For himself *granted* him the right to overrule council decisions concerning dogmas. And he increased all these concessions in several letters to the point of conceding infallibility. Leo I, known as the Great (and the only pope, apart from Gregory I, your equally "great" pope, to be honored with the rare title of Doctor of the Church), went so far as to repeatedly affirm in letters to the emperor that he needed no human instruction, was enlightened by the Holy Spirit and could not err in faith! Pope Leo emphatically assures him that the Emperor Leo, "filled with the purest light of truth, does not waver in any part of the faith, -but with holy and perfect judgment distinguishes right from wrong"; -that you are sufficiently instructed by the indwelling Spirit of God and that no error can deceive your faith; -that your gentleness does not need human instruction and has drawn the purest teaching from the overflow of the Holy Spirit. Yes, he confesses that it is his, the Pope's, -It is your duty -to reveal what you know and to proclaim what you believe - (patefacere quod intelligis, et praedicare quod credis) - and all this, although the Pope is not at all convinced of the infallibility of the Emperor!"

(Interestingly, quite a few bishops, for example those of secunda Syria, even more those of prima Armenia, even applied the promise of Peter in Mt. 16,18: You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the pillars of hell shall not prevail against it, to Leo, but not to Leo, the pope, but to Leo, the emperor! For them, Christ was of course the head of the holy Catholic Church

-But their strength and foundation, wrote the bishops, are you, the emperor, in imitation of the immovable rock of Christ, on whom the Creator of the universe has built his church.



Dxrü : - WAR SERVICE UNDER CHRIST ..."

On the other hand, Leo emphasizes without end that it is less the emperor who rules than Christ and God. That the emperor had his power from the Most High - *regnat per Dei gratiam*-. He asked Julian of Kios to give the monarch -the right suggestions- (*opportunas suggestiones*) at the right time. He, Leo, knew from -multiple experience- the faith of the glorious Augustus and knew that he was -convinced that he would serve his ruler best when he was particularly anxious to work for the integrity of the Church-. For the emperor had received his power above all for the protection of the Church, as Leo I emphatically emphasized, very often calling the emperor -*custos fidci*-. And the ntinen dez church, he suggests, is also the benefit of the state. -It is to the advantage of the whole Church and your kingdom if one God, *one* faith, one mystery of the salvation of men and *one* confession is maintained in the whole world. Not enough, this representative of Christ is already enticing us with how much the religion of love benefits war, the good news of the army's effectiveness. -If the Spirit of God strengthens the unity between the Christian princes", here meaning the emperors Marcian and Valentinian, "then the whole world will see how confidence grows in two respects: for through progress in faith and love [!] the power of weapons {1} becomes insurmountable, so that God, graciously moved by the unity of our faith, will at the same time destroy the error of false doctrine and the hostility of the barbarians-.\*

A clear language! Love and weapons! Unity, strength, destruction of enemies - of course, this has long been the program and practice of Christianity (I. Ch. ), especially in Rome, where, for example, probably in the early \$. Century, the Christian Aponius not only eagerly proclaimed the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Eternal City, but also a Christian imperial theology. Accordingly, the head of the people are the Roman kings, - those, of course, who have the truth and the power.

have recognized their holiness and serve Christ in humility (!). From them flow the pious laws, the praiseworthy peace and the sublime submissiveness (!) to the cult of the holy church as if from the Carmel river ...- But so that all this, the pious legislation, the praiseworthy peace, the submissiveness, flows and flows beautifully, the kings must do -war service under Christ the King of kings ...-."

Leo understood it the same way, propagating one God for the whole world, one empire, one emperor - (one God, one empire, one leader ...!) - and one church, of course, which he gave up as a "sacral order", as a "pax christiana", which -only- two enemies endangered: 'heretics' and 'barbarians'. - That is why the emperor must also fight against both" (Grillmeier SJ). That is why he is committed to *reparatio pacis*", to what they understand by it, what they hide under it: war until they have what they want (cf. *ip f*, 36-t), regardless of losses. That is how they still want it today, and no other way. Seventeen centuries of church history illustrate this. Bloodier than anywhere else. And more disastrous ...

### **Coim "ORATION FOR THE NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE - KETZER" UNDER "PRESERVATION OF MeN5CHEMWORT"**

Such a pope knows no pardon for "heretics". Time and again, he rails against the "heresies of the heretics of the beloved-, their -sharp arrows-, -poisonous lies", -godless religious ardor-, -monstrosities. They are all, Leo teaches, seduced by the "devil's deceit", -corrupted by the devil's wickedness-, susceptible to all sorts of vices, -inclined to ever graver sins". Sometimes they appear humble, sniveling, sheep's clothing, but inside they are ferocious wolves who only cover their wild predatory nature with the name of Christ. The devil leads them, and these animals, the whole  
-Rudel their carnivores, as I said, sometimes gently before'

cunningly, with friendly participation, they finally commit murder".

Basically: the description of one's own practice. A classic self-portrait.

As pastoral theological prophylaxis, Pope Leo always and repeatedly recommends - it is closely related - fasting, mortification of the flesh, contempt for the world, especially<sup>5</sup> of course, as<sup>4</sup> applies to this whole -morality- up to the eighth century, contempt for the wol[tist. -Wol luxt- fihti, according to Leo, - among the stan- ds of death". In reality, of course, it is the other way around. If renunciation of instinct leads to aggression, lust-murder leads to murder. Just as Christianity - according to Nietzsche - turns almost everything on its head! That is why, according to Leo "the Great", the Christian must also "constantly fight against his lust", must "deprive the lusts of the flesh of any breeding ground", must "kill his desires, die to his vices", must "avoid all earthly lust". For Leo, "all worldly love is excluded". He literally teaches: -You must despise earthly things in order to become partakers of the kingdom of heaven-.'<sup>o</sup>

All of this is for Leo I, the Pope, the Holy One, the Church teacher, clear as day. Whoever thinks otherwise lives -in filth-. For for whom else, he asks, "do the desires of the flesh fight but for the devil ...-.\*'

The -great- Leo really does deny that -outside the Catholic Church there is nothing pure and holy-! A n d this with reference to St. Paul (Rom. I§,z3). That is why the Pope also forbids "any contact" with non-Catholics! He expressly calls for their contempt and that of their teachings. He orders them to flee "like deadly poison! Say goodbye to them, avoid them and avoid talking to them.

-No communion with those who are enemies of the Catholic Church

They are Christians in name only! They must all return to their dark hiding places!

The pope, especially one for whom non-Catholics are hardly anything other than devils, wolves and robbers, thought nothing of religious denominations, religious disputations.

nothing in the first place. Everything had been decided, and if anything was still to be decided, he decided it. Without hesitation, he declared to the Council Fathers of Chalcedon that they could not be in doubt as to what he wanted - which must not be believed ...-. And after the Council, he urged the emperor not to allow any new negotiations. That would be ingratitude to God. -What has been defined in all form (pie et plene) must not be discussed anew, otherwise we give the impression, as the damned would like, of doubting ourselves ..." -According to Leo, questions of doubt were no longer to be examined, but he, Leo, only had to explain the correct decisions with the highest authority. -For if it is always necessary to disagree (disceptare) with human convictions, there will never be a lack of people who dare to contradict the truth and trust in the wisdom of worldly prudence". On the other hand, "it is enough to know true faith, who lehr- (scire quis doceat)."

But anyone who taught differently from Leo, he used the state against, according to a custom that had been practiced for a long time but which he intensified. Much like Nestorios (S. •i7)

Pope Leo also appeals to the ruler of the East: "Distribute If you defend the secure existence of the Church against any kind of doctrine, then Christ's strong hand will also defend your empire. In the West, Christ's strong hand had to deal with "a bigoted woman" and "an imbecile emperor" (Gregorovius): the very clerical Augusta Galla Placidia, who for a long time managed the government affairs for her not at least good Catholic son Valentinian III. but was also involved in important political decisions until her death in November '5 \*-. (One of her long-time advisors: St. Barbatianus, a priest who worked many "miracles" first in Rome, then in Ravenna.)"

The government certainly also had an interest in promoting the centralization of the Roman Church, if only because the tottering empire itself hoped to benefit from this in the provinces that Germa- nians occupied or threatened. Such considerations

These conditions made Leo's successes in the West possible. The state's policy towards the church was intended in the gnnzcn

On the one hand, the 4th and J centuries sought their unity and pacification, but on the other, they resisted the allegiance of a single episcopal see. The state overcame Alexandria in alliance with Rome at the Council of Chalcedon. However, the attempt to keep Rome in check\* through the Patriarch of Constantinople failed. The sraat was weak, and the pope used this weakness for his own purposes, although he himself was always well-adjusted and never rebellious.

Leo I maintained excellent relations with the princes. A great Part of his surviving correspondence - 4 letters - is addressed to the imperial family. Catholic Camelot praises "a trusting and harmonious collaboration". Jesuit Hugo Rahner

speaks of -Leo's imperial devotion-. And even in his earliest epistles, the pope vehemently attacks the -heretics-: nothing but a segregated, partisan, rebellious crowd, full of perversity, depravity, mendacity and godlessness, full of deceit and folly; their doctrine a single bad pestilential delusion: error, pravus error, totius erroris pravi- tas, pestiferus error, haereticus error.\*

The initiative for this anti-heretical cooperation, the battle of the -children of light- against the -children of darkness-, obviously came from the Pope. He sent letters of praise and thanks to their Majesties for the punishment of his opponents. He knew that without the support of state power, heresy would be overpowering, especially in the East. He therefore explicitly and repeatedly called on Valentinian **III**, Marcian, Leo I and the Empress Pulcheria, a passionate supporter of the Pope's idea, to fight "heretics", to "act pro fide". He wanted the expulsion of dissenters from office and dignity, especially their banishment, but also passionately justified the death penalty for them, demanding that it be made impossible for them to "continue to live with such a confession". The pestilence of heresy is for the pope -disease", which must be -cut out of the body

of the church" (haereses a corpore ecclesiae reseccantur). The emperor, who has to persecute "heretics" with "the sword of the tongue" as well as with the "naked sword", appears in Leo's work as a "Vicarius Christi vel Dei", an "extended arm of God". The Catholic theologian Stockmeier comments on this obvious bloodthirstiness as follows: -The state is called upon to cooperate with all its means and possibilities in the accomplishment of the Idealstate [!]. -Religion, with the rich abundance of its values [!] and goods, places itself under the protective hand of the emperor and also finds refuge there. Gratefully it looks to him ...-

Leo I wrote to his agent, the Bishop Julian of Kios (in Bithynia Pontica), probably the first Apocrisiar at the imperial court in Constantinople, that "if heretics have gone mad, so that they would rather rage than be healed, it is a matter for the imperial power to suppress more vigorously the disturbers of ecclesiastical peace as well as the enemies of the state, which rightly claims its Christian rulers"

-Then they should at least", as he says to his envoy in another letter, "strengthen the power of the punitive authorities."

To the Patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, whose ambitions he himself jealously resented and denounced to the emperor, he declared on October 11, 457 "strongest disapproval that among your clergy there should be some who are prone to the malice of their opponents ... Your diligence must be vigilant in seeking them out (investigandis) and punishing them with due severity (severitate congrua); those to whom punishment can do no harm should be cut off without pity."

And since Anatolius was not sharp enough for him, he wrote to Emperor Leo that if his brother Anatolius showed himself lax in the oppression of heretical clerics "through all too coarse kindness and gentleness, then restrain your faith, to give the church the means of salvation\* not only from the clergy, but also from the city.

be used-. -For the episcopal and apostolic sense of your piety should also be inflamed by the practice of just punishment.

To Gennadius, the Exarch of Africa, the Pope wrote that Gennadius must now turn against the enemies of the Church with the same vigor as against the external enemies, -fighting the battles of the Church for the Christian people as warriors of the Lord. Be it known that the heretics, if given freedom, "rise up against the Catholic faith in order to instill the poison of heresy into the members of the body of Christ. The Emperor Marcian had already thanked *you* for the fact that "by God's providence, heresy was destroyed by you" (*destructa est*).\*

This was undoubtedly what Pope Pelagius praised as Leo's life-sparkling concern for the Glatiben. This was certainly what Emperor Valentinian publicly praised on ry. July44J as the -humanity of man.

praised the "kindness of mild Leo". And that was obviously what a modern panegyrist, Jesuit Hugo Rahner, repeatedly praised as Leo's -moderatio- - in the comprehensive and untranslatable sense of this genuinely Roman and Christian word that Leo loved so much ... *Moderatio* is the fine sense for distributive justice, for the mafi, for the balanced center between the extremes, the wise, oh almost diplomatic assessment of what is possible in each case, which, despite all the elegance of yielding, unwaveringly adheres to the goal ..." In short, according to the Catholic theologian Fuchs in the second half of the twentieth century, Leo is concerned with century, it is about "emphasizing human dignity - as with John Paul II (see my pamphlet "A Pope travels to a crime scene")."

In reality, even as a deacon, Leo was relentless in the -heretic fight.

SEO L AS A SUCCESSOR OF PELAGIANS<sup>14</sup>, MANICIANS,  
PgISCILLIANS AND AS A PREDICTOR OF FLIND LOVE

Leo already intervened decisively in the ruination of Augustine's great opponent Julian of Aeclanum (I yoi ff). According to a report by Prosper, it was due to the deacon Leo that Sixtus III refused to reinstate the harassed Julian 4iq in his bishopric. Just as Leo later condemned him again. (He also urged Emperor Marcian to place the already exiled Eutyches in an even more remote area.)<sup>^</sup>.

Leo's first attack as pope was 4V against the Pelagians (I çqz f5 in Veneticn. Bishop Septimus of Altinum had accused him of having clerics in the Archbishop of AquiJeja's diocese.

of Pelagius and Caelestius had been received into the Church without revocation. Leo praised the suffragan, but sharply rebuked the metropolitan that through the laxity of the shepherds "wolves in sheep's clothing" had penetrated the Lord's flock, threatened him with severe apostolic wrath for further laxity, and urged the suppression of the "heresy" - the arrogant heresy of -serious disease" (pestilentiam) and to "eradicate this heresy".

**Almost** like an Inqtiisitor, Pope had been hunting the Manichaeans since çd3.

For if he found, he wrote at the time, "something true in any part of -nffeii heresies", it was in the dogma of the Manichaeans -Not even the slightest thing that could be tolerated. Everything was bad with them. Mani himself was a deceiver of the unfortunate, a servant of "lewd superstition", his teaching a stronghold of the devil, who not only ruled over a kind of depravity, but also over every conceivable folly and immorality. All the depravity of the pagans, all the depravity of the 'carnally minded' Jews, all the forbidden things in the secret teachings of magic, all the sacrileges and blasphemies in all the heresies, all of this has found expression in this sect as if it were the devil.



accumulated in a kind of senſgrid'e at the same time as all the other garbage. Leo affirms: -Nothing is holy with them, nothing pure, nothing true", "Falles shrouded in darkness and everything deceitful". Indeed, he claims that the "number of their crimes" is "greater than the number of words available for them".

Exaggerations, generalizations, absolutizations that speak for themselves.

Manichaeism (cf. I i66 ff), which, a g a i n s t the background of a transcendental monism, rigorously dualized the world of appearances, was a syncretistic universalism with its Buddhist, Iranian, Babylonian, late Jewish and Christian elements, a world religion that stretched from Spain to China. Usually rejected out of hand because of its claim to exclusivity, it was only the Uyghur (a[turkish) empire in Mongolia from yöy to g s' atreligion. Christian emperors continued to persecute the cult (which had already been legally opposed by Diocletian) as the most dangerous of all "heresies". Even the Catholic Theodosius I, who was as fond of blood as he was of water, threatened adherence to Mariichaeism with the death penalty after a long series of church fathers had written and wrote against it, particularly successfully Ephrem (cf. I i66 and Augustin (IH71. himself for almost ten years). chäer.\*'

Since the conquest of Carthage by the Vandals\* (43s), many Manicheans fled to Italy, especially Rome, with the droves of African refugees. There, Leo frequently and passionately attacked them, calling them a "devouring cancer" and a "cesspool of cesspools" and leaving them in his "care" (Grisar SJ).

track him down, arrest him and probably torture him. He also imprisoned the Manchaeon bishop (a nobis tentus) and made him confess. Through a tribunal of Christian senators, bishops and priests, which he himself presided over, he had a confession made.

December4j a number of Electi and Electae (of "chosen ones" who do not kill living things, do not damage plants, do not engage in sexual intercourse

dtirhen, while the auditors, the "listeners", could marry). The pope revealed their "defilements", including ritual "fornication" on a very young girl to liberate the divine particles of love in the semen humanum. For both St. Leo and St. Augustine (-non sacramentum, sed exsecramentum-) put their finger on Manichaeian lust as such (Grillmeier SJ). Leo had the writings of the cursed demanded and publicly burned. Some who were still to be reformed had to renounce, were punished by the church and snatched from the maw of godlessness. Others, however, who

-The pope had - according to the decrees of the Christian emperors - secular judges sentence him to life-long (!) banishment (-per publicos iudices perpetuo sunt exsilio relegati-). He had also investigated the personal details of foreign Manichaeians during the interrogation, had his victims forced to make statements about their teachers, bishops and priests in other provinces and cities and had also ordered all Italian prelates on 30. On January 30, dqq, he ordered all Italian prelates to track down and seize escaped Manichaeians, enclosing the Roman procedural acts for instruction and emulation, and finally extending his hunt for "heretics" as far as the Orient."

Not enough. He even incited the laity to denounce, snoop and brag, a business that was to flourish so blessedly in the medieval church, in the destruction of dissenters, of -witches-. -Unleash the holy zeal that the care of religion demands of you!" he cried and commanded "the defense of *all* believers "¡ commanded, - that you bring to the attention of the priests the manichiians who are hiding everywhere-¡ demanded "to uncover the hiding places of the godless and to fight down in them the very one they serve, i.e. the devil. *If*, beloved, the whole world and everywhere the whole Church are to take up the weapons of faith *against* such people, then you in particular must distinguish yourselves in this work by your industriousness.

ttlii . . .-\*

The same Leo, however, who acted almost like a medieval inquisitor, could constantly spout his Christian slogans, demanding forbearance, peaceableness, charity, avoidance of quarrelsomeness, renunciation of revenge. Immer again and again he could hypocritically preach: "And because everyone transgresses, let everyone forgive! Let us not unwillingly put up with what we so gladly put up with!" - "Eliminate all enmity among men through peaceableness, 'by not linking evil with evil' 'and forgiving one another, just as Christ forgave us! -"Let every revenge cease ..." "Away, then, with all threats! Let cruel severity be turned into mildness and abruptness into gentleness! May all forgive each other their transgressions- -Let us pray: 'Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors!' The paper expressly emphasizes this: -This does not only mean those who are close to us through friendship or kinship, but downright 'rifi# people with whom our nature connects us, whether they are enemies or allies, free or slaves-."

Only not heretics! Only not Manichaeans! Only not Pelagians! Only not Priscillianists! Only not Jews! Not all people of other faiths! Only not all unbelievers - ... ofle Menschen-! Paper, paper, paper! All the hypocrisy of this church, its snarling -Good News-, its heap devouring -love of enemies-, its disgusting peace palaver, all this is to be grasped here, a disgusting duplicity, untruthfulness, which runs through its history, denounces, mocks itself, pillories itself, leads ad absurdum, from antiquity until today. The gospel of the executioner!

Or to put it another way: Leo the Great.

The Pope comes back to the Manichaean theme remarkably often and almost always in a deeply agitated manner. He characterizes these people with always the same slurs as instruments of Satan, liars, pests, forgers of Scripture, as "quite simple-minded people ... who in blind ignorance or out of filthy

To turn to things that are not wholesome, but detestable.<sup>10</sup>

Although Leo's -general sense of shame- prevents him from going into more detail, he nevertheless likes to refer to these "things", their "immoral acts", which are -idolatrous-, which also defile body and soul, which *know* neither purity of faith *nor* chastisement-, which appear -obvious-. At the same time he *warns* - and at the same time warns - women "above all" to become acquainted with such people, to converse with them - so that you do not fall into the snares of the devil, while your ear is unsuspectingly delighted with their fabulous stories! Since Satan knows that he seduced the first man through the mouth of a woman [!] and through the gullibility of the woman [!] drove all people out of the se $\acute{e}$ ty of paradise, he is still pursuing *your* generation with confident cunning - "

While he warns the women, he defames them according to a ancient tradition cultivated by the greatest Christians of antiquity, St. Paul, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine. For the fact that women are "primarily intended to satisfy the lust of men", as St. Chrysostom teaches, could not have been taught by the Popes themselves. Chrysostom teaches, was something the Pope himself was able to observe among the Manichaeans. After all, they revealed to his tribunal "a wicked deed that one w o u l d be ashamed even just to repeat". However, he was aware, indeed, he himself had conducted the investigation about it so painstakingly that there was hardly the slightest doubt, neither for those who did not really want to believe in the matter, nor for the habitual grumblers. All the people in whose company the heinous act w a s committed were present: a girl, of course, at *the* age of *no more than* ten )ahren and two women who had raised her and ordered such a shameful act. Also present was young Merisch, barely out of boyhood, who had defiled the girl, and her own bishop, who had ordered such a despicable crime. AH these people s a i d one and the same thing in the same words.

This brought to light abominations that we could hardly listen to. We were not obliged to offend our listeners by speaking more openly, as the documentary evidence clearly shows that there is no discipline, no respectability, not a trace of shame in this sect, whose law is lies, whose religion is the devil, whose victim is shame."

Finally, Pope Leo obtained a tougher rescript from Emperor Valentinian to maintain "public order". June *QS*, which repeated the earlier punishments, ordered the Manichaeans to be treated in the same way as the desecrators of a sanctuary, denied them civil rights and honors throughout the empire and called Manichaeism a "publicum crimen", -toto orbi" condemnable. Anyone who provided shelter was guilty of the same crime. The accomplices also lost the freedom of contract, the active and passive right of inheritance, etc. "Kern overlooked", it says at the beginning, "tolerate more the recently uncovered crimes of the Manichaeans. What monstrous, unspeakable and outrageously shameless things have not been uncovered in the court of the most blessed Pope Leo before the illustrious Senate by their own open confession ... We cannot fail to take note of this, since it is not our place to be lax in the face of such a despicable insult to the deity. This imperial order to persecute the Manichaeans, which once again shows the close relationship between state and church, law and religion, *res Romana* and *ecclesia Romana*, was drawn up in the papal office, The pope himself played a "major part" in this, as Jesuit Hugo Rahner writes, after he had shortly before *ziivor* Leo's -fine and humane center *ziszfidn this and world flight-*, shortly after the love so often praised by Leo, -Leo's humanity as a secular deed. In reality, the law he initiated was against the Manichaeans -of draconian severity- (Catholic Ehrhard), *lieÉ*" he persecuted the Manichaeans "right into their last hiding places" (Catholic Stratmann)."

The same Leo, however, who could drive the state to brutal persecution, could also demand noble forbearance and forgiveness from it. -The harsh rule against our subjects should be softened and all revenge for an offense should be abolished! Let the guilty rejoice that they have seen these days when, under the rule of pious and God-fearing princes, even the harsh public punishments will be abolished! Let all hatred cease ...- The same Leo, who incites the state to judge, banish, imprison and kill heretics, could also ask again in a very Christian way: "Let all revenge and every insult be forgotten! -So if anyone is so filled with vengeance against anyone that he throws him into prison or puts him in chains, let him bring about his release as quickly as possible, not only if he is guilty, but even if he seems to have deserved the punishment!" The same Leo could shout: - No one shall have in us an oppressor ...- The same Leo knew that Jesus forbade -him to defend himself with an armed hand against the wicked."

Paper, paper, paper!

The pope's referral of the Manichaeans to the state's criminal jurisdiction was in line with legal norms, the imperial heresy laws, but what was new was the close collaboration between the ecclesiastical and secular courts. And just as the beheading of Priscillian and his companions *could* be attributed to the *first blutif* heretic trial, Leo's Manichean attack could be attributed to the first -inquisition trial, this was not the case in strictly legal terms either.'-

Leo's English biographer Trevor Jalland finds the Pope's actions not only illuminating for his character, but also calls his manhunt "the first known example of a partnership between Church and State in carrying out a policy of religious persecution". Until now, the state alone had suppressed heterodoxy, but now, for the first time, the Church, in the person of the Pope, had taken on this task; whereby, of course, the joint persecution of Priscillianists, Donatists, Arians,

---

of pagans, Jews must be remembered as early as the fourth century, when no pope has ever engaged in such inquisitorial behavior himself."

A few years after the expulsion of the Manichaeans from Rome, Leo fought against Priscillianism in Spain. The bishop there, Turibius of Astorga (Asturia Augusta), had established their continued existence during a visitation and reported their most important -cultures- in sixteen chapters."

However, the Spanish bishop had reported correctly, and in any case had informed the pope much more objectively than his replica suggests. This is because Leo -preferred to fit the above mediations into his scheme and turned them into a distorted picture of Priscillianism: the Priscillianists are placed alongside the Manichaeans - {Haendler}!-

Iii Indeed, the Roman here generalizes in the same way. What is not papal is diabolical. Again he rails against -This wicked heresy", "the abominable sect", the "godless frenzy", by which "every morality is shattered, every bond of marriage is dissolved, all divine and human law is destroyed". Once upon a time, in the year 383, the first direction of Christians by Christians in Trierj <is ff) had the Christenheit was still outraged, the response to the death sentence was allegedly even "among the most important bishops ... clearly negative-(Katholik Baus). But the oh so humane, moderate Leo, the sanctimonious caller for mercy, for the abolition of all revenge, threats and hatred, the so hereditary preacher of forgiveness, of the Good News that embraces *all* people, of love of neighbor, love of the faithful, the man who teaches that Jesus does not want to see himself defended by an armed hand, who is now happy about the Trier outrage, who passionately justifies the liquidation of Priscillian and his companions. -Our fathers, in whose time this godless heresy broke out, rightly (Merito) did everything in their power to eliminate this godless madness from the whole Church; the secular princes also detested this sacrilegious nonsense so much that they killed the author of it and many [!

Pupils with the rind of public laws niederwar-. Leo "the Great" was able to overcome the opposition of such  
 -This is why it is almost cynical to emphasize the murder of heretics: -This severity was long beneficial to ecclesiastical clemency, which, though satisfied with episcopal judgment, avoids bloody punishments, yet is supported by the strict laws of Christian princes, since those who fear corporal punishments often resort to spiritual remedies. Leo convened a church assembly in Galilee against the Priscillianists, but was unable to eradicate them completely. A century later, y6y, the Synod of Braga (capital of the Suevians in the 6th century) hurled no fewer than seventeen ana- thematizations against the Priscillianists, who were apparently still numerous in Spain, as a result of Leo's advance, and drove the bishops to fight the heresy more intensively."

### LEO "nER GROSSE" DEFENDS THE JEWS

His anti-Jewish statements are far less frequently documented or even mentioned than this pope's heresy offensives. And yet Leo I also belongs in the long line of anti-Jewish church fathers from Justin, Irenaeus, Cyprian to Athanasius, Etisebius, Fipraem, Chrysostom, Jerome, Hilarius, Ambrose, Augustine (I chap. z; also I ø38 ff, jIE /.

Even for the noble, mild, moderate Leo (cf. p. zöa), the Jews are only stupid, blinded, benighted, their priests -god-forgotten-, their scribes -foolish-; their knowledge is -so ignorant-, their scholarship -so unlearned". -They do not grasp with their minds what they have learned from the words of the holy *disciples*. For their foolish rabbis the truth is an offense, for their blinded scholars of the Scriptures the light becomes darkness".



white templates, slogans of poster-like clumsiness, sectarian stultification campaigns of the simplest kind. Again and again there is the "darkness of ignorance-, there -the light of faith-, again and again there -the sons of darkness-, there -the true light-is shining", again and again -injustice is fighting ... against justice-, -the lie against the truth", -delusion" against -wisdom" - always the same degouting scheme."

Again and again, this pope reproaches the Jews for the death of Jesus. In ever new sermons he castigates their conscienceless leaders and priests who had forgotten their duty; all priests were dominated by the thought of how they should carry out their crime against Jesus. All of them were "filled with the fury of patricidal hatred, with only one goal in mind", all of them "equal in cruelty".

And finally Pilate gives your godless people the blood the price of righteousness ...-."

In line with the tendency of the Gospels, Leo also incriminates the Jews and exonerates Pilate, the Roman, -even if he lends his arm to the angry people ...-. For the hands of the Jews, which were at the service of Satan, struck "his immaculately conceived flesh on the cross", their godlessness was "harder than all tombstones and rocks". In contrast, "the warriors of Rome showed greater willingness to believe in the Son of God ...". -On you, you false Jews and you gortforgotten leaders of the people, weighs the whole weight of this outrage, "the whole responsibility. The injustice that Mr. Pilate brought upon himself by his sentence and the soldiers by carrying out the order makes you even more hateful in the eyes of the people."

"On this morning, you Jews, the sun did not set on you. Not the usual light showed itself to your eyes, but terrible blindness blinded your godless hearts. This morning destroyed your temple and your altars, deprived you of the law and the prophets, abolished your kingship and priesthood and turned all your feasts into eternal mourning, for your plan to destroy the temple was wicked and cruel.

"To give up to death the 'author of life' and the 'Lord of glory', you 'powerful bulls and numerous bullocks, you bellowing beasts and furious dogs'."

More than once Leo I compares the Jews to animals gone wild, to bulls, oxen, he invokes -the defiant and blind rage of master bulls and the wild behavior of untameable oxen-, he blasphemes them -roaring beasts of prey", craving -the blood of the righteous shepherd".

Pope Leo "the Great" never tires of defaming the Jews. time and again he vilifies them - the fervent vedolgiants - who -murderers-, -evildoers-, -the godless Jews-, eQOtt- the -loose and unbelieving Jews-, the -fleshly-minded Jews-, -the vengeful Jews-, the -butcherous elders-, -the unrighteous and blind-, -the bitter and irreconcilable-, -the licentious people who looked into the eyes of the high priests" (just as the Catholics looked into the eyes of their popes for so many centuries!) Again and again Leo speaks of their "wicked deeds", their "iniquity", their "terrible crime", of the "raging goodness of the Jews", the "blindness of the Jews", the "wickedness of the Jews", the "stubbornness and cruelty of the wicked". They are always the -foolish scribes-, the -forgotten priests-, the -thieves and mercenaries- of Satan, they are rejected-, -full of hypocrisy-, -insults-, -abuses-, -meaningless mockery". The enraged Jews always do everything to Jesus that they can think of, they hurl against the Lord of glory the -the deadly bullets of their speeches and the poisoned arrows of their words". -Again and again and again he lets them scream -Crucify him, crucify him! -From this you should recognize that you are rejected. -Both testaments therefore rightly condemn you-. For -all time- these deeds of the Jews are -an object of abhorrence- for **Pope** Leo.

Such harassment must have poisoned the honest people and led to ever more severe legal measures against the Jews\*, to the expropriation or burning of their synagogues even in ancient times (1 ç3q ff), to the incessant pogroms of the

Middle Ages and modern times. Yes, as recently as 1888, the Catholic Krämer-Badoni writes with regard to Pope Leo I: -The harshest discriminatory state laws were enacted under his pontificate, and of course not out of the blue. The Roman emperors had never interfered in religious matters if the religious followers were politically loyal. The new intolerant role was imposed on them by the Church. ^

All of Leo's and the Church's diatribes against the Jews as "murderers of God" are all the more grotesque because the Jews were merely carrying out God's will. God wanted to be killed by them! He wanted to redeem the world in this way! He had foreseen the whole procedure since eternity - at least since in his -Heils plan- (see: -Stammelternpaar-, -Erbsünden"-Malheur, "Sint- (lut- and other such mifilang. So the Juden only vollstieckten. They were, as Leo himself knows, chosen by God to promote the work of redemption, since it was precisely their unjust cruelty that brought redemption. Thus, for the "great" Pope, they are an object of disgust and yet also of "joy". However, there is no sign of joy about the Jews from him, or from any of the other -famous- church-fatherly anti-Jewish ruffians. But what a pity for every word about the absurdity of a theology that hates the Jews, has them persecuted (oh, all too much) to the death - and owes them everything!"

#### Diz -S1ERNSTUNDE DER MENSCHHEIT"

The most enduring peace was that of Lno I- 45\*, when the Huns under Attila, after the difficult battle on the Catalaunian Fields near Poitiers, one of the great massacres of peoples in European history, suddenly broke into northern Italy via the unguarded passes of the Julian Alps, devastated and plundered it and overran Aquileia, Milan and Pavia. Their king Axila was next to Geiserich, with whom he was always in contact and successful.

empire, undoubtedly the most important ruler of the time. But even then, the Huns - like the Russians in Nazi Germany - were perceived as being inferior. Latin chroniclers describe them as rather small and slow-witted, with slit eyes in dark skin, covered in animal pelts and riding bareback on their wild horses like the devil, spreading terror, death ... "May Jesus continue to keep such beasts away from the Roman world!" prayed St. Jerome.

Envoys, the consul of the year 41 Gennadius Avienus, the former prefect Trygetius and Bishop Leo confronted the aggressor and asked for the Mincio near Mantua, between Lake Garda and Po, his abug, whereupon Attila, the scourge of God, refrained from advancing further.

A lot of ink was wasted because of this. And it is no coincidence that the other two envoys are hardly mentioned at all. All the more so, however, of Leo, who, incidentally, spoke of it himself only once and remarkably briefly. He was celebrated - far more Christian legend than history - as the liberator of Italy from the Hunnic hordes, and it was even said that during the papal address to Attila, the apostles Peter and Paul appeared in the air in Leo's support. Raphael designed (i 512./i5\*4) the

-Star of humanity" (Kühner) in a famous Fresco painting of the Vatican Stanza d'Elidoro. Algardi decorated Leo's tomb **altar** with the same scene (under Innocent X). **But** when on another occasion the father of Cassiodorus (leading statesman under Theodoric the Great, then a monk) and Carpilio, the son of Aetius, obtained the withdrawal of the Hun army with such a petition, far less fuss was made of it. And at Manrua, Anila was not held back by Leo's eloquent tongue as always, but for a man of his stature, for whom a Roman bishop would hardly have caused more anguish than a Roman senator, quite other things: food shortages for his soldiers, the horses, various epidemics irri Lord, unrest in his rear, an uncovered advance, the difficulty of keeping up with the enemy in the central Italian mountainous landscape, and the fact that he was not able to keep up with the enemy.

cavalry to operate, an impending attack by Ostrom on Pannonia, the Hunnic Empire, perhaps also the memory of Alaric's sudden death soon after the capture of Rome.

In the centuries to come, so many *Catholic* princes did not pay the slightest attention to papal wishes - and should Bishop Leo have been respected by an Attila of all people, prompted to make such significant and momentous decisions? Should the king of the Huns, according to Prosper Tiro, have been so pleased by "the presence of the highest prince of the church [1]" that he "refrained from continuing the war, promised to keep the peace and withdrew to the Danube region"?

Even today, Catholics still celebrate Leo as the savior of Europe, the 5th century as "a turning point for the West and the Church". Because: "In the raging 8th century of the migration of peoples, Pope Leo I stood like a rock in the earth. You could almost call him a 'Pope of Catholic Action'." And the Catholic theologian Josef Fuchs provides a "TABLE PICTURE" of Pope Leo I, *who* defended people in the natural world: I. IRdem he saved the West from annihilation by the f- tons ...- And exactly opposite, on the next page, Fuchs brings the -TAF-ELBILD *Die Kir'fir* rerteidigi iiwere Menschenwürde indem indem sie vor denn *Communie-* mes warnt ...- So the things in this "Kominentar für den Katecheten-, darin -der Beug auf das corpus Christi mysti- cum übera!l hervorleuchtet- {0. Berger), zweifçllos in zeitgemaBe Sicht."

Attila returned to Pannonia and died unexpectedly the very next year. 453. in a bridal bed probably of a Germanic woman, perhaps the beautiful Burgundian princess 11- dico, in a wine frenzy, in love exhaustion - one of the famous The most famous wedding nights in history and world literature. For the Huns, according to Herman's writer in his biography of Attila, "a real Hun death, a royal death. For although they were intrepid fighters, they possessed -wisdom of life and

Art of living enough to make the one who died in the midst of joy happy. Schreiber rightly admires the fact that the young woman was not accused by the dogs. -Even a thousand years later, Ildico would have been tortured until she admitted to being a witch who had brought about Attila's death with an evil love spell."

Apparently, however, the love of the two was so well known in the king's immediate surroundings that? a suspicion of murder did not even arise; whereas in the Byzantine tradition, that of the West, in the monk chronicles, the Christian heroic poems and heroic sagas, the accusation of murder flourished.\*.

In the pious Occident, the word is circulating at all, hardly by chance,  
very distorted, false ideas about the Huns.

Of course, they conquered entire peoples in bloody battles, but then did not enslave the subjugated without any rights, as the Christians so often did (the Turks were sometimes more popular with their peasants than their Christian masters). The groups incorporated into the Hun Empire gained full parity, and in certain cases were preferred by the ruler to his own eastern tribes. -This is certainly an exception in the whole of human development, writes Michael de Ferdinandy, and yet it is very easy to explain: for the victorious nomad, the defeated enemy, if he has not proved to be unfaithful or treacherous, immediately turns into a friend ... The leader of a defeated or voluntarily subjugated people, however, becomes *a* member of the council of the Great Khan, and this does not happen 'pro forma'. The Ostrogoth king Walamer becomes Attila's most trusted friend, and the Gepid king Ardarich also becomes Attila's designated successor ... The Germanic peoples also remained loyal to their former great ruler in the Andes ...-

- a man, by the way, who is also a -God's sword-,  
of **course** that of the Huns."

Three years later, however, Leo I was unable to make much of an impression on the Vandals.

At that time, Petronius Maximus had publicly executed Emperor Valentinian III, the violator of his domestic honor, on z6. MaŹZ '15 and married his widow Eudoxia. Eudoxia, however, summoned the Vandal king Geiseric, whose fleet then appeared at the mouth of the Tiber. Panic in Rome! Jent confronted Leo the Sandals. But now there was no longer a starry hour. The invaders plundered the city - without murder or fire - for two weeks by every trick in the book. The pope himself had to deliver the most precious church vessels with his own hand. Emperor Maximus and his son died during their escape (permitted by Geiserich), Maximus presumably at the hands of a bodyguard. Father and son were torn to pieces by the people and thrown into the Tiber. Thousands of prisoners, including Empress Eudoxia and her daughters Eudocia and Placidia, carried away the sandals, irreplaceable works of art, many of which were lost forever in shipwrecks on the return journey."

However, neither Leo's behavior nor his Christianity seems to have impressed the Romans very much. The high preacher himself shouts indignantly: -It is exceedingly dangerous when men are ungrateful to God, when they no longer wish to remember his benefits, when they show neither contrition at their chastisement nor joy at their deliverance ... I am ashamed to say it (Pudet dicere), but I must not remain silent: The pagan idols are honored more than the apostles. Mad spectacles are more diligently attended than the churches of the holy martyrs."

Leo I already had reason to state: -"The dignity of St. Peter is not lost even in an unworthy heir" (Petri dignitas etiam in indigno haerede non deficit). One of the old, clumsily devious, but understandably less and less dispensable trick sayings of Catholica from century to century. And, of course, Leo - who could declare that the Church itself shied away from bloody punishment - but left this punishment to the Christian princes, - whose fear of the death penalty made them too spiritual.

of healing" - anything but unworthy. And the Church counts this ancient inquisitor among its greatest popes. He became a saint and - through Benedict XIV iyyç - a Doctor of the Church, indeed, he was given the epithet "the Great"! -Humility, gentleness and love for all people were the main traits of the holy chief shepherd, and for this reason he was honored and loved by emperors and princes, high and low, pagans and the roughest peoples (Donin)."





## CHAPTER 6

# THE WAR IN THE CHURCHES AND FOR THE CHURCHES UP TO EMPEROR JUSTIN (518)

-Monophysitism became the national religion of Christianity.

Egypt and Abyssinia and also prevailed in western Syria and Armenia in the 6th century, Nestorianism with its doubt about the Gortēs mother conquered Mesopotamia

and eastern Syria. This was a harsh but important political consequence: in the 7th century, the Arabs were excluded from the religious, political and economic life of Egypt and the East.

financial yoke of the Byzantine capital. K. Beil'

... the harsh condemnation of the confession of Chalcedon as an imposition on the Oriental churches lies in the history of the next two hundred years, in

the ZicratlTt VOlt4S z to crwo 6jo, from Chslzcdo" to the onset of Islam: the most terrible uprisings of the people and the monks, namely in Egypt, in Palestine and parts of Syria against the Chalcedonense open this period, and

At the end of the two hundred Jahre, the fesforanisiscri--monophysitic national churches in Armenia, Syria, Egypt and Abyssinia, which had been experienced by bitterest hal against the,ricrhic imperial acirch in B nz-. P.

Kawerau'

the east stands in bright lights!<sup>4</sup> or:  
", . . , THE TEUFfIL YOU AND Lso"

The great council, which Harnack compared to the "Robbers' Synod" (p. \*37), which Harnack neritized in order to distinguish it from the Robbers' Synod B.äubex- and veriätheisynode-, reassured the congregations.

not. On the contrary. It only put them in the middle of !fl Atlfriihr. It became the beginning of many new calamities, annoyances and an5toB to a schism that continues to this day, whereby each side naturally considered and still considers itself to be "orthodox", "orthodox".

Chalcedon was an imperial church synod, the resolutions became imperial law. And since the terms of art used for the new doctrine: Essence, nature, substance (usia, physis, hypostasis), which had always been used differently by Greek thinkers, theological speculators and squabblers had almost inexhaustible opportunities to talk past each other and heretically attack each other, especially as the concept of person (Greek prosopon) contributed by the Latins was also highly ambiguous and the West was particularly affected by the disagreement until the death of Pope Gregory I (604).<sup>3</sup>

Now, of course, the post-Chalcedonian development is not being questioned here for its inspirational power for a Christological spirituality (Grillmeier). Oh dear, no. -We are "only" interested in the {church}political consequences, the incessant religious quarrels, the advocacy of the 'orthodoxy', the -heresies, the eternal church strife, all the hatred, the blood, the uprisings, military operations, in Palestine ztimal, in Egypt, the

Banishments, imprisonments, liquidations, all the years of conflict between emperors and popes until the agreement finally reached by Pope Hormisdas and Emperor Justin I almost seventy years later, which of course brought no peace, but new, intensified persecutions\*.

The church assembly was now quickly accused of having Nestorian tendencies. The synod members were even called Nestorians, and later also "diphysites" (two-natured people). The followers of St. Bishop Cyril in particular ignored his Christology in Chalcedon and saw in the distinction between the two natures emphasized by Leo I pure Nestorianism, an abominable

-heresy"! (In fact, even Nestorios, who is still ostracized today, had virtually prepared the Christological formula of Chalcedon, he had welcomed the Leonian formulations as his own justification - the Pope the exile in the desert, condemned once again with the Council\*! Now, however, even Jesuit Wilhelm de Vries recognizes in the synods of the Persian Church of the Nestorians in the y. and 6th century [with the exception of Seleucia: 4861, at best -a quite correct Christology").

The resistance to Chalcedon therefore did not come from the Nestorians. It came from the Monophysites in Egypt, where the successors of the schismatic patriarchs reside in an unbroken order to this day, and in Syria, the strongholds of Monophysitism, where monasticism, which was fervently admired by the crowd, was also Monophysite. He came from the Monophysites in Arabia, Abyssinia, where countless Syrian Christians fled after qyz. It came from Persia and Armenia and led to the separation of entire peoples of the East from Catholicism. In the eighth century, a variety of Christian sects dominated the south-eastern edge of the Mediterranean: Severians, Julianists, **Phantasists**, Theodosians, Gajanites, Phthartolatrians, Actists, Themistians, Tritians, Tetradites, Niobites. And all these and more favored the expansion of Islam in the 7th century, which conquered Palestine, Syria and Egypt and gave rise to numerous national churches, some of which still exist today.

Throughout the Middle Ages, the monophysical bishops, theologians and historians continued to attack the "heresy of the hypocritical council", the "smug belief of the Ketnerian council", as the bishop of Takrit wrote in the early 7th century. The bishop of Takrit, Abu Ra'ita, wrote in the early 7th century, for whom "the known loose Markianos is simply the second Jeroboam". A little later, the Copt Severos, Bishop of Uşmunain, claims in his -Book of the Councils- that Dioscorus had received a "strong slap in the face" from the Empress in Chalcedon - Pulcheria also praises the -Dictionary of Theology and Churches, -Heiress of the Spirit of her Grogv't'r' Theodosius I" -, which had been the cause of further mistreatment of Dioscorus. According to the Jacobite historian Barhebraeus (1226-1286), his nation's best-known historian, the saint had sexual intercourse with her husband despite her vow of virginity; according to Neostorios, she also had sex with her brother Theodosius. (In fact, Pulcheria was not considered a saint in antiquity, when her recklessness was still too drastic in some respects. This veneration, writes the ecclesiastical lexicon just mentioned, -is only verifiable *in the Middle Ages*"). Ignatios Nfih (Nori), in the early 16th century. Patriarch of the Jacobites, speaks of Chalcedon as -this accursed council-, which -condemned by the Lord-, and let Dioskor to the Emperor Marcian, -the friend of the devil': -It is enough that there are three heads in this council: the devil, you and Leo-

Pulcheria, Marcian and Leo were enough to set almost the whole of the East ablaze after the synod, which was, all in all, so highly gratifying for Rome.

In Alexandria, whose Archbishop Dioscor had been exiled to Paphlagonia in November 451, the agitated Christians burned the imperial church in response to the news of the council's outcome. The Alexandrian occupation and the church, the former temple of Serapis, where they had taken refuge, were still alive. Marcian appealed to the Alexandrians to unite with the "holy and catholic church of the orthodox". -With such action you will

save your souls and accomplish things pleasing to God." But soon he did not allow them any further propaganda against the Council and imposed a long series of punishments on "heretics" in the harsh constitution -*Licet iam sacra-tissima*-. It was only amid savage punitive battles, murder and manslaughter, that Dioscorus'

In November 5i, his apostate confidant, the archdeacon PrOtOfiOG {dJ 457)\* was consecrated by four equally apostate bishops, took possession of his see and held it with papal recognition and under constant strong troop protection. The people and the monks, but also many clerics

ker, continued to stand by Dioskor, while Procerios, the -true disciple of the apostles (Leo I), had his main support in Emperor Marcian. However, after his death in January 457, as we will soon see, a *new era broke out* in Dlexcndria.

The riots became more violent, in which monks were again particularly involved.

In the East, it was the monks who fomented resistance to Chalcedon. Other groups of monks, of course, tirelessly agitated for it. In any case, the monks fought in the front row on all fronts" (Bacht SJ).

n,ai A bloody monastic revolt broke out i n Palestine even before the close of the Council. Here the monk chiefs Ro- manos and Markianos as well as the religious and counter-bishop Theodosius (d5I-453), a pious zealot and follower of Dioscorus, who is said to have already caused turmoil in Chalcedon, conquered Jeru- zalem with ten thousand fanatical ascetics for about twenty months before fleeing to Mount Sinai. The ambitious Juvenal, patriarch of the city from yz to q58, who was not rightly accused by the monks of having broken his oaths and promises and betrayed Cyril's theology, meanwhile lost his chair. z[3I he had presented forged documents in Ephesus to support his claims to power, the expansion of his spire (by three provinces: Phoenicia l and 11 as well as Arabia) and allegedly favored Cyril. J3q he went over to the other side, was, alongside Dioskor, probably the most prominent leader of the "Council of Robbers" and, among 113 BiSC courts, the

the first to a d v o c a t e the rehabilitation of Eutyches, whom he -entirely orthodox". In Chalcedon, he quickly changed sides again. He shamefully abandoned Dioscorus, his old ally, confessed to his banishment and to the rehabilitation of Flavian. Now he fled ct - mud I say that he is venerated as a saint in the Orient (feast: a. July)? - Head over heels to the emperor in Constantinople.

In Jerusalem, however, Theodosius, supported by the people and monks, took his place. The monks burned down houses and committed atrocity after atrocity. The bishop of Scythopolis, Severianos, was murdered together with his companions on his return from the council - not the only bishop they killed. Many bishoprics now came under the control of the Monophysites, who soon ruled the whole of Palestine, but were soon chased out again - of course not without troop deployments, a regular battle. The uprising was co-financed by Caesar.

Eudocia, who had reigned in Jerusalem since '43, the widow of Theodosios II, fell apart with the court, resisting the attacks of Pulcheria, her hated sister-in-law, and Marcian's on Eutyches. Through Eudocia, her influence and her intrigues, almost every monastery in the circle of the "Holy City" is said to have fallen away from Juvenal. On the other hand, from Rome, the pope drove against the

-Rots of false monks-, the mercenaries of the Antichrist, as he wrote to Julian of Kios in November 452, not without also accusing the fugitive Juvenal. Just two years ago, Leo did not even want Juvenal's name (along with that of Dioscorus and Eusthatius of Berytus) to be mentioned in the service. Yet this great forger and front changer before the Herm was such a capable missionary that he had already consecrated the chief of a Bedouin tribe as the first "Bishop of the Tent Camps" around 447 - a n d later also the "Honor of the Alt3ie".

But in January 454 Leo had to thank the ruler for forcibly returning Juvenal to his chair! And on September of that year he i n c i t e d the patriarch himself to more rigorous attacks! The Leo demanded the eradication of the Eutychians. They should all, like

the Dioskor appendix, be taken to where they are harmless and prosecuted under criminal law'.

Emperor Marcian, the compliant helper of the Pulcheria and the Pope, who also attested to his "unification of royal power with priestly zeal", had announced measures against all those who refused to comply with his definition at Chalcedon: ordinary private citizens were to be expelled from the capital, the military and clergy were to be expelled. He considered further stratagems possible. Between February and July alone, he issued four decrees to confirm and reinforce the Council's resolutions, and in the fourth of these decrees, dated July 8, he took a particularly harsh stance. July yz against the -Etitychiancr -. He banned their meetings, teachings and sermons, forbade them to ordain bishops and priests and to ban monasteries. He forbade them to have clergy and their monks to have any monastic community. He denied them testamentary and inheritance rights, banished them from Constantinople, but clerics and monks of the Eutyches monastery from the entire empire. Anyone who took them in was threatened with confiscation and deportation, and anyone who heard their preaching had to pay ten pounds of gold. The monks were punished with laws similar to those applied to heretics and Manichaeans. Their writings against Chalcedon were to be burned and their owners and disseminators deported. And soon he fought for the -right- faith with troops."

The Council Emperor also persecuted the pagans with all brutality. Pagan acts of worship were threatened - \* 45\* with **ÜOfi ISkAtiOfi**

and execution, whereby both the executors, the helpers and the concerned the accomplices. The penalty for neglecting the law The amount for the governors - zo pounds of gold ilrl Ja \* 4W - was increased by Marcian to o pounds of gold each for the governor and his authority."



## PARSV LEO HATCHES AGAINST THE CHRtSTLICHES

## "TRUPLE OF STEN 8

Behind all the anti-heretical attacks, however, stood Leo I. He repeatedly tried to prevent any renewed discussion of the council resolutions, to keep the heretics at bay and to send the monastic rebels into a strictly isolated exile.

Yriumphantly he informs the Gallic bishops that after Chalcedon no one is allowed to defend the "false doctrine" under the pretext of ignorance, because the synod of almost 6m of our brothers and fellow bishops, which had failed for this very reason, did not allow any art of disputation or eloquent discussion to be used against the divinely founded faith ... The holy synod ... has now separated this monstrous falsehood of diabolical disposition from the Church of God by cursing this stain."

In Constantinople, Julian, an Italian educated in Rome, who had become bishop of Kios near Nicaea and therefore knew Greek, established himself as Leo's permanent vicar against the current "heretics" (*contra temporis nostri haereticos*). According to the official letter of appointment of xi. MÄ 45s, the pope thus had his accredited informer at court, so to speak, his overseer, confidant, mediator, whipper-in. He should, as Leo repeatedly demanded, fight the heretics, including the opposing monks, i.e. have them prosecuted by the emperor and the temporal courts. Julian must, he ordered him, -as my deputy (*vice mea functus*) take special care that the Nestorian and Eutychian heresy does not revive anywhere; for there is no Catholic strength in the Bishop of Constantinople. Against him, -as he deserves to exalt me, I defer to ...-. The Iconian Yikar, however, had to keep an eye on the patriarch of the capital as well as on the empress dowager Eudokia, who organized the monks' revolt in Jerusalem and Palestine, or the unrest of the Egyptian monks. Last but not least, however, Bishop Julian was to keep an eye on the bigoted imperial couple living in -Josephshe-, whose priestcerli-

The monarch repeatedly praised Leo's work, whose -protective duty- towards the Church he demanded much more frequently, for the benefit of Rome's shortcomings - -advised". Leo told the monarch himself to listen to Juliane's suggestions as if they were his own.

This supposedly so moderate, humane Hierarch (p. zdz) never wandered to m a k e life as sour as possible for his opponents, to at least silence them even more radically, whereby he had a favorable tool in Emperor Marcian, the former Feld- herm married to the nun Pulcheria. So he wrote to him on ry. April 451: -However, since you accept my suggestions for the tranquility of the Catholic faith gem, you may know that I have been informed by communication from my brother and co-bishop Julian that the godless Eutyches ewar is deservedly in banishment, but still, on the day of his condemnation (damnationis loco) against the Catholic Church, spouts much venom of his blasphemy full of despair and spouts with even greater shamelessness that which the whole world detested and condemned in him, so that he can deceive harmless people {innocentes). I think it a!so very wise if your clemency orders him to be taken to a more distant and hidden *on*."

For all imperial measures, Leo in March 451  
Bishop Julian of Kios and the Holy Empress Pulcheria. And of course he was particularly pleased when the regent had Comes Dorotheus restore "order" by force of arms. Many monks lost their lives in the process. The archimandrites Romanos and Timothy were imprisoned in Antioch, while the deposed pope Theodosios was dragged to a monastery prison in Constantinople. Pope Leo, however, praised the bloody work in a letter to His Majesty as the work of their faith and the fruit of imperial piety (vestrae fidei opus, vestrae pietatis est fructus).  
Sickness must be brought to health, turmoil to peace. -I rejoice therefore ... that the kingdom, since Christ guides it, is calm, since Christ protects it, is powerful. Leo

did not stop praying for Marcian, as he wrote to him two years before his death, -because the Church and the Roman Res Publica are much promoted by your good from God."

ALSO AT ISER LEO ). POPE L X O C L A I M S  
CONTINUOUSLY AGAINST "THE CRIMINALS" AND  
REJECTS ANY OVERHEAD'IDLUGH

Pulcheria, whose "for Herm pleasing care of a holy Her-  
sens" the Pope likes to praise so much, not without adding that it  
should be

-also remain in practice", died in Jul 411, Marcian ann a6.

Januar 417 - LeOfl Bcten for long life for the majesty remained  
unheard of.

The powerful magister lilitum Flavius Ardabur Aspar, an  
Arian "heretic", son of a Goth and a high Alanian, was  
supposedly offered the imperial dignity. But Aspar, of  
424 bls 4zi Roman general, but not a partisan of Orthodoxy,  
refused (or was refused). Thus, after man-  
chen with his help, on y. February, one of his officers received  
the purple, Leo I. 1457\*474). whose unfounded mistrust was  
finally overcome by A8par ztim, who had proven himself in the  
service of three Kai8ers.

fell victim. Leo, a strict Catholic - who paid great attention to the  
sanctification of holidays, especially venerated St. Daniel the Pillar  
and was nicknamed by the church

-the Great has come -. 47\* in the imperial palace Aspar  
and his son Patricius, whom he, Leo himself, had elevated to  
Caesar, whereby the ruler's bigoted Catholicism towards his Arian  
and anti-Chalcedonian-minded victim also played a role."

When the Monophysite op- position became increasingly strong  
after the death of Emperor Marcian (bly), Pope Leo emphasized  
the binding nature of the Decree of Faith of Chalke- don more  
and more; he wanted to prevent "any new negotiation" of what  
had been decided by the inspiration of God, or, as he put it, "any  
new negotiation".

wrote another time, -which so eminent an authority (tanta auctoritas) determined by the Holy Spirit". Thus Leo not only declined an invitation to Constantinople, but also instructed his legates to meet in Constantinople after the presentation of his doctrinal letter of ry. Aug. 4i (an Arr supplement to the doctrinal letter to Flavian, therefore later called Toinus II) not to get involved in any discussion."

But the Roman tirelessly pushed on against the "heretical perversity" of so many in the East, especially in Constantinople, Antioch and Egypt. Everywhere he wanted to enforce, as he wrote to Bishop Julian, what had been decreed in Chalcedon "under the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the salvation of the whole world". For the sake of this "salvation", he turned to bishops and presbyters,

Deacons, he sent envoys to the court, such as the bishops Domitianus and Geminianus on >7 Augii- 458, and repeatedly wrote to the new emperor Leo, about whose

virtues, the Roman state and the Christian religion can rejoice. But, as always, when the Church emphatically strives for "salvation" for itself, only disaster for others could and must result. After all, Pope Leo urgently called on the imperial filius ecclesiae to take appropriate action to restore "Christiana libertas", which, if possible, always meant: bondage for all others. He implores the emperor after all,

-that he, mindful of the common faith ... thwarts all heretical machinations", incites him again and again to resist the murderous hands of GotrJoser Leufe, who

-The -great wickedness-, the -wickedness of the heretics-, urges that -the perpetrators- be punished. He demands the purge of the clergy, demands that the prince -triumph over the enemies of the Church; for if it is glorious for you to destroy the weapons of opposing peoples (!), how great will be your glory when you free the Alexandrian Church from its raging tyrant!" You can see here, as always, what the popes are concerned with: the destruction of the changing enemies of the empire and the annihilation of all internal opponents. -Recognize, venerable emperor ... what help you owe your mother church

dest, who boasts of you as her son in a special way." Leo "the Great" wanted weapons and violence to be used, but no council, no religious discussion. He detested disputes in general, especially in matters of faith. He also repeatedly emphasized to the emperor that any possibility of negotiation had to be ruled out - and yet at the same time he asserted:

- "We are not vengeful, but we cannot associate with the servants of the devil."

In addition to radical intolerance, there is also, as usual, the euphemism. Leo's last sentence is fatally reminiscent of the one quoted and commented on earlier by St. Jerome: -We too desire peace, and we not only desire it, we demand it, but the peace of Christ, the true peace ( - \*441 The same attitude, the same hypocrisy.

Leo's letters to the East are pure diatribes wrapped in pious phrases. They always revolve around one and the same theme, they always urge the subjugation, elimination and destruction of the opponent, who is repeatedly insulted as godless, wicked, satanic, criminal, who is clumsily exaggerated. Only the Antichrist and the devil", euggeriert the Pope Emperor Leo I on i. December yy7, would the -impregnable-

bare fortress. Only those who - in their hearts

Malice will not allow itself to be instructed, those who -under the appearance of zeal for the soul- sow their lies and pretend that it is the fruit of their search for truth". Unbridled rage and blind hatred have concocted deeds that can only be called contemptible and disgusting - but ... The Lord God has made your majesty so rich in enlightenment about his mysteries. Therefore you must never forget: The imperial power is conferred upon you not only for the government of the world, but above all [!] for the protection of the Church (sed maxime ad Ecclesiae praesidium) ... Now then, it would be a great thing for you if, in addition to your imperial diadem, you were also to receive the crown of faith from the Lord's hand, if you could celebrate a triumph over the enemies of the Church!"

They are, after all, Christians, priests, whose destruction of the

Pope demands of the emperor, Christians, priests, whom he despises, abhors, whom he accuses of lying, of hatred, of licentious good, whom he calls "Antichrist" and -Teiifel- - a language that has been rampant in the "best", the leading Christian circles since the beginning (1 ch. 3).

Many apologists who devalue studies by critical researchers such as Erich Caspar, and even more so the works of Eduard Schwartz, Johannes Haller and many others, as "incriminating" due to their "exclusively political view", have the greatest difficulty in making the main motive of the popes appear not as political, but, of course, as Fritz Hofmann, for example, as "*genuinely religious*" - and yet they themselves have to "emphasize" that the

-The battle for Chalcedon, more than half a century the  
-the center of all papal endeavors-, to be -far away on the  
*political level.*"

But what is happening on the pofitish'rn level is also largely political, mainly political, basically even just *political* - a single struggle for power: power within one's own church: power within competing churches and for power over all others. History proves this! Religion is merely a pretext. It is only a means to an end. The fact that many and especially well-intentioned, gullible

- The fact that Christians who are not well informed see, feel and experience this quite differently does not change the facts, the reality. It is true that these Christians, the "religious forces" in particular, are part of this reality, indeed, as its basis, its prerequisite, they make it possible in the first place. But all this remains "private" - and what unscrupulously and cynically makes use of it, abuses it terribly throughout life (sometimes with the excuse of self-deception - the people have mercy on me -) makes history, world history: criminal history.

## BATTLES OF FAITH BETWEEN CHRISTIANS

The Christological controversy, the struggle between Chalcedonians and Monophysites, raged through the east of the Roman Empire with almost unimaginable intensity. The second half of the 5th century and the entire 6th century were filled with it. The disputes, depositions, banishments, riots, intrigues, murder and manslaughter never ceased. One side of Christendom always sought to reject the Formula of Chalcedon, the other to enforce it. Fiercely at odds with each other, the Monophysites were united in their opposition to the

-cursed- synod, against Chalcedon and Rome. The acts of violence, persecutions and martyrdoms that were constantly demanded by orthodoxy and often carried out by the government only increased confessional resistance. And the compromises sought by some emperors, their occasional concessions, concessions, concessions, all of this failed mainly due to the recalcitrance of Catholicism. Of course, as is usually the case, it was much more about the Christian palaver, the dogma of the 'two natures' than about influence, ambition, money and power, about nationalism, not least that of the Egyptians or Syrians. For despite all the inflamed delusions of faith, there was a certain "national" struggle for independence among the Orientals. Behind it and closely linked to it was the social contrast between the natives, the Syrian Seniites, for example, or the indigenous fellahs of the Nile, the Copts, and the thin, more or less educated Greek upper class, the rich Greek landlords, who, supported by imperial officials, police, officers and clergy, professed allegiance to the official imperial church. And from this ruling class, from the foreign oppressors who were ruthlessly fleecing them, the locals sought protection from the monks, the bishops of the country, whom they admired effusively and who naturally abused them in their own way."

But the focus was on the spectacle of faith!

Especially in Alexandria, the center of the opposition, the opponents of Chalcedon rose up. And if Pope Leo §54 spoke of the "darkness that nests in Egypt", this darkness became even denser."

The Alexandrian patriarch Dioscorus I, deposed in Chalcedon as a supporter of Eutyches, had been succeeded by the council-loyal Catholic Proterios ('s- 4i ) (through whom Leo admittedly suffered a defeat in the question of the Easter date dispute, which Rome only accepted with grimness). And soon after the death of Marcian on aö.

January '57 Proterios was opposed by the monophysite monk-priest Timotheo- (4ivq6o), surnamed Ailuros (-Wiesel"), a loyal follower of Dioscorus, dflß 8ifl IÖ.

March was canonically consecrated by two bishops. For years he is said to have stirred up the monks of Alexandria against Proterios, even appearing at night as an angel in front of the cells of the Anachoretas with the admonition to avoid Proterios and to elect Timotheos (himself) as bishop, Falls the story, which has been handed down several times, is true, it shows what these monks, if it is false, could be expected to do to the world - which, of course, can apparently be expected to do anything at any time. Timotheos Ailuros was immediately arrested by the imperial governor, the chased away Proterios was brought back to Alexandria with the military, but already on z8. March 4s7 From a frenzied mob of Christians during the God-service (on Maundy Thursday or Good Friday) in the church of Quirinus was murdered. His body was desecrated, torn into strips and burned - he himself was a saint of the Roman Church (feast: February 8).

Afterwards, Archbishop Timotheos Ailuros - Leo I. calls him a "wicked murderer" (parrieida), at any rate he was the beneficiary of the murder - the Egyptian episcopate of opponents. All bishops who resisted were deprived of their chairs. At a synod in Alexandria, he hurled the ban against the pope and the patriarchs of Coristan Tinople and Antioch - apparently as revenge for the fall of Dioscorus, the rise of Constantinople and probably also for the Ignoria.



But after the introduction of Cyrillic Christology in Chalcedon 4, Emperor Leo had the Alexandrian removed - with ever greater and more intense pressure from the Pope, who flooded the Orient with mail and implored the ruler not only to be the ruler of the world, but also the protector of the Church.

Timotheos Ailuros was banished, first to Paphlago-ria, then to the Crimea. The Alexandrian throne, however, was ascended by Timotheos Salopha-kiolos ("wobbly hat"), who was raised by only ten bishops - a -new David in gentleness and patience- (see David: I 8y fj."

Leo sent letters of congratulations and reminders to Egypt in August 40 - the last mail he received. He was delighted to congratulate the newly appointed "wobbly hat", praised the Emperor Leo because of the expulsion of the predecessor, the -wicked patricide- - and died in the fall of the next year on io. November ^

Leo I, the first outstanding papal figure in history, an equally skilful pragmatist and doctrinaire, the perfect blend of both, nevertheless resembles in his behaviour, as Haller aptly recognized, less a lion than a fox. He could be so shamelessly submissive to the Emperor Leo I as if he were the banner-bearer of the Caesaropapism (p. ayq f). And he could, as it seemed opportune, resolutely show off his master even to higher lords. A diplomat through and through, he could advance and retreat, hump and kick and build himself up like nothing else in the world. Above all, however, he could coerce his own clergy. He could excoriate veritable saints and deny the priesthood to "shabby" slaves. He could demand humility and obedience from his flock and claim authority over everyone in the church, the highest rank, the highest honor - while also demanding modesty. Above all, however, he could relentlessly persecute and prosecute everything that was not Catholic, through incarceration, banishment, physical destruction - while he proclaimed love of neighbor and enemy, complete forgiveness, every renunciation of revenge. He repeatedly stretched the

He was the first emperor to intercede on their behalf, without allowing himself to be drawn in by them, without caring about the collapsing empire of the West, whose impotence he rather used for his own purposes, whose last power he played off against the East in order to profit in this way, albeit with less and less success in his later years. However, Leo's decisions continued to shape ecclesiastical law for centuries. And his authority was such that his letters became a favorite object of Christian forgers. ^

### ÜAPST HILARUS, EMPEROR ANTHEMIUS AND CHRISTIAN UBER-REGENTS-Gnovxsm

Leo I. was followed on xq. November the sarde Hilar-\* i4\*I\*4 \*) --not by merit, but by divine grace--, that Deacon of the Roman Church, who once left the -synod of robbers- so hastily that he had founded a chapel in Rome in gratitude for his salvation (p. xc3).

His experience of the East left a deep impression on Hilarus. Almost from

Finally, he wrote to Western addressees, especially to Spanish and Gallic bishops. In contrast, there is not a single letter from his seven-year pontificate about the Christological problems of Chalcedon, indeed, apart from a tiny fragment, *none* at all to the Orient! The turbulent conditions in southern Gaul, Germanic conquests there, the usurpation of the episcopate of Narbonne by Hermes, its partial disenfranchisement, the continuing rivalry between Arles and Vienne, certain turmoil in Spain too, all this does not explain enough; especially since the pope also had time to persecute the "Macedonians" (favored by Emperor Afithemiiiis) in Rome, but above all to indulge in a lavish passion for building, to further decorate the Lateran and, after the Vandal plundering, to pompously decorate other "houses of worship", St. Peter's, St. Paul's, St. Peter's and St. Paul's. Peter, St. Paul, S. Lorenzo. The Roman church was already the richest of the

The church of Constantinople and Alexandria were the most beautiful churches in the entire Christian world. While the city became more and more run down, dilapidated, the basilicas sparkled in fairy-tale splendor: baptismal fountains with silver deer, confessions with arches of gold, crosses covered in precious stones, altars glittering with preciousness ... But in all the Pope's correspondence: -Niciit a single religious problem ..." (Ullmann)."

In foreign policy, Emperor Leo I, the bigoted Catholic, had already made a tremendous effort several generations before Justinian to destroy the Arian Vandal Empire, whose religion was as odious to the Catholic Romans as its Germanic race and customs.

As there had been no emperor in Weston since the end of q6y, Leo 4 7 appointed Marcian's son-in-law Anthemius as Caesar for the West. Anthemius, already victorious over the Ostrogoths and Huns, invaded Italy with a army, became Augustus there and threatened Geiserich with war through the Eastern Roman Empire in the event of further hostilities against Western Rome. When Geiserich himself declared war, Eastern Rome prepared an army for the huge sum of around 6q 000 pounds of gold and yoo 000 pounds of silver, to which the Byzantine financial difficulties of the following year have been attributed. But the Germanic heretic empire was to disappear from Africa. However, Leo's Vandal war, in which his brother-in-law Basiliskos, the brother of Empress Verina, allegedly commanded zzoo ships and more than ion 000 men in d68, was certainly considerably exaggerated, a complete8 fiasco; although victory was almost in the bag, but at the last moment it succumbed once again to the cunning of old Geiserich, who also cashed in all the conquests made by Ostroni."

Emperor Anthemius I'<7\*47-) was religiously indifferent, if not secretly hostile to Christianity. He made an Old Believer philosopher prefect of the city and turned Pope Hilarus against him. His tolerance towards "pagans and heretics" aroused confidence, and eventually he became the victim of the

West's all-powerful emperor Rikimer (p. 3i J), who believed his position of power to be under threat. Rikimer raised '7\* the senator Flavius Anicius Olybrius (the husband of Placidia, the daughter of Valentinian III) became Augustus and conquered Rome after a fierce civil war. A mob of Christian gangs of the Arian faith rolled through the city on rt. July, robbing and murdering their way through the city, which was plagued by famine and plague. According to an old report, but again the sources are not consistent, only the Vatican area, already full of monasteries and churches, and St. Peter's were spared; Anthemius was in any case smashed to pieces during a street fight in the church of St. Chrysogonus. But the very next month, in mid-August, Rikimer himself died (and was buried in the church of St. Agata in Subura, which he had built or renovated). Only a few weeks later, Olybrius followed him, both victims of the plague."

Since Emperor Leo Anfafl8 also died in Constantinople in 474, further interference in the West, where there had previously been a loyal break with Geiserich, was not possible. In the East, however, the religious riot shook the empire to such an extent that the

both subsequent rulers more or less accommodated the Monophysites - with stage-ready political grotesqueries.

Leo I had appointed '7i \*- 'nCIt's **grandson**, Zenon's son, as his co-ruler and successor. After **Leo's** death on x8. January In February 474, Zenon (actually: Tarasis Kodissa, 474-s7s and 47 49s), an Isaurian chieftain who had been arrested by the people, was elevated to the office of Augustus and co-ruler in 474.

first emperor was crowned by the patriarch. However, his young son Leo 'II did not live to see the end of the year. Now the empress's widow Vqrina sought to procure the purple for her lover and therefore faked a palace revolution for Zenon. Head over heels, but with the state treasury, the emperor escaped in January

475 ' - his home of robbers, while the people of the capital city slaughtered the Isaurians. However, it was not Verina's lover who ascended the throne - for eighteen months - but her brother

BasiliskoS 147i 47s, the miserable loser of the Vandal War, perhaps, as has been assumed, of Germanic origin.

Origin. He sent against Zenon his relative, another Isaurian robber chief, Illos, an Orthodox Christian, whom he bribed with great promises. But instead of eliminating Zenon, Illos, who had already worked for him earlier, went over to him again and, in addition to the patriarchs, worked for him again.

Akakios, for Zeno's comeback. At the end of Aug. 47, the latter regained power, not through war - he was already in control before Basilisko's army commander (because he had declared his love for the king).

the empress's husband, a well-known gallant) - but through gifts and promises. And he retained this power despite his unpopularity with the people and in senatorial circles, despite incessant civil wars, while he had the usurper Basiliscoc and his **wife** and son bese0 ved and his countrymen who had returned with him did worse than before.\*.

The political turmoil, however, exacerbated and complicated the religious turmoil.

Emperor Basiliskos, who died of starvation with his family in a dry cistern in Asia Minor, had sought to shore up his rule after the rebellion against Zenon with a strict monophysite policy. Under the influence of the Alexandrian patriarch Timotheos Ailuros, who had returned after sixteen years of exile, he simply revoked the decrees of Chalcedon and the Tomus of Leo and banned them because they had caused discord and division. He threatened all those who would not sign the new decree, the so-called Enkyklion (preserved in two different versions), with the application of the -heretical- laws of Constantine and Theodosius II - and more than half a thousand bishops immediately signed this "heretical- glati- bensbekenmmis! It was the first "decree of faith" issued by an emperor without a synod! Most of these bishops had previously, **under** Emperor Leo I, p r o f e s s e d the Chalcedonense, i.e. the opposite Sinn . . ."

Theologians are never embarrassed; they know no shame.

Tiniotheos Ailuros triumphed, he was now enthusiastically received again in Alexandria after a long exile, although he admittedly took a different direction. And in Antioch, a new source of unrest after Alexandria and Jerusalem, Petrus Fullo (Petrus Gnaphcus, "the Walker"), a Monophysite monk, came to the episcopal throne; he too, incidentally, for the second time. He had already ousted the Catholic patriarch Martyrios (547-) there once before, Emperor Leo but still<sup>475</sup> deposed, arrested, deported to Egypt and Finally, he was sent to the super-Orthodox monastery of Akoimetes near Constantinople. But Peter Fullo, to look ahead only briefly, succeeded in returning to the coveted see of Antioch, once a stronghold of Orthodoxy, a third time, from 85 to 108, and now even died as patriarch - but not without first ousting John of Apamea, whom he himself had appointed as bishop, and then quickly removing his successor, the Chalcedonian Stephanos II(477\*479). , who fell in a street fight and was then replaced by his successor. whose successor Stephanos III died after a few years and finally his successor Kalandion had been expelled. <sup>13</sup>

-The Old Church has become fashionable-, cheers Frits van der Meer today, "because people are once again aware that water is at its loudest near the source."

## **PAPST SIMPLICIUS HOSTS THRONRÄUBEN Basirixos AND EMPEROR ZENON**

In Rome, Hilarus had now been succeeded by Simplicius (483-493). And the new pope, who once again made Oriental policy the main focus of his office, did not flatter the usurper less submissive than a legal ruler', i.e. he behaved like countless other popes in such cases.

-Seven when I look at the reverence with which I have always

I humbly look up to the Christian emperor", he began an agitational homage on io. **Jart** - 47\*. -I cherish the desire to live up to this feeling that binds me in unbroken to express his correspondence with you." Simplicius spoke of his -submissive-, his -devout reverence for Your Majesty-, his duty -to greet you, glorious and most gracious son and exalted emperor, in an appropriate manner-. Then, however, he condemned -the robberies of the false teachers- in the eighth, especially the -bishop murderer Timothy-, for he had -blown up the fire of the former frenzy anew-, -gathered together a bunch of degenerate people- -all Christians after all! - and seized anew the church of Alexandria, which he had previously defiled with episcopal blood, and we hear that the man of blood had also driven out the current rightful bishop ...

My spirit, venerable Emperor, shudders when I consider all the crimes committed by this 'gladiator'. But even more, I confess it openly, I was horrified that all this could happen, so to speak, under Your Majesty's eyes. Who does not know, or who doubts" - and now he stroked the usurper's barr again, quite eagerly - "who does not know?

-Your Majesty's sincerely pious mind and your devotion to the right of the true faith? Has the heavenly providence of Providence so directed that you have grown up for the salvation of the state by the example of the virtues of the two emperors Marcian and Leo, that you have been led by them to an intimate sympathy with the Catholic truth, so that no one dares to doubt that you follow in fidelity to the faith those whose successors you are in the imperial dignity? And after explaining to Basiliskos, of course, that -among all the affairs of the realm, the pious ruler must above all take care of that which protects his rule-, that therefore -all other things must be preceded by the proper fulfillment of duties towards heaven-, -without which nothing can rightly endure-, he implored him -insistently with the voice of the blessed Apostle Peter (beati Petri apostoli voce), from which Arr also



Whatever I may be as minister of my see, do not let the enemies of the old faith do their work with impunity if you want your own churches to remain subject to you ... Do not tolerate that the faith' our only hope of salvation ... be violated in any way if you want God to have mercy on you and your state".\*-

The ruler therefore once again had to protect the true Catholic faith and remove Ailuros, who was not only a murderer, but was lower than Cain, an -antichri- **stus-** and -divini culminis usurpator", while the imperial usurper could also be celebrated by the pope as -christianissimus princeps-. The Enkykليون, which made monophysitism the imperial creed but immediately met with the determined resistance of the patriarch conspiring with Zenon

of Constantinople, Akakios (14s 4 s), a towering politician who increasingly became the focus of Roman attacks, was formally withdrawn by an antienkykليون. In doing so, Akakios, who was probably the first

Bishop of the capital with the title -ecumenical patriarch- (universalis patriarcha), also coolly ignored the *referre ad sedem apostolicam*, certainly more than the preservation of the

-He had the "right" faith in mind, namely the maintenance of his claim to patriarchy, the sovereignty of his throne, the validity of the canon 28. For this reason, he even had the Stylite Daniel in Anaplous near Constanrinorejri, who was frerietically revered by the masses, subjugated by *sciner Saulc iierbitreii* and sent *with a huge* crowd against Basiliskos, who was escaping to his palace outside the city - a cleverly arranged demonstration, as successful for the patriarch as it was embarrassing for the emperor. -The enemy of the holy church was forced to his knees, the Vita S. Danielis Stylitae rejoiced. However, Basiliskos feared Zenon more, who was already striking back in the mountains of Isauria with military superiority. Thus, after a few months, Basiliscus revoked the decree of faith (in a certain healthy form that betrayed his reluctance) and, in a new decree, unceremoniously confessed the opposite:

-that the apostolic and orthodox faith ... alone shall remain unchallenged and unshaken and shall reign forever in all Catholic and apostolic churches of the orthodox ...- But the usurper, however unpopular, was not recognized.

non among the people, Endg **AUGU\*** 47s was swept away. It was seen more as a punishment from heaven than as a success of the returning

the emperor, where crowds of prelates soon flocked to pay homage to him. -After this turn by the hand of the Most High, Pope Siniplicius immediately rejoiced and repeatedly demanded the deposition and banishment of his opponents in the East, Paul of Ephesus, Peter Fullo, Timotheos Ailuros and many others, demanded that he now, with God's help, vemeibe the "tyrants of the Church", demanded -an exile without return- (ad inremeabile ... exilium). Immediately the pope adjusted himself completely to the new situation. He pretended - a clumsy clerical bluff that continued through the centuries into the post-Nazi period - that he had never contacted the exiled Basilis kos (first his -glorious and most gracious son and illustrious kaiser-, the -christianissimus princeps-, then the -tyrant-; for successor Felix III: the -heretic tyrant-!) He acted as if he had not courted the latter's favor in the same way as he was now courting Zeno's. As if he had not reminded Basiliscus of his great role models Marcian and Leo 1, just as he now reminded Zeno of them! The papal epistle is *characterized* as it were by unctuous submissiveness, submissive flattery and iii'eisily effusive praise for the Kaiiet- {Ullmann}.

Zenon had initially inspired the Romans with an orthodox faith. The king was extremely pleased with Timotheos Ailuros, and at his insistence ordered his banishment, which, however, prevented his death on 3z. J- ' 477. just as he was to be taken away; it was said that he had poisoned himself. His monophysite archdeacon and successor Petros III Mongos was only able to remain in the patriarchal see for 36 days. It was then seized by a monk opposition to the Catholic Salophakiolos curück, which led to bloody battles in the city and Petros Mongos was sentenced to deportaÜon, but,

was unseizable, *uncrgct*. Alexsndria now had two patriarchs - one who was seen but not respected, and one who was respected but not seen.

Zenon, however, who had regained power in Constantinople with the help of Orthodoxy and Akakios, was understandably more interested in his seat of power than in Rome or even its servile bishop and soon decreed clearly enough: -the Church of Constantinople is the mother of our own piety and of all orthodox Christians, and this most holy see of our city shall rightfully have for all time all privileges and honours with regard to the ordination rights of bishops and precedence over all others, as they were recognized before our accession to power". At the same time, Zenon sought to mediate between the two contending ecclesiastical parties by issuing a 'union decree' in the form of a letter to the Christians of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya and the Pentapolis, a formal edict of faith."

**Dxs HENOTIKON - A RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT, FIGHTED  
BY ROM, DIVIDES RICH AND  
CHRISTENESS I'4OCH LOWER**

The Henotikon (the -unification- formula: a term originating from the vulgar language, which the noble papacy never called by name, even later) was the masterful work of Patriarch Akakios and his friend Perros Mongos, a typical expression of the imperial church idea, an attempt at reconciliation between Catholics and Monophysites, which soon divided them even more deeply. The Henotikon wanted to reconcile Monophysites and Diophysites in the interest of imperial unity, the prerequisite for which was the unity of faith, but above all to pacify Egypt and Syria in terms of religious policy and to consolidate the state as a whole, all the more necessary as the emperor was equally beset by Ost\$otes and rebellious generals such as Illos.

The Henotikon was not formally heretical. It interpreted the findings of the Councils of NiCA8& (3ay) and Constantinople 13 -). It retained the unity of Jesus and his essential equality with the "Father", as well as the keyword "God's eternity", Cyril's Christology of the "Twelve Anathematisms", the condemnation of both the -etznr- Eutyches and the -Heretics- Nestorios - Zeno had the Nestorian school of EdeG\*\* 4 9 completely destroyed. In contrast, the Henotikon ignored many controversies. It avoided all kinds of dogmatic complications.

certain formulations of Chalcedon, whose saniingen it ignored, especially the precarious, indeed, dangerous terms.

-person- and "nature-. Thus, disregarding the actually controversial point (one or two natures: Christ was said to be - one, and not two-), Emperor Zeno, a devout Christian, wanted to win the Monophysites over to the imperial church, unite the quarrelling clergy on a middle line and thus secure a unified cult and religious peace for the empire. -Whoever thinks or thought otherwise, then, now or ever, be it in Chalcedon or elsewhere at a synod, we say anathema!" Another emperor, Theodosius I, had been just as radical, indeed even more resolute, a century earlier, on z8. February j8o the orthodox faith (I Jiq f)."

However, just like the bloody oppressions, the peaceful attempt at reconciliation did not bring unity. The He-notikon satisfied neither the Orthodox nor the Monophysites. The individual bishops acted as they saw fit, writes Euagrius of Antioch (incidentally: the one of all ancient church historians who had the highest state titles). The Christian opponents no longer held communion with each other. Hence there were many divisions in East and West and Africa ... The situation became even more absurd. For even the Oriental bishops held no communion among themselves. Even in the East, where the henotikon was held by the mono- physite patriarchs of Alexandria, Petros Mongos, the "Stammler", Timotheos' most important follower, and Antio-

chiens, Petrus Fiillo, also by Martyriuc of Jerusalem and other prelates, at least four sharply rival Christian main groups: one for Chalcedon without Henotikon; one for Chalcedon and Henotikon; one against Chalcedon and for Henotikori; one against Chalcedon and Henotikon. Yes, there were always new divisions, the Severians, J lianisten, Agnoeten, Aktisteteten, Ktistolaträ, Tritheiten, Damianisten, Cononites, Niobites et cetera, who all spread more or less or completely contrary teachings about the nature of Christ and the resurrection of the human body. Not even all the Monophysites accepted the Henotikon, as did the extremist Acephaloi.

Nevertheless, the Edictum Zenonis, as it was originally called, would probably have gradually pacified the bitter church struggle in the East, had it not been fomented from the outside by the Bishop of Rome. The Henotikon, a purely imperial declaration of faith, had been ignored, not even asked. Moreover, his fiercest rival, Patriarch Akakios of Constantinople, who from the outset sought a middle line, a certain balance between Chalcedonians and Monophysites, supported and even led the efforts of the governments to mediate. At the same time, the papacy fundamentally rejected any kind of compromise solution in dogmatic matters and, as always, remained true to its principles. And finally, Rome adhered to the decisions of Chalcedon all the more because the *Roman Church had been allowed to have a say in them, for the first time ever at one of the great imperial synods. -All previous decisions had been made solely by bishops and theologians of the Eastern churches (Dannenbauer)."*

Thus, quite unlike his predecessor Hilarus, Pope Simplicius took up the tradition of Leo I again - albeit much more clumsily. But no mediation, especially not if it was at the expense of his universal claim.

He constantly called on the Orient to fight "heretics", whereby he Akakios, an eminently political head far superior to his own,

The emperor, for his part, was hardly taken very seriously by either of them and was often ignored. Again and again he urged Akakios to obtain from the ruler the banishment of the "Hiretics" to an inaccessible exile, to have them excluded from human association by a special imperial decree, to isolate them as if they were suffering from an infectious disease, which is almost reminiscent of ostracism and banishment, to take them out of their hiding place and put them in a distant country, even Petros Mongos, "the journeyman and prince of the heretics", who had gone into hiding. Any flare-up of heresy must be made impossible. There must be no peace. The patriarch should constantly ask the monarch, whether convenient or not, to use state power to protect Catholicism,<sup>13</sup>

The imperial -heretical- dispute seemed too weak to Simplicius. He also disliked the fact that Zenon's court patriarch had ordained the patriarch of Antioch, who was independent of Constantinople, which he saw as an undue increase in the power of Akakios. And when even in Alexandria the recently appointed Timo-theos Salophakiolos died in February 482, the Catholics elected the monk Johannes Talaja, but the emperor and Akakios enthroned the old friend of Timo-theos Ailuros, the schismatic bishop Petros Mongos, instead of the perjured traitor, the bishop who had been expelled from the Catholic Church.

-socius haereticorum", as Pope Simplicius wrote to Akakios, the propagator of militant "heresies", as he wrote to the emperor (neither replied: -nullum responsiim-, as successor Felix registered with great astonishment), the dispute with Rome broke out openly."

## THE AmxIAN SCHISMA BEGINS - AND CHURCH HocHvsRRAT

The bishops of the East were united with those of the West, especially the Roman bishops, in one interest which, of course, divided them the most: power politics, which is always also and above all personal politics. The Catholic Handbook of Church History quite rightly states that the inextricable confusion of the Eastern Church could not be solved with formulas, because it did not arise from formulas, but because it was necessary to deal with personalities (Beck). But that means: with personal, power-political interests, which had long since and increasingly overlapped with those of the "big politics, which only made the opposing views all the more tricky."<sup>10</sup>

Emperor Zenon had deposed Petros Mongos when he was still pursuing orthodox church policy, but had not ordered his banishment despite repeated efforts by the pope. )nce he was concerned with mediation, reconciliation and winning over his Monophysite subjects, he was able to use Petros again and, after the death of Salophakiolos in the Febftl\*\*4 - again. Indeed, it was precisely that common form of unification, the Henotikon, which the emperor used to settle the clerical dispute and ensure the unity of the Oriental Church under his rule.

The leadership that Petros Mongos (c88a to 490), a brash, ambitious man, sought to achieve was developed together with the patriarch Akakios."

The pope's candidate, however, was John I Talaja. Because of his connection with the Isaurian Illos, he had once had to swear an oath to the emperor before the patriarch and the senate that he would never become a bishop. After the death of Timotheos Salophakiolos, however, ]ohannes Talaja had himself immediately ordained as his successor in Alexandria, breaking his oath. Outraged, Zenon deposed him and Petros Mongos took his place. And while Talaja's monks accepted the new patriarch, who was a Monophysite, the Henotikon

branded as "heretics", Talaja himself turned to the imperial general Illos, who had long been influential at court, when he was timing his plans for an uprising against the emperor. The military man had already joined forces with the Catholic patriarch Calanedion in Antioch against Zenon and also sought contact with Odoacer, the Germanic ruler in Italy, with whom Pope Simplicius was already negotiating. Talaiah therefore fled via Antioch, where Illos was staying, to whom he had already made "rich gifts" as administrator of the Alexandrian kirehe {Bacht SJ). And from Illos he fled q83 to the Pope, to whom he had appealed, advised by Illos and the Patriarch of Antioch. Shortly before his arrival, Pope Simplicius died after a long illness (March io. q83), but his successor, Felix, who had evidently been elected under pressure from Odoaker, now attacked the emperor fiercely. And this happened at the same time as Illos rebelled against him in Asia, sided with by the Patriarch of Antioch, who was an ally of John Talaiah and the

Pope Felix II - (4\*3-'s-) - he is called the third, although Felix II was the antipope. was the first pope to come from the Roman aristocracy. He was also the first pope to begin his office after the

St. Felix was the son of St. Gregory I. He was the son of a priest himself and (presumably) the great-grandfather of St. Gregory I. (probably the great-grandfather of Pope Gregory I). Married before his clerical career, St. Felix had a number of children, was himself the son of a priest and (presumably) the great-grandfather of Pope Gregory I (the Great).

**ßen»).**<sup>43</sup>

After John Talaiah's intervention, the new Roman prince protested. In everything he did, he was decidedly more forceful than his somewhat weak and servile predecessor. Although unversed in curial affairs, he had a well-functioning chancery, headed by Gelasius, who later became pope.

As late as 4 3 Felix sent an envoy, Bishops Vitalis of Troenro and Misenus of Cumae, to Byzantium and, without directly attacking the Henotikon, presented Emperor Zenon with the con-



zil of Chalcedon as the "right middle road", while Zeno, of course, saw the right middle way in the Henotikon. In a further letter - a sophisticated mixture of arrogance, barely concealed bitterness and appropriate biblical priory - Felix also demanded in vain that Akakios -honestly- answer to St. Peter and his synod in Rome. Akakios, who energetically expanded his position of power, did not think about it. In terms of imperial canon law, he was roughly equal in rank to the Roman, but as "Pope of the East" he did not feel equal to him, but considerably superior. In fact, the Roman bishops were, despite increasingly frenzied polemics, struggles over principles and pretensions, legally, factually and in some respects spiritually quite powerless, almost a quantité négligeable, at least compared to the rulers of Constantinople. Thus Akakios had the Roman legates, the bishops Vitalis and Misenus, imprisoned and bribed as soon as they went ashore at Abydos, whereupon they fell down ignominiously and even attended a mass celebrated by the patriarch in Constantinople. But the pope lic4 Akakios, -who imprisoned me in mine-, on z8. July 8¢ by a Roman synod, excommunicate and irrevocably curse him, as well as every bishop, cleric, monk or layman who consorted with him - the first great schism between East and West. -God had expelled Akakios from the office of bishop, Felix declared in his solemn exhortation, by a decree from heaven.

-Know that you are of the episcopal dignity as of the catholic dignity.

The Holy Spirit's judgment and our apostolic authority will *make it impossible for you to be* excluded from the community and the number of believers, and never again to be released from the bonds of anathema.

The defensor Tutus brought the Roman synod's decree of deposition, signed by the pope and the bishops in attendance, to Constantinople. (According to a dubious version, monks from the opposition, the Akoimeten monastery loyal to Rome, pinned the bull of excommunication to the archiepiscopal pallium during the Sunday service, whereupon those around him were banned.

bang, which was partly crushed and partly encased). The Defensor ecclesiae Tutus, however, was put under pressure and was fired by the Pope, as were the Legates Vitalis and Miseries. They had communicated with Akakios in solemn mass and also recognized the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Petros Mongos. It was not until eleven years later that Pope Gelasius I accepted the misenus again, as one could not risk letting the penitent die of old age or illness without face with the Church. The other Lcgat, VitaJis, had already died . . ."

St. Felix III wrote to the emperor at that time, already at the beginning fearing very much for the salvation of the ruler and at the end again invoking "God's judgment seat", in a hitherto unheard of tone, just as urgently sharp as cuttingly cold, quite obviously going back to the chancellor Gelasius, that the emperor had to subordinate (subdere) his will to the bishops of Christ in God's affairs, that he was to learn from them, not to teach them, that he was not to play the Lord, but rather to follow the Church, since God wanted Your Majesty to bend the neck of this Church in pious devotion - the papal claim to power of the coming years, a phrase that recurs in many ecclesiastical law collections. Neither the regent, to whom the loyalty of Egypt and Syxia was important, nor Patriarch Akakios, who called the pope's name "Sthlange", -The Roman Synod of y. October \*as a result of which the Roman Synod of y. October \*as a result of which the Roman Synod of y. October \*as a result of which the Roman Synod of y. October \*as a result of which the Roman Synod of y. October \*as a result of which the Roman Synod of y. October \*as a result of which the Roman Synod of y. October \*as a result of which the Roman Synod of y. October \*that hunted for it

-our pearls are cast before swine and dogs ... The Satan is overwhelmed and yet he continues to work. The Pope had now excommunicated all three patriarchs, citing a customary law that had allegedly long been practiced in Italy. The 35-year shiSlita (4u-s.s' - i- see Rome and Constantiriopel was the folge.^

One mud this hardly believable high driving place in the Zu-

The Roman priesthood, which was gradually becoming more and more insidious, had already allowed itself to do to an emperor when he did not want what it wanted. -One thing is certain," wrote Felix (Gelasius): It is also most salutary for your own jurisdiction if you endeavor to bend (5ubdere) your imperial will under the bishops of Christ in all matters concerning God, as God's law requires, and not to stretch out {prae- ferre) over them. You are not to teach the sacred mysteries, but to learn from their administrators. You are to follow the firmly established claims of the Church, but not to prescribe purely human legal norms to the Church. You must not want to lord over (dominari) the sacred institutions of the Church, for God Himself has willed that Your Majesty should bend the neck of this Church in fio'tim."^.

Rome never denied the orthodoxy of the Henotikon.

Significantly, the papal epistle to the Emperor also any discussion of the monophysite or diophysite **dispute**. For once again, it was not fundamentally about faith, but about prestige and power. Without this competition "between the two popes of Old and New Rome, the 35-year dispute between the churches of the East and West, which began with Felix 111, would probably not have broken out at all" (Haller). It was about Constantinople's claim to leadership. Rome wanted the dispute, brought it about on purpose, by hook or by crook. It acted more arrogantly against the emperor and the patriarch than ever before. Of course, it only afforded itself this courage under the protection of two Germanic heretics - first Odoacer, then Theodoric. Rome rejected all of the emperor's attempts to change him, and even allied itself with troops who rebelled against him\*.

This was done by Illos, who once set out under the usurper Basiliskos to destroy the dethroned Zenon but brought him back to the throne (p. 300). Illos, like Zenon an Isaurian and promoted by him to general, was of course appointed as an advisor at the side of the returned majesty.

st3t as a result of three assassination attempts (4 7. 47® \*\*It d q8I) - he lost an ear in the third assassination attempt, but was able to escape again - was not comforted by his life, even if Zenon denied any involvement, indeed, each time expressed his lively sympathy for those still alive. For a long time they did not dare to fight openly and behaved as if they were -still chiefs of brigands in their native mountains- (Schwartz). Illos grew tired of serving at Zenon's side. He had himself given a command in Syria and through the empress's widow Verina 4 4 had the general Leontius as counter-emperor."

But the Chalcedonian opposition was also in league with Illos. First of all, the opposing bishop John Talaiah in Alexandria, whom Emperor Zenon declared to be a perjured traitor (periurium) and guilty of every shameful deed. Talaiah had established close relations with Illos and later with the exarchs of Egypt, who were conspiring against him, and had finally fled to Rome, where he conspired against the emperor and the pope initiated a break with Constantinople. Shortly thereafter, the deeply Catholic Calanedion, bishop of Antioch, where the counter-emperor Leontius resided, also joined forces with Illos, but after defeating Leontius, whose reign lasted only two months, he was banished as a high priest. Illos had also attempted to involve the Germanic usurper in Italy, King Odoacer, in the conspiracy, albeit in vain, but he was defeated along with his general Caesar, \*\* < \*\*\*B ' \*\* 4 8 was executed. However, Odoacer soon declared his independence from the emperor and joined forces with the Vandals in Africa.

The papacy is now gradually undertaking one oppominist swing of world-historical proportions after another. And while its victims fall by the wayside, it itself becomes ever bigger and stronger. First it turns against Ostrom with the Goths. Then, with Ostrom, it destroys the Goths, the Vandals. Then it stands on the side of the Lombards again against Ostrom. And finally, after gaining "freedom", it fights the Lombards, its liberators, with the Franks. - Only the

We can still follow the first and second acts of this shameless play in this volume.

In the west, where completely disrupted, chaotic but very useful conditions for the popes prevailed, one shadow emperor succeeded another after Valentinian III, a total of nine in two decades. Presumably six of them were murdered, including Majorian in August 4\*<sup>i</sup> on the Ira and, on ti. July s7-. Anthemius in Rome (p. zq8 f). Hanging axe and poison raged. The army commander and -Kaisernia- held the reins.

Rikfmer, who, even more powerful than Stilicho and even Aiiirus, prepared the Germanic kingship in Italy, but as the Arian offspring of a prince of Stieben and a daughter of the test-Goth king Wallia, could not yet hope to rule himself. After the last of the Wcströmian shadowy figures, the child emperor Romulus Augustus, a four-ten-year-old boy, '7\* had been dethroned by the Skyrian Odoacer - whose father Edoco held a prominent position in Attila's army - and had been compensated with a pension, commanded

Odoacer as the first Germanic king of Italy i'76-4s5) over the entire country; the extent to which this was recognized by Ostrom is disputed. Odoacer killed the father of Emperor Romulus, Orestes' former secretary Atticus, and Orestes' brother Paul on z8.

August and on ç. September. DCf 47s Emperor Julius Nepos continued to protest in Dalmatia for another four years until he was murdered in his country house near Salona in May4 8o. The Western Roman Empire had come to an end, had perished, according to Edward Gibbon in his monumental work -Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire", through the -triumph of religion and the Barbarei-.'<sup>o</sup>

## THEODERIC CONQUERS ITALIA OR - O IST GOTT?-

The legal successor to the empire, however, was Eastern Rome. The latent conflict between the western and eastern parts of the empire had constantly intensified over time, and the old papal tactic of playing off the western ruler against the eastern one had failed since the death of Valentinian III. Eastern Rome also prevailed against the Germanic tribes in domestic and foreign policy. Just as Emperor Zenon succeeded in holding on to his throne, which was constantly threatened anew, through the "most unconditional diplomatic fencing game of all time" (Rubin), not least by diverting the Ostrogoths threatening the Eastern Roman Empire to Italy.

The Ostrogoths, i7i subjugated by the invading Huns (cf. 1 Joy ff), had arrived in the Hungarian Danube basin at the beginning of the J century and - after Attila's death (qJ3) and the rapid decline of his seemingly unbeatable

Roman sovereignty. They settled in Pannonia, in the area around Lake Balaton. Theoderic (the Dietrich of Bern of legend) was born here around the middle of the 5th century as the son of King Thiudimer from the House of Amaler and was probably baptized an Arian as a child. However, the sources are almost completely silent about his origins and youth, as well as his first years of rule. At the age of seven, Theoderic was taken hostage to Constantinople, where he remained for eleven years, apparently in the immediate vicinity of Emperor Leo. There he had studied Latin and Greek, learned to appreciate ancient culture and became acquainted with political and military conditions and married an imperial princess.

Theoderic's most dangerous Ostrogothic rival was Theoderich Strabo. For years, Zenon played the two distantly related princes off against each other, but they also turned against the emperor on several occasions. In the coup of the BasiliskoS '7i, Theoderic, the Amalian, took Zenon's side, while Theodericli Strabo, the elder of the two, joined the usurper. 47 of all the honors, but then in all

offices and dignities. But q8i he succumbed to a wound that he had inadvertently inflicted on himself. The two Strabo brothers, who now took over the leadership together with his son Rekitach, were murdered soon afterwards. And q8q Theodoric killed a cousin with his own hand in Constantiriopel, with Zenon's knowledge."

Despite Amaler's high honors - PatfiziUS (476), friend of the emperor, consul (4 41 - there was always friction between him and the regents, including Theodoric's devastating marches through Thrace, because the desolate land on the When Dorian was no longer able to feed his people, Zenon formally commissioned him to make a move against Odoacer, the "ruler of violence" (Procopius)."

Odoacer was a Skyrian or Rugian, in any case a German and an Arian Christian. Raised to king on a3. z\*\*\* 47 \*-fR without ever wearing a purple cloak or diadem, he ruled Italy from the Alps to **Mount Etna** for three years; Geiserich had ceded Sicily to him in 477 in return for a tribute. When later an invasion

Odoaker also threatened the Eastern Empire, where Theodoric devastated Thrace, Illos rebelled and the emperor was thus in distress, he resorted to the time-honored means of eliminating Germanic tribes by inciting the Rugians to invade Italy.

invaded. But Odoacer beat them to it and destroyed their country (in today's Lower Austria on the left bank of the Danube) in two campaigns in 7 and q88, destroying their rule and the majority of their people - a war not only between two Germanic tribes, but also, since the Rugians were also Arian.

between two Christian kings. Zenon, however, reconciled with Theodoric, defeated Illos in ø88, had him beheaded and in the same year sent the Ostrogoth king against Odoacer, whom he had regarded as a usurper, a tyrant, and had only reluctantly tolerated as *his ruler*. Zenon, a "master in the use of political means", as Procopius notes, promised Theodoric that he would be able to tame **the entire** western world for himself and his Goths by defeating Odoacer; for him, who belonged to the Roman senate, it would be more worthy,

to defeat a tyrant and then rule over Rome and Italy than to engage in a dangerous battle with the emperor. Theodoric was delighted with this proposal and set off for Italy, taking the entire Gothic nation with him."

This happened in fall 4 -

Theodoric set out from Moesia with his warriors, their wives and children, but by no means with the whole people, some of whom remained in the Balkans. Instead, groups of other origins took part, perhaps a total of 100,000, perhaps a 200,000 people, but probably far fewer and in any case fewer than Rome had inhabitants at the time. "A whole world," writes a contemporary, Bishop Ennodius of Pavia, "came to them, wagons served them instead of houses, and they gathered everything they could reach into walking tents". Of course, it must be remembered that these Goths were also Christians. Already on the way, they almost completely renounced the Gepids, who were related to them but hostile, also Christians, in Romania, after Theodoric himself took the lead in an extremely critical situation and, according to an old source, raged "like a torrent in the seed fields, like a lion in a herd". Then there was a four-year, bitter war that devastated northern Italy, especially Liguria, and was rich in vicissitudes, apostasy and betrayal on both sides.

Theodoric first defeated Odoacer with a large, also reinforced by other Germanic armies in the summer and fall of 476 at the Isonzo and near Verona, where the Adige had been dammed by the mass of casualties. Afterwards Milan, probably under the influence of the local bishop Laurentius, who had stood by the superior Theodoric since the beginning of the war (and under him probably became the most powerful primate in Italy). The bishop of Ticinum-Pavia, Epiphanius, sought out the Amalians in Milan). On 11 August 476, there was a serious battle on the Adda, in which Theodoric was defeated by a Visigoth army of King Alaric II.



Despite heavy losses, he remained victorious for a third time. As before, the desperate Odoacer retreated to Ravenna, his last base. The Goths surrounded him and for two and a half years besieged the city, which was almost inaccessible due to its lagoon, marshes and earth walls and was one of the strongest, almost impregnable fortresses of the time - the "raven's castle" of legend. The attackers were unable to make any headway, nor could the defenders gain any breathing space by making a break for it. However, since the summer of 472, when the aggressor came into possession of ships in Ariminum, he was also able to blockade Ravenna from the sea. On 27 February 473, Archbishop John of Ravenna brokered a treaty according to which both kings were to share the rule of Italy. On 16 February, the gates of Classe were opened to Theodoric. On 1 March, Archbishop John led him in solemn procession with crosses, flags of smoke and psalm-singing to Ravenna. But a few days later, Theodoric invited Odoacer to his palace at Lauretum, the imperial palace, and, as the assassins he had commissioned hesitated, single-handedly stabbed to death his defenceless, sixty-year-old Greek partner - an Arian Christian the other Arian Christian - in breach of oath. "Where is God?" said Odoacer when the first sword blow hit him in the collarbone area. And Theodoric, when his second blow cleaved Odoacer in half: -This beast has not even a bone in his body-. At the same time, he exterminated Odoacer's family. He shot Odoacer's brother himself in a church with a bow. He first banished his son Theke, then executed him, and sentenced his wife Sunigilda to death by starvation. Moreover, on the orders of the Amalungs, Odoacer's troops and their families were completely murdered in all parts of the country.

Theodoric the Great!

He was now the sole ruler of Italy, albeit under the suzerainty of the Eastern Roman emperor. And this bloodthirsty victor, the successful student of the Christian art of slaughter, who had organized a massacre that vividly recalls the ghastly bloodbath after Constantine's death (337), who as ruler was also

He loved phrases such as "our pious grace" (*pietas*) and "our providence" (*providentia*) and felt himself to be a king by the grace of God. Just as Constantius II, the -first representative of God's grace- (*Secck*), felt and declared himself to be a particularly divinely sent ruler, a "bishop of bishops", despite his comprehensive maesaker of relatives: -Always let us boast in faith ..." Theodoric, the king of Gaul by the grace of God, now said: -With God's graciousi assistance, everything we want is subject to our power". Or: "we rule with God's help". He had Arian churches maintained everywhere, built a church dedicated to St. Martin in Ravenna itself, right next to his residence, and also restored the Basilica HCrculis - and yet, at least at that time (and therefore at all), he was a "robber and murderer", and indeed a "great Sti1s" (*de Ferdinandy*).<sup>6</sup>

The Goths of his time were Födcrians, not Roman citizens. But only Goths could be soldiers. The Romans were not allowed to serve in the army, with the apparent exception of a few warlike tribes in the border region. But like the Catholic Romans, the **Arian** Goths were not deterred from war by their Christianity. On the contrary. They are said to have taken the church's prescriptions very seriously, and Theodoric himself prepared for war through prayer and prayer. His mobilization order for the campaign in Gaul stated: -The Goths must only be told to fight more than they are allowed to do so, because a warlike race takes pleasure (*gau- dium*) in proving itself." (*Atich Gundobad*, the *homme* king of the Burgundians, whose princes were loyal to the bishop of Rome, had taken advantage of the conflict between the feuding Christian Germanic tribes, undertaken a raid into Liguria and carried off many prisoners)."

Immediately after Theodoric's victory, a large part of central and southern Italy, especially the city of Rome, which had already closed its gates to the declining Odoacer, but also Sicily, declared their support for the king, whose Ostrogothic kingdom stretched from Hungary to southern Galicia.

lia and the former Roman provinces north of the Alps, but only lasted sixty years and ys3 was finally destroyed by the battle of Vesuvius (p. 437) The narrower Gothic settlement area included Samnium, Picenum,

Northern Tuscia, the Aemilia, Veneto and above all the land north of the Po. The Goths settled more scattered in Dalmatia, Istria, Savia and Pannonia. In foreign policy, Theoderich gained a leading position through alliances with all Germanic states. He married the sister of the Merovingian Clovis, gave his daughters in marriage to the kings of the Visigoths and Sandals, and his niece to the king of the Thuringians."

#### COLLABORATION WITH DRR "KETZERI SCHEI't" EMPLOYMENT POWER

When the Amalian invaded Italy, there had been a schism between East and West since the Henotikon, i.e. enmity between Constantinople and the Pope. This was entirely in the interests of the Goths, who were naturally more interested in their own influence in Rome than that of the Eastern emperor. In Constantinople itself, the difficulty in coming to terms with Theodoric was in fact blamed on the ecclesiastical schism. Perhaps less out of fundamental tolerance than out of political calculation, the Amalian pursued a pro-Catholic policy. However, the Arian rulers of both the Visigoths and especially the Ostrogoths were generally largely tolerant, without any conversion rage. The Romans were not forced to convert. They themselves were famous for Gothic magnanimity, which of course did not stem from Arianism, but was a Gerinan heritage, as the saying shows: it does no harm to walk between a pagan altar and a church and show your devotion to both. The Arian clergy, who did not live in celibacy up to the level of bishop, nor did they offer a home to monasticism, neither sought to influence their own government nor to

he proselytized among his Catholic neighbors. Nor could anyone accuse the king himself of ever having turned a Catholic into an Arian or persecuted a bishop. His mother Hereleva became a Catholic and was given the name Eusebia. Pope Gelasius had contact with her, but apparently did not want bishops to travel to the royal court without his approval. In Rome, where Theoderic first appeared in the year 500, received by the people, the Senate and, at the head of the priests, the Pope, he first went to the Basilica of St. Peter - three hundred years before Charlemagne - to pray at the (alleged) tomb of the apostles "with great devotion and like a Catholic" and to present St. Peter with two silver candelabra weighing seventy pounds. He was also tolerant towards the Jews, as Odoacer apparently was. -For the sake of civilization, he said, "the benefits of justice should not be withheld even from those who still err in faith". Or: -We cannot command a faith, because no one is forced to believe against his will. Several times he defended the Roman Jews against the clergy of Rome, where yzi the Jewish synagogue, three hundred years dlier than St. Peter's, than the Lateran, had been burned to the ground by Catholics; apparently an act of revenge for the punishment of some Christians who had murdered their Jewish masters. However, the Romans had already repeatedly vandalized the synagogue, most recently burning it down under Theodosius. Christians also set fire to a synagogue in Ravenna. And it was also Catholics who snatched Theodosius' body from the tomb and desecrated it. - For

practicing pagans, however, the Goth, adopting the law of the emperors Mareian and Valentinian, retained the death penalty with,<sup>se</sup>

As king of Italy, Theoderic also exercised ecclesiastical sovereignty, not only the general right of superintendence, but also civil and criminal jurisdiction. The popes, who benefited from his rule and were able to increase their influence, also recognized him as the rightful ruler. At the same time, they saw themselves compelled to -assist the all-powerful Arian king

The Goths wore the mask of a friendly disposition, but perhaps this only strengthened their inner hat- (son of David). After all, the Italian Catholics never came to terms with the fact that the Goths were heretics.

After all, the popes, who otherwise fought Arianism to the point of vemichtung, never rebelled against Arianism because they themselves were ruled by Arians. Even the most important pope of the century after Leo I, Gelasius, never thought of preaching against the heretical occupation. Almost everywhere in Italy, Arian bishops held office alongside Catholic bishops. As in Ravenna, there were also Arian churches in Rome, and no Catholic religious fighter touched them - while the synagogue could be burned down! But the Jews didn't regret it! Their religion didn't depend on them! Respected Catholic bishops such as Epiphanius of Pavia or Laurentius of Milan collaborated particularly closely with the Amalians. And Gelasius himself maintained devout correspondence with the "great power" of Theodoric. Indeed, he was able to negotiate a legal deal (concerning finances) with the Gothic count Teja, a man who, as the pope wrote, was nevertheless

-without doubt from the other community- to threaten him with his own "Lord King, my son": -because in his wisdom he does not **want** to oppose ecclesiastical matters in any way, it is right that whoever lives under his rule should imitate the example of the great king, so as not to appear to be going against his will. Just as Gelasius, for all his wild polemics against the oppositional Church of the East and Akakios, spared the emperor himself, even assuring him that his predecessor Felix III had "not touched the imperial name in the least". And Gelasius himself praised the pious zeal displayed by the mild majesty in his private life.

In the Orient, not only had Akakios died in November 484 and his see been filled by Fravita, who died the following March after a mere four-month reign, but also Zenon in April 491. Pope Felix, who died in

Feb. 48\*, had courted him coldly, so to speak, without concession, and presented him as the victim of his ineffectual patriarch. Empress Dowager Ariadne now joined with a court official of more mature age, who had risen under Zenon and had been a candidate for the patriarchal see of Antioch three years earlier, after Peter Fullo's death, but now became emperor: Anastasios I (4s--@) "

### ISER ÄNASTASIOS IJHD ÜAPST GELASIOS STEP INTO THE RING

Anastasios, who had been expressly committed to supporting orthodoxy and the Creed of Chalcedon when he was elected by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Euphemios (4s--J96), soon defended Zenon's Henotikon. He favored the highly educated and successful later monophysiarh Severos (yzz-Ji8) of Antiochia, a -ge- iiaal man (Bacht SJ), who served at the imperial court from Jo8 to yn.

made a guest appearance. Indeed, the emperor gradually sided with the Monophysites. Even before his accession to the throne, he had occasionally proclaimed his support for them and was seriously discussed as the successor to Peter Fullo. However, the ruler's support for the Monophysites drove the Catholics, particularly in Asia Minor and the Balkans, to outrage, especially as Anastasios I was also a rigorous tax politician. However, his corresponding measures were judged very differently, particularly positively by Procopius and the learned John Lydos. After all, the monarch was able to consolidate the coinage system and reorganize the state finances through a fundamental renewal of the tax system and a very frugal and still relatively humane administration. He was even the only late Roman emperor ever to abolish a tax, the chrysargyron, a gold tax that burdened the cities and benefited the lower classes.

came. At his death, he did not leave any debts, but left the FiskUS 3\* pounds of gold. Ergo, from a Catholic point of view:

-Thirst for gold and heresy tainted his government and his name" (Wetzer/Welte). Emperor Anastasios did not build any magnificent buildings, like so many popes, but all the more harbor facilities, water pipes and the like, as he also took energetic precautions against famine. And finally, under him there were never such savage persecutions as Justin and Justinian **staged** immediately after the abolition of the Henotikon ..., and when it seemed necessary to him to remove bishops, he strictly demanded that no blood be shed (Schwartz). Thus, even for a theological opponent, he was

-Atiastasios, the good emperor, the friend of the monks and the protector of the poor and unfortunate."

However, he did not protect everyone.

First of all, Anastasios "cleansed" the court of his predecessor's Isaurian compatriots. The latter's entire family fled. Isauria itself was engulfed in a small-scale war that lasted for years, all opponents were captured and killed and entire sections of the population were deported to Thrace. Cleradezu was characterized by defensive wars against the Persians, the old hereditary enemy, and against the Bulgarians, remnants of the Huns, who had been reinforced by other Asian tribes and now became a new "hereditary enemy" for centuries - although this emperor, in stark contrast to his Catholic successors, generally avoided wars of aggression (Rubin)."

*In the 'iibrigen, Anastasios I made common cause with the Monophysites.*

Court patriarch Euphemi• (49 qQ6), a Syrian and rigorous Chalcedonian, distrusted the future emperor from the outset; he knew his lay sermons. Thus, before Anastasios' coronation, he allowed himself to be

The patriarch swore that he would "preserve the faith unwaveringly and bring no innovation into the holy church of God"; the patriarch deposited the written homology in the church archives. He was obviously more concerned with

com - where  $\text{£-elix III.}$  and  $\text{Gelasius I.}$  did not, however, get very close to him - than with his oath-breaking Christian ruler. The court bishop managed to escape several assassination attempts, but it seems that he also had contacts with the rebellious  $\text{Isatirierri,}$  whom  $\text{Anastasios}$  had supported since his reign.

$\text{Afltfitt bekr'-s* 49}$  he had  $\text{Eupheinius}$  deposed and excommunicated for high treason by a Constantinople synod, whereupon he was exiled to  $\text{Euchaïta}$  and his

successor  $\text{Makedonios (çq6-yi i)}$  was sworn in atif the  $\text{Henotikon.}$  Naturally, the monarch unleashed the fierce resistance of the Catholics and was repeatedly in danger of losing the throne. However, not only religious but also economic reasons played a part in this, which were often interrelated.

Pope  $\text{Felix III}$  died in Rome at the end of February4s• .  $\text{Gelasius (4P*-4s6)}$  became his successor as early as March i. As Chancellor of the Curia, he had written  $\text{Felix's}$  letters and had already

considerable influence. And although he only reigned for a few years, he left his mark on them in an unmistakable, indeed powerful way, full of controversy, verve, dialectical acuity and intransigence. Although ironically sarcastic, he was also prone to prolixity, verbosity, convoluted paradoxes, tapeworm sentences and often purely rhetorical stylistic devices, but all in all he produced a skillful mixture of Roman jutisprudence and biblical sayings, rarely forgetting the threat of divine judgment. In short, this pontiff was diplomatically and legally predestined for his post, was not only politically highly significant, but was also the first truly educated theologian among the Roman bishops for a quarter of a millennium, since  $\text{Novatian (p. ioo f5.}$  The "born Roman" ( $\text{Romanus natus,}$  as he called himself, although he obviously came from North Africa, did not shy away from sophistry or outright lies, such as the assertion that Rome alone had ordered the Council of Chalcedon for the sake of truth (cf. p. zz8 f). Or: no Christian emperor since Christ had assumed the title of supreme priest. He also derived from the



He denied Constantinople all the privileges now accepted by the Empire and the Church. Furthermore, he took the side of the stronger Theoderic against Odoacer, who was on the defensive, and then used his position between the emperor, who was severely hampered by internal political quarrels as well as Germanic and Hun invasions, and the king, who stood behind him, to push his claims to power to a height that would not be heard of again for more than three hundred years."

Of course, all popes knew what they owed to the faithful and the Bible. And so even Gelasius did not fail to affirm that he himself was completely unworthy of his office, that he was "the least of all men" (sum omnium hominum minimus). On the other hand, however, despite his unworthiness, he alone was charged with the "care" of the whole of Christendom. And this care, according to Gelasius, concerned everything that affected the faithful, their entire public and private life throughout the world.

Gelasius often quotes the alleged words of Jesus in Matthew (xö,i8 J.). He often insists on the Petrine nature of the Roman See; for the See of Blessed Peter only confirms the other sees, consolidates them. And at the synod in March Jqy, which took up the legatnn Misenus again (p. 3ii f), he allowed himself to be humbly celebrated by the assembly - by bishops, 58 presbyters, plus a few deacons and adcle- vates - however unworthily. The synod members acclaimed no less than eleven times: "In you we see the Vicar of Christ, in you we see the Apostle Peter"; whereby for the first time they saw in the Pope a Vicar of Christ and publicly declared him as such."

Gelasius, "the least of all men", cannot do enough to trumpet his own primordial power, his own rank, his own power to the East, so to speak, over the whole world in which he is the first. For the highest and first is the divine, is God, the -summus et verus imperator-. What is divine, however, is decided by Rome, the -first chair of the most blessed Peter-, the -engelhafte Stuhl-. It is the guardian and executor of the truths of faith. Only what it recognizes is valid.

He confirms every synod by virtue of the authority vested in him alone. Gelasius was the first pope to have his decretals appended to the synodal statutes together with those of his predecessors, i.e. he ascribed them the same significance as the canons of the synods, which the East, of course, never recognized. Nevertheless, Gelasius felt himself to be above all others, even declaring that this chair could "reverse" every conciliar decree. Such claims were historically completely up in the air, they were untrue. But they corresponded to the terrible tendency and, if you like, immanent logic of the process that had begun long before Gelasius and that was undisputed in curial letters of the y. century. Century incessantly recurring concept of the -gubernare-, the

-(leadership, government), which for the time being culminates with him and goes so far that Gelasius not only once considers the disregard or negation of papal claims to be an insult to God. The man pulled out all the stops to emphasize Rome's (and thus his own) primacy over all. -We cannot conceal what the whole Church on the face of the earth knows, that the See of Peter has the right to dissolve whatever has been bound by the decision of any bishop, and that he {the See} has the right to judge any church, while no one has the right to sit in judgment on him. The Decrets have determined that one can appeal to this See from all over the world, but that no appeal from it (to another institution) is permitted" - a passage that has been included in numerous collections of church law.

## THE DOCTRINE OF TWO POWERS OR THE STATE AS THE POPE'S BRIDGE

Although Gelasius, as pope, wrote to the emperor only once, his ambitious, even daring epistolary offensives were directed not least at him, whom the Henotikon directly involved in the church schism. And even if the Roman did not deny that the emperor surpassed the human race in dignity, for him, who here continued and crowned Ambrosian ambitions (vg 4 If, Bio), he was merely a "son".

{filius). As such, however, he was allegedly able to not judge. For he is not its head, but has the right and the duty, at the risk of his own salvation, to pursue the interests of the church, to persecute everything that causes trouble in state and church, that incites schism and heresy. If the church has no or only little power, then the council acts for it: its ruler's office! In short, the emperor must carry out the orders of the see that God has chosen to be the master of all bishops. The emperor is the servant of God, the Minister Dei."

It was inevitable that the Catholica's enormous growth in power would not only make it a combatant, but also a competitor and opponent of the state, as soon as the latter sought to curtail its ever greater, ever more insolent claims (always, e v e n in the second century, called the rights of God!), which did not shrink from any regression

- then ever parried until today with the nice saying, dafi man

-God- more than people, that means more because clergy than anyone else.

"As the soul dominates the body, as the ruler dominates the earth, so spiritual power dominates temporal power," said the Doctor of the Church Chrysostom. -The kingdom of the emperor extends to the earth and earthly things, but our kingdom extends to souls and the sotge for them. But as much as the soul is exalted above all earthly things, so much more must our kingdom be exalted above that of the emperor" (cf. p. ritt f). Ambrose had already written in the

Theodosius, he placed the concept of -religion- higher than that of state -order- (I §38 ff). Indeed, he could already openly assert the "far inferior value" of "royal splendour" compared to "episcopal honor", using the not exactly modest equation of lead and gold."

Church leaders liked to come up with such uplifting sentences in conflict-laden situations.

In recent years, Patriarch Kalandion of Antiochia was convicted of high treason (4\*J). \*--riAfch JOhannes I Talaja of Alexandria for perjury by imperial criminal justice had been deposed. So now Pope Gelasiis I - an old episcopal endeavor, of course! - the privilegium fori. The emperor was not entitled to judge the clergy, as the disciple was not above the master. According to Gelasius, divine as well as human law decreed that bishops should be judged at a council of bishops, even if they were absent due to secular error."

What human laws the Pope meant here may? The constitution of Constantius from the year 351 (i --1' It did not prove successful and soon had to be abolished. Valentinian III, on the other hand, examined it on 15 April 9Jz in criminal matters to the state courts! Pope Gelasius, however, had raised a new postulate with his claim to a special spiritual jurisdiction, the "subordination of state criminal justice to the clerical court of arbitration, had ridden a foolhardy attack on public law in order to force the **emperor** to accept one of the most fundamental constitutional principles of the ancient legal system in favor of the Church."

But not enough. This pope, who ignores reality almost like a dreamer, who denies the actual past, who turns history on its head, who does not call the emperor the head of the Church, but its son, the -defender-, the -guardian-, the "patron- of the Catholica, -fidei custos et defensor orthodoxae-, like his predecessor Felix III.

Gelasius thus not only asserts { tq ): -The whole Church throughout the world knows that the See of Blessed Peter has the right (read} to dissolve whatever is bound by the *sentences of whatever* bishops-, but he even puts forward the monstrous thesis that the emperor has to submit to the bishops in divine matters, to learn from them, not to teach them, not to rule them, but to obey them. He should bend his neck according to the will of **God**. Literally:

-2 *it is through these things* (quippe), exalted emperor, that *this world is governed in the first place - the sacred authority of the bishops* (auctoritas sacrata pontificum) *and the royal power* (regalis potestas). Of these two, the weight of the priests is all the heavier, since they will also have to give account for the kings of men before God's court. For you know, most gracious Son, that although you are superior in dignity (dignitas) to the human race, you nevertheless bow your neck to the superiors (praesulibus) of divine things and expect from them the means of your salvation."

This "doctrine of the two powers", which was first formulated here, became the foundation of medieval canon law and gained historical significance. For more than a millennium, it was probably the most quoted papal phrase, a classic catchphrase, probably just made up from the fictions of his predecessors. Gelasius was not even concerned with the doctrine of two equal powers. Rather, he wanted to transfer episcopal power to imperial power. He did not even shy away from subliminal threats: "For it is better that you hear in this life what I accuse you of than in God's court how I accuse you! ... With what forehead will you one day ask for eternal reward from him whom you have persecuted unhindered in this life".

But this, as well as other outrageous pretensions of Gelasius - for example, that the successor of Peter was the first in the Church and superior to all, that he judged without exception in it and that no one in the whole world was allowed to evade his judgment, that no one was allowed to challenge him - this was theory, was divorced from reality.

very far away and, moreover, only possible under the protection of Ostrogothic, curiously "heretical" rule. The -Handbook of Church History- confirms this, and even presents the pope as a kind of Western fighter, against the defeated Odoacer of course. But even for the Catholic handbook, it is becoming clearer with each passing day ... that for Rome the question of the primacy of Constantinople, rather than the question of Chalcedon, was at the heart of the matter. Whereby, however, no "greed for power" speaks from the champion of papal supremacy, but only "the feeling of his high responsibility before the judgment seat of God" (F. Hofmann) - with which Gelasius in particular is so fond of threatening, with which they all threaten again and again ..."

ÜAPST GELAS IUS FIGHTS THE "ÜESTI LENZ"  
**FROM SCHISMATICS, " RETI KERN AND HENDERS**

Only "for God's sake" certainly aticli, for nothing else, the incessant struggle against "schismatics and heretics", which is frequently reflected in the sixty or so letters or decretals of this pope, but also in six theological treatises, four of them alone against the Monophysites.

Gelasius repeatedly accused the schismatic -Greeks-, a word that now recurred more frequently and signaled mutual distance, of stubbornness, -errors-, and not even the dead, he knew, were forgiven their errors. He never attacked the Henotikon directly - he does not even mention it - but only the consequences of its personnel policy. It was never primarily about the doctrine, but always about the person, the chairs, the power. Gelasius showered these

-Greeks- with accusations, rebukes, mockery and derision. He is surprised - "Miramur" is how he likes to start his letters, -valde mirati sumus-, which always involves something dangerous. Constantinople, the imperial capital, Gelasius claims, will be

not counted among the (great) chairs at all, has no metropolitan position at all, the patriarchal chair there, in fact the first in the whole East and by the z8. The patriarchal see, which was in fact the first in the whole of the East and was placed equal to the Roman see by the canon of Chalcedon, had no rank or seat among the chairs - "nullum nomen", the patriarch had no pontifical power to revise the judgments of the apostolic see, which alone was responsible for the truth that Akakios and his followers so criminally disregarded, kiin,

-All of the pope's letters had the same purpose: the eastern to put the bishops in the wrong - (Ullmann).

From the outset, Gelasius provoked Patriarch Euphemius in Constantinople, who rejected Gelasius's announcement of his candidacy but congratulated him nonetheless (a few years later, he was accused of high treason, dethroned and deported). Of course, as his responsum makes clear, Gelasius had not even considered reporting from the "first see" of Christendom from a subordinate position. Himself arrogant to the extreme, he accuses Euphemius of being "highly arrogant", accuses him of neglecting his duty, of weakness, and takes him to task with dialectical skill and sarcasm, with arrogance: -You see yourselves cast down from the Catholic and apostolic community to the heretical and damned community. You know this and do not deny it ... and invite us to descend (condescendere) with you from the heights to the depths ... - Finally, he ends with a subliminal threat:

-We will come, brother Euphemius, no doubt we will come before that fearful and trembling tribunal of Christ" (pavendum tribunal Christi) ... Just as threats of the Last Judgment, the judgment seat of the eternal Judge and King, are frequent in Gelasius."

He also frequently turned against Akakios\* the -crime- of the patriarch, against "the pestilence of Eutyches", "the Eutychian contamination of the East", "nothing of a's obdurate malice", "stubborn evil foolishness", "wretched agitation", "gossip"; whereby -Eutychianism- for him meant a games convolute of -heresies", "all coinplants, followers and followers", and "all the heretics".