Part I

TEXTUAL STRATEGIES IN LATE ANTIQUITY

Chapter 1

PROBLEMATIC CLERGYMEN, POINTED CEREMONIALS, AND IMPERIAL ANXIETIES

JUSTIN I'S LETTER TO HYPATIUS (*ACO* 4.1:199–200) RECONSIDERED

MICHAEL WUK

ABSTRACT This article re-examines one letter sent by Justin I to his *magister militum Orientis* Hypatius, dated August 7, 520, and preserved in the acts from the second Council of Constantinople in 553. As a command to investigate local hearings into potentially "heterodox" activities in Cyrrhus, this communication has been mined for its information on imperial governance, military affairs, and doctrinal conflicts in the sixth century. However, the significance of the events which allegedly took place in Cyrrhus has not yet been fully explored. This chapter focuses on these events, which consisted of two rituals: first, the procession of an image of the deceased bishop, Theodoret, into Cyrrhus; and second, the celebration of Theodoret and other theologians of questioned "orthodoxy" in a public festival held in the city. A closer examination of these reported activities reveals an imperial concern that the participants had parodied well-known ceremonials to signal the return of problematic theologies to Cyrrhus. To Justin and his advisers, the procession and the festival were emphatic reminders of the city's troubling doctrinal heritage, and as such were as much of an issue as the messages they asserted.

MICHAEL WUK is the Senior Classical Languages Tutor at the University of Lincoln. Until 2025, he is based at the Freie Universität Berlin as a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellow. His work explores the cultural, institutional, and religious history of the late antique Mediterranean and Near East (third–seventh centuries CE), especially concerning concepts of obligation and interactions between rulers, subjects, and other sources of authority. Michael is currently preparing for publication a book on the swearing of oaths in Late Antiquity, while starting a new project on rites of monastic initiation.

IT IS NO overstatement to describe the documentation associated with church councils as dense. The attempts to record what had occurred before, during, and after ecclesiastical synods—or at least, versions of these events palatable to those who emerged "the victors"—mean that we are often better informed about the proceedings of a few days of debate than about entire regimes.[1] While many scholars who have tangled with the dauntingly magisterial and magisterially daunting series of critical editions initiated by Giovanni Mansi (1692–1769) and Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940) will no doubt be thankful that this enormous corpus of evidence has already been compiled, many may also have felt lost amidst the overwhelming amount of information that confronts the unwary.[2] To be sure, this situation has improved with the production of excellent commentaries over the past century.[3] Nevertheless, despite their value for understanding other aspects of life in the late antique Mediterranean, many of the documents included in the conciliar acts have predominantly been considered in relation to the immediate ecclesiastical issues at hand, if not overlooked entirely.

One exception is a curious letter included in the acts of the second Council of Constantinople. The synod, held in May–June 553, was ostensibly convoked to determine the "orthodoxy" of the so-called Three Chapters: various works authored by Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia from 392 to 428, Ibas, bishop of Edessa from 436 to 457, and Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus from 423 to ca. 460.[4] At the same time, the church meeting was also an imperial attempt to assert authority over the clergy, in particular Vigilius, bishop of Rome from 537 to 555, whose vacillating position on the Three Chapters had obstructed Justinian's efforts to condemn these works.[5] In response to ecclesiastical pleas that he preserve the doctrinal landscape as it was during the reign of his predecessor and uncle Justin I, Justinian sent the *quaestor*

1 See most recently Graumann, *Acts of Early Church Councils*.

2 *Sacrorum Conciliorum*, ed. Mansi; *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicum*, ed. Schwartz and Straub (hereafter *ACO*). Other editions of conciliar minutes have been produced, whether as part of larger series, such as those in the *Corpus Christianorum*, or as standalone publications, such as *Akten der Ephesinischen Synode*, ed. Flemming.

3 See, in particular, Hefele and Leclerq, *Histoire des conciles*, and note also the translations of Richard Price and collaborators in the *Translated Texts for Historians* series.

4 "Orthodoxy" and its antonyms "heterodoxy/heresy" are discursive concepts used to identify beliefs which particular authorities supported or condemned: Kahlos, *Religious Dissent*, 105–20. This chapter only uses these terms with scare quotes.

5 Gray, "Legacy of Chalcedon," 232–35; for an introductory discussion see *Acts of the Council of Constantinople*, trans. Price, 1:1–98.

Constantine to interrupt the council on May 26, 553. During this session, the council's seventh and penultimate, Constantine gave the attendees the letter in question and explained its original context. This communication, originally sent on August 7, 520, instructs Hypatius, the *magister militum Orientis*, to investigate local hearings about a public procession and festival held by the clergy of Cyrrhus to honour theologians of questioned "orthodoxy," including Theodoret and Theodore, two of the Three Chapters. By demonstrating his uncle's active interest in these celebrations, Justinian justified his condemnation of the Three Chapters and his attempt to assert control over Vigilius.

As a source which relates both to major Christological debates and imperial intervention in local justice, this letter has attracted some scholarly interest. The most extensive treatment of Justin's communication is Fergus Millar's analysis, which contextualizes the document in the synod of 553, the religious landscape of the fifth and sixth centuries, and the apparatus of responsive governance at work.[6] Other scholars have primarily mined the source for what it tells us about military affairs and imperial governance in the sixth century: A. A. Vasiliev and Walter Kaegi point towards Justin's concern for contemporary doctrinal disputes, especially as they pertained to the armed forces; Geoffrey Greatrex highlights the emperor's expectation that commanders like Hypatius play roles in the settlement of provincial religious conflicts; Brian Croke takes the letter as proof of Justin's agency, contrary to the widespread perception that Justinian dominated the reign of his elderly uncle; and Philip Rance has utilized the references to soldiers who offered testimonials during the local hearings to determine the long-standing association of a military unit with Cyrrhus.[7]

While Justin's letter has clearly received considerable attention, these explorations do not fully consider the significance of the events that purportedly took place in Cyrrhus. To be sure, the imperial identification of the alleged celebrations as public expressions of "heterodox" belief has been noted, in particular by Millar, who also highlights that various rulers had viewed many clergymen from Cyrrhus and the province of Euphratensis as Christological malcontents.[8] In his commentary on the conciliar minutes in

6 Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," who also provides a translation of the letter, based largely on an early form of the standard version offered by *Acts of the Council of Constantinople*, trans. Price, 2:97–99.

7 Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 232–33; Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest*, 82; Greatrex, "Moines, militaires et défense," 288; Croke, "Justinian under Justin," 35–36; Rance, "Third *Equites Stablesiani* at Cyrrhus."

8 Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 127–35.

which the letter has been preserved, Richard Price also terms the procession and assembly "a spontaneous reaction to the routing of the miaphysites," in a manner similar to other modern surveys of the late antique Christological landscape.[9] And yet, despite these brief gestures towards the choreography of the Cyrrhene ceremonials, the pointed assertions behind the rituals in question have been largely overlooked.

This article offers a reconsideration of Justin's letter to Hypatius, with particular concern for what messages the participants intended the celebrations to articulate, or at least the significations perceived by Justin and his officials. Following a contextualization of the demonstrations within the events which led to their organization, each ceremony is examined in turn. When taken together in the testimony provided by Justin's letter and Constantine's explanation, the procession and the assembly read as forms of the public ceremonies used to mark the arrival of dignitaries into provincial cities, but with an important twist. Rather than the typical purpose of welcoming new officials or prominent authorities to the area, the celebrations instead heralded the coming of a new bishop and the subsequent metaphorical return of "two-nature" Christology into the city's doctrinal milieu. As such, Justin, his provincial officials, and the local parties who reported on these events were not solely concerned with the "heterodox" beliefs supported, but also anxious about what the methods of articulating these beliefs meant.

While the evidence does not allow us to determine precisely what happened at Cyrrhus or exactly when these celebrations took place, we can use the letter and the *quaestor* Constantine's contextual preface to reconstruct a sequence of events. At some point before the letter's issuing on August 7, 520, Sergius, the bishop of Cyrrhus, was replaced by another clergyman named Sergius. This substitution was doctrinally motivated. While the first Sergius refused to support the theology ratified at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, his successor, who for ease of reference we will call Sergius II, was known to be Chalcedonian in sympathies. Not long into his reign, Justin emphatically defined "orthodoxy" as adherence to the decisions made at Chalcedon, and so in 519–520 many Eastern churchmen faced a similar fate to Sergius I. Numerous anti-Chalcedonian bishops were driven into exile and succeeded by leaders who supported Chalcedon and were open to signing a

9 *Acts of the Council of Constantinople*, trans. Price, 2:97n88. Other commentaries: Hefele and Leclerq, *Histoire des conciles*, 3.1:104; Honigmann, *Évêques*, 78; Maraval, "La réception de Chalcédoine," 139; cf. Frend, *Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 226, who briefly refers to the celebrations at Cyrrhus without reference to Justin's letter or Constantine's explanation.

statement of Christological belief formulated by Hormisdas, bishop of Rome from 515 to 523, and endorsed by Justin himself.[10]

It is in this context of transition that the celebrations occurred. At some point after Sergius I had been deposed but before Sergius II had entered Cyrrhus, two local clergymen named Andronicus and George ceremonially led an image of Theodoret into the city.[11] An unspecified time after this procession had been completed, Sergius II arrived at Cyrrhus and presided over an assembly that celebrated several long-deceased theologians. In addition to Theodoret, Sergius' gathering was reportedly held in honour of Diodore, bishop of Tarsus from 378 to 391/2, Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia from 392 to 428, and "some Nestorius who [Sergius] said was a martyr" ("Nestorii cuiusdam quem martyrem esse dixit").[12] Nestorius, whom at one of the subsequent hearings Sergius seems to have retroactively claimed to be a local Christian hero despite (as Justin's letter notes) the absence of any known shrine for a martyr of that name in the province, was the most controversial inclusion.[13] The emperor, the officials who investigated these celebrations, and possibly also the parties who reported on these events unsurprisingly identified this individual as Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople from 428 to 431, whose name had become a byword for "heresy" in imperial communications after his condemnation at the First Council of Ephesus in 431.[14]

---

10 Many of these same Chalcedonian bishops had similarly been driven into exile under earlier regimes. See further: Gray, "Legacy of Chalcedon," 227; Millar, "Not Israel's Land Then"; Menze, *Justinian*, 44–105.

11 Citations of the letter and Constantine's explanation refer to the documents' place in the council's acts, and also the page- and line-numbering of Straub's edition. *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6, 12 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.2–3, 199.23–27. Cf. Croke, "Justinian under Justin," 35, who suggests that Sergius was involved in the procession's organization.

12 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6, 12 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.3–5, 199.28–30.

13 Constantine's introduction to the letter pours further scorn on Sergius' attempt to explain away the celebration of Nestorius, who is described as "supposedly one of the sacred martyrs" ("quasi unius de sanctis martyribus"): *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6 = *ACO*, 4.1:187. See also *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.36–37. Cf. Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 135, who suggests that Sergius' assembly openly framed Nestorius of Constantinople as a martyr.

14 For instance: *Codex of Justinian* 1.1.5.3, dated to ca. 527; *Novels of Justinian* 42.1.1, dated to August 6, 536. See more generally Halleux, "Nestorius"; *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, trans. Price and Gaddis, 1:24–25. Note also the comparable prognosis of Severus, who had been driven into exile around the same time as Sergius I: *Letters* 5.12.

As is made clear in Justin's letter, it was not just this suspicion of Nestorian sympathies that attracted the emperor's attention. Justin's letter expresses concern that Sergius had not only failed to punish Andronicus or George for their involvement in the procession, but also remained in communion with the two and even doubled down on their public expression of belief.[15] It is also notable that provincial officials only became involved after the bishop's arrival, perhaps as the former expected the church leader to intervene. No doubt as Justin and his representatives lacked the knowledge themselves, the letter does not specify when the informants on the events decided to contact judicial officials, nor exactly what motivated these concerned parties to do so. In fact, given that the emperor's letter and Constantine's preface only specifically name Sergius, Andronicus, and George, we cannot be sure *who* reported on the clergymen, or if many other Cyrrhenes participated in or supported their celebrations. Besides the accused churchmen and the civic *defensores* who oversaw the subsequent hearings, the only other individuals identified in relation to these events are the Third *equites Stablesiani*, a cavalry cohort stationed in the city's vicinity.[16] While scholars have typically pointed towards these servicemen as the parties who reported Sergius to civic authorities,[17] the evidence only states that the soldiers had given evidence during the official investigations and were to have their testimonies re-examined by Hypatius.[18]

Whoever first informed on the clergymen, the servicemen were summoned to provide evidence about both procession and festival during a hearing held before the civic *defensor* of Antioch.[19] As Millar emphasizes, Antioch was the municipal centre of Syria I, and so was not the most natural place for an investigation into the events in Cyrrhus, which lay in the nearby

15 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:200.8–12.

16 Rance, "Third *Equites Stablesiani* at Cyrrhus."

17 See in particular Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 135: "It remains striking that these soldiers should have been aware that such a demonstration was irregular, and needed to be reported to the authorities." Cf. Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest*, 82, who suggests that the soldiers themselves were suspected of participation in the celebrations.

18 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.22–23, 200.3–4, 15–22.

19 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.30–34. Cf. Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 135, who states that the hearing at Antioch was primarily concerned with the procession.

province of Euphratensis.[20] Perhaps the decision to try Sergius II and his clergy at Antioch was an attempt to draw Hypatius, who as *magister militum Orientis* was based in this major municipal centre, into the fray. Given that Justin's letter expresses surprise that the commander had not already become involved in a trial held in his own city, those who reported on the celebrations in Cyrrhus may similarly have expected Hypatius' intervention, not least as soldiers under his command had offered testimony. It is also possible that the parties unhappy with the ceremonials endorsed by Sergius thought to seek external intercession to counteract the clergymen's authority and networks in their own community, and negate the chance that the investigation would be skewed in the church leader's favour. After all, late antique provincial officials were known to avoid going against local interests in judicial trials, and bishops, who occupied positions of spiritual and administrative leadership in the provinces, wielded significant influence in their sees.[21] This tendency not to get involved in problematic cases might also explain why Hypatius appears not to have initially intervened in the celebrations, and why Justin made his *magister militum* swear an oath to perform a full investigation.[22] At the least, Sergius certainly recognized the potential of his influence: the bishop not only stayed with Paul, his episcopal colleague in Antioch, seemingly in a bid to draw on the known Chalcedonian clergyman's reputation during the initial hearing into his activities, but also later contested the Antiochene investigation on his return to Cyrrhus.[23]

Safely back in his own see and unhappy with the decisions made at Antioch, Sergius petitioned the *defensor* in Cyrrhus to reinvestigate his case and provided numerous statements which asserted that no festival had been organized in honour of Nestorius.[24] Although Justin's letter indicates that Sergius also sought to prove his innocence by later offering statements confirming that he and the province's other bishops firmly condemned Nestorius and adhered to the theology supported by the major ecclesiastical councils, the issue of the procession seems to have been to some extent settled in Antioch, and nothing further is known about the fates of Andronicus and

20 Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 126, 135.

21 Administrative reluctance: Harries, *Law and Empire*, 153–71; Slootjes, *Governor and his Subjects*, 55–68. Episcopal authority: Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*; Testa, "The Late Antique Bishop."

22 Oath: *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:200.12–15.

23 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.33–34.

24 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.34–37.

George.[25] On the other hand, as is suggested by the subsequent referral of this case to Justin, Sergius' hearing at Cyrrhus temporarily exonerated the bishop. Constantine's explanation of the letter states that "certain Easterners" ("quidam Orientales"), possibly the same parties who had initiated the trial in Antioch, had contacted the imperial court about both procession and festival. It is after this petition and the minutes from the investigations at Antioch and Cyrrhus had been read to the emperor that Justin sent his letter to Hypatius, who Constantine tells us did investigate the matter. Having decided that Sergius was guilty, or perhaps looking to answer questions about his own doctrinal affiliation, the *magister militum* sent the bishop into exile, where the latter died in disrepute.[26]

Evidently, the celebrations at Cyrrhus were taken seriously by witnesses present in the city, the *defensores* who presided over the related hearings, and, if not Hypatius initially, then certainly the emperor once he became aware of them. Justin's letter even commands the *magister militum* "to investigate with focused precision" ("singula cum subtilitate requirere") the choreography of the procession, specifically whether the clergymen walked in front of the image of Theodoret and whether they sang psalms as had been reported.[27] The participants similarly viewed these demonstrations as pointed articulations of belief, as indicated by their modelling of the rituals on other well-known ceremonies. Beginning with the parade orchestrated by Andronicus and George, processions had a long history of usage in the ancient and medieval Mediterranean. Despite some initial hostility against such public demonstrations, ecclesiastical leaders recognized the utility of these rituals and introduced comparable ceremonies into aspects of Christian life, in particular church services and religious festivals.[28] Given their experience as clergymen, Andronicus and George may have been inspired by a form of processional psalmody or liturgical practice. In fact, in his hagiography of the Cappadocian monk Sabas, the monastic author Cyril describes one such procession into the shrine of St Thomas in Scythopolis, not only

25 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.37–200.1.

26 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.1–11. Hypatius' doctrinal affiliation: Greatrex, "Hypatius," 138.

27 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:200.6–8.

28 Most recently: Latham, *Performance, Memory, and Processions in Ancient Rome*; Frank, "Picturing Psalms"; Lavan, *Public Space*, 1:150–234; Brubaker and Wickham, "Processions, Power, and Community Identity."

contemporary to the demonstration in Cyrrhus but also intended to celebrate Justin's support for Chalcedon.[29]

Despite the similarities with this celebration in Scythopolis, the details provided by Justin's letter and Constantine's explanation point towards the Cyrrhene clergymen's parade being a quasi-*adventus*. The core purpose of the *adventus*, which developed from other forms of triumphal cavalcade, was to celebrate the arrival of a person or persons of significance—whether rulers, officials, or clergymen—into a municipal centre.[30] While the specifics of each ritual could differ in practice, the first step of the process was typically a formal entrance into the city. In the case of the procession at Cyrrhus, we are specifically told that the clergymen began outside the civic boundaries: Andronicus and George "led [the image of Theodoret] into the city of Cyrrhus" ("in Cyrestenam civitatem introduxerunt").[31] The crossing of the municipal threshold was effectively the point of the *adventus*. The ceremonial movement through the city gates, where the celebrated party or parties was/were often met by a reception party, was intended to symbolize the local population's welcoming embrace of the honorand/s.[32] It is for this reason that the clergymen in Cyrrhus decided to initiate their demonstration extramurally.

The parading of Theodoret's portrait (*imago*) is itself another clear parallel with the involvement of the arriving party in the *adventus* ceremony, whereby both are emphasized as the focal points of their respective rituals.[33] Given that Theodoret had died decades before Andronicus and George organized their procession, it is no surprise that the churchmen utilized a visual representation of the deceased bishop to symbolize his involvement. Never-

29 Cyril, *Life of Sabas*, 60–61.

30 Scholarship on the *adventus* and its antecedents is extensive, but see, in particular, MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony*, 17–89; Dufraigne, *Adventus Augusti*; Lehnen, *Adventus Principis*.

31 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.26–27, paralleled in the explanation of Constantine, who instead refers to Cyrrhus as "the aforementioned city" ("in praedictam ciuitatem"): *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.3.

32 For instance: Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae* 16.10.5, on Constantius II's arrival at Rome in 357; Constantine VII Porphryogenitus, *Book of Ceremonies* 1, appendix C, on Justinian's procession into Constantinople in 559.

33 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6, 12 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.2, 199.25, 200.5. Owing to the nature of how the evidence has been transmitted (see the next paragraph), we cannot determine from the term *imago* alone what form of portrait was used. Cf. Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 135.

theless, while many welcome processions featured the central party's physical presence, a large number were also built around the parading of images, through which newly enthroned rulers could announce the metaphorical arrival of their regimes in numerous cities at once without needing to attend each ceremony in person.[34]

The use of Theodoret's *imago* was thus very much in keeping with the nature of the late antique *adventus* ceremonial, as is also the case with the other reported aspects of the clergymen's procession. Just as the bishop's prior death necessitated carrying a portrait, the use of a wheeled cart (*currus*) was not just a logistical convenience but a common element of formalized welcome rituals.[35] While lesser dignitaries and military personnel sometimes rode on horseback, the central figure would typically occupy pride of place in the official cortège on a richly decorated drawn carriage, routinely termed a *carpentum*.[36] That our evidence for the celebrations at Cyrrhus refers to a *currus* rather than a *carpentum* is not controversial. Although the "certain Easterners" who informed the imperial court about these celebrations presumably did so in either Greek or another locally dominant language, and the official transcripts of the hearings at Cyrrhus and Antioch were no doubt written in Greek, Justin's letter to Hypatius was composed in Latin. This imperial communication would then have been translated into Greek for the clergymen gathered at the Second Council of Constantinople to make the missive's contents easier for the attendees, most of whom would have communicated in Greek, to understand. Constantine presumably addressed the attendees in Greek for the same reason, but as the subsequent acts were initially recorded in Greek and then rendered into Latin, there may have been some terminological slippage in the wagon's description.[37] And yet, even if this process of translation and retranslation had little impact on the wording of our evidence, Andronicus and George would presumably not have been able to acquire a fully bedecked *carpentum*, especially on short notice. The use of *currus* could indicate that a more banal, readily available form of wheeled cart was utilized. Nevertheless, in practice the *currus* of Cyrrhus performed the same function as the *carpentum* of other *adventus* ceremonials: to allow the celebrated party to proceed in stately fashion through the streets of the welcoming city.

---

34 Lavan, *Public Space*, 155–56.

35 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6, 12 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.2–3, 199.26.

36 Lavan, *Public Space*, 157–60.

37 Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 122–23; Rance, "Third *Equites Stablesiani* at Cyrrhus," 356.

The final recorded aspect of the clergymen's procession is the recitation of psalms, which once more has parallels in the organization of welcome cavalcades. According to Constantine's preface and the start of Justin's letter, Andronicus and George accompanied the processional cortège while singing psalms (*psallentes*).[38] A later section of the imperial communication specifies that the churchmen were singing while marching in front of Theodoret's image (*praecedebant*).[39] Whether Andronicus and George preceded, followed, or walked alongside the wagon, processional music and chants were common aspects of the *adventus* ceremonial, with psalms and hymns becoming especially common with the routine involvement of clergymen.[40]

Although the precise songs used are not stated, Justin's letter informs Hypatius that the transcript from the Antiochene hearing specifically flagged up the psalms recited.[41] This interest in the hymns chosen might suggest that the selection of psalm/s was emphatically connected to Theodoret and the circumstances of the procession. Various ecclesiastical historians have suggested that those involved in one instance of relic translation—a specialized form of *adventus* intended to celebrate the movement of a holy person's remains—thought about the songs they used.[42] Having heard that the interment of Babylas, a local bishop killed in the mid-third century, had caused the renowned oracle at Daphne to fall silent, in 362 the emperor Julian ordered the translation of the martyr's relics away from the site to a martyrion in Antioch.[43] Complying with this imperial command but pointedly expressing their disagreement, the citizens reportedly drew Babylas' remains on a cart while singing Psalm 97:7 ("Those who worship idols are put to shame, those who boast in idols: worship him, all you gods!"). Although he was no doubt more troubled by the subsequent burning of Apollo's temple at Daphne, these accounts suggest that Julian was angered

38 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6, 12 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.3, 199.27.

39 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:200.7–8.

40 For instance: Eusebius, *Church History* 9.9.9, on Constantine's entrance into Rome in 312; *Latin Panegyrics* 12(2).37.3, on Theodosius I's *adventus* into Emona in 388. See further Latham, "*Adventus*," 404, 408; Lavan, *Public Space*, 162.

41 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:200.7.

42 On relic translation, see, for instance, the famous fourth-century Trier relic *adventus* ivory, with Brown, *Cult of the Saints*, 88–94, and Kritzinger, "Cult of the Saints and Religious Processions."

43 Julian's efforts to preserve the worship of Apollo at Daphne were controversial and contributed to the ruler's famously fractious relationship with the Antiochenes: see most recently Teitler, *Last Pagan Emperor*, 80–81, 118–24.

by the deliberately selected censure evident in this recitation and punished some of those involved.[44] Perhaps Andronicus and George approached their procession in a similar manner to those involved in translating Babylas' remains to Antioch: as a response to recent imperial interventions in the empire's religious landscape.

The timing of the clergymen's demonstration suggests that all parts of the ceremonial were a direct reaction to Justin's definition of "orthodoxy" as agreement with the decisions made at the Council of Chalcedon. Amongst the many issues discussed at Chalcedon in 451, the theologians gathered for the synod sought to settle the ever-thorny problem of Christ's nature by defining Jesus as being fully consubstantial with both God and humanity.[45] One such proponent of this duophysite theology was Theodoret, who had been deposed during the second Council of Ephesus in 449 for supporting the condemned theology of Nestorius but was reinstated on October 26, 451, during the eighth session of Chalcedon.[46] Owing to continued Christological disputes, subsequent emperors took a variety of stances on whether the decisions made at Chalcedon were to be officially supported, with Justin's immediate predecessors Zeno and Anastasius even moving back from full imperial endorsement of the council.[47] Justin's reimposition of Chalcedon as the benchmark of "orthodoxy" was thus a watershed moment for the Cyrrhene clergy, who not only had their anti-Chalcedonian bishop, Sergius I replaced with the pro-Chalcedon Sergius II, but also saw the reputation of Theodoret, their most renowned theological proponent, to some extent restored.

By co-opting the significations of typical *adventus* ceremonial, Andronicus and George publicly demonstrated what they interpreted these events to mean. In the first place, given that welcome cavalcades were naturally intended to celebrate the arrival of the central party, the churchmen who organized and participated in this ceremony asserted that Theodoret had returned in triumph to the city, which greeted the formerly condemned

44 Rufinus, *Church History* 10.36–37; Sozomen, *Church History* 5.19–20; Theodoret, *Church History* 3.10–11. Socrates, *Church History* 3.18–19, preserves the same story without specifying the Psalm used. Philostorgius, *Church History* 7.8, does not mention the Psalms.

45 Amongst many excellent summaries of this complex debate, *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, trans. Price and Gaddis, 1:56–75, remains the clearest.

46 Our best evidence for Theodoret's expulsion and reinstatement comes in the minutes from the eighth session itself: *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* 8.

47 Gray, "Legacy of Chalcedon," 224–27; *Acts of the Council of Constantinople*, trans. Price, 1:1–8.

theologian with open arms. Processional pageantries were also public articulations and negotiations of the dynamics of authority between those involved, with (self-)identifications of local communities and the places of those who constituted these communities colouring the ritual's formalized interactions.[48] The clergymen's celebration was not just a welcome ceremony, but an expression of both local Cyrrhene identity, framed around the city's famous bishop, and also the reinstatement of said bishop's ecclesiastical dominance in his former see. To be sure, Theodoret was not entirely exonerated at this point. The deceased clergyman was still routinely associated with the anathematized theology of Nestorius, hence the emperor's interest in this incident, and would later be condemned once again at the Second Council of Constantinople. Justin's letter even states that, by celebrating the bishop, Andronicus and George had "show[n] that they are of the same sect [as Theodoret]" ("ostendentes quod eiusdem illi sectae sunt"), thereby pejoratively characterizing all those involved as "heretics."[49] Nevertheless, to some of the Cyrrhene clergy, Justin's overt support for Chalcedon signalled the vindication of their famous bishop and warranted a public representation of the theologian's metaphorical return to imperial "orthodoxy."

That this festivity coincided with the selection of a new episcopal leader was surely no coincidence. Putting aside the Chalcedonian sympathies of Sergius II for the present, the entrance of a bishop into his see was also often marked with welcome rituals, including an *adventus* ceremony. In some cases, such demonstrations could celebrate episcopal returns from exile and constitute local protestations against the circumstances which had originally driven the honorands away from their sees.[50] These purposes are certainly applicable to the events at Cyrrhus, with Sergius II's acquisition of the episcopal throne mirroring the ritualized entrance of Theodoret's image into the city.

However, neither Justin's letter nor Constantine's explanation frame the procession as a welcome ceremony for Sergius II, who had yet to enter the city. While it may be that the bishop was granted a separate *adventus* ceremony on his arrival and our evidence simply has not recorded it, the second celebration with which we are concerned—the festival convoked in honour of Theodoret and other deceased theologians—seems to have been what

48 See, in particular, Brubaker and Wickham, "Processions, Power, and Community Identity," 182–87.

49 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:199.27.

50 As, for instance, with the returns of Athanasius to Alexandria in 346 and John Chrysostom to Constantinople in 403: Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orations* 21.28–29; Theodoret, *Church History* 5.34. Episcopal *adventus*: Lavan, *Public Space*, 156–57.

publicly marked the start of Sergius' episcopal tenure. Although the bishop was eventually held responsible and deposed, some slight doubt about who orchestrated this gathering is expressed late in Justin's letter. The emperor instructs Hypatius to discover whether the church leader actively ordered the proclamation of the assembly ("praedicari fecit") or simply allowed it to happen ("celebrari concessit"), presumably at the behest of Andronicus, George, and any other collaborators.[51]

Wherever the initial stimulus originated, as with *currus*, the terminology used to describe this assembly ("collectio") and its celebration ("celebrauit") is generic, and prevents us from determining the choreography of the festival, or exactly where in the city's vicinity it took place.[52] Given the ecclesiastical backgrounds of the participants and honorands, we might presume that the gathering was to some extent a liturgical affair. After all, the festival was reportedly held in honour of several deceased clergymen and even framed Nestorius as a martyr. Nevertheless, the placement of the celebration after Sergius had entered Cyrrhus suggests that the assembly's convocation was conceived as some form of welcome ceremonial. Group gatherings routinely featured in the rituals which marked an authority's formal arrival and, through ritualized speeches and acclamations, expressed the assembled group's expectations of how the arriving party would benefit their city.[53] Sergius' *collectio* certainly fulfils the basic criterion of asserting what some of the Cyrrhenes wanted from their bishop: the newly arrived church leader openly celebrated Theodoret, whom at least Andronicus and George thought worthy of public tribute, and other associated theologians, thus demonstrating his intent to represent the latent duophysite leanings of his see.

Even if the gathering was not organized as a welcome assembly for Sergius, the choice of honorands indicates that the ceremony was meant to symbolize the return of these clergymen and their theology to the city. All the named clergymen were routinely mentioned in reference to each other, in particular owing to their shared relationship with the see of Antioch and their common duophysite beliefs. Before becoming bishop of Tarsus in 378, Diodore had served as a presbyter in the city and led his own ascetic community, which gave rise to a particular breed of "two-nature" theology.

---

51 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:200.9–11.

52 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.4.6, 12 = *ACO*, 4.1:187.3–4, 199.28–29, 35–37, 200.9–11, 15–17, 19–20.

53 Slootjes, *Governor and his Subjects*, 110–28; Latham, "*Adventus*," 398–407.

Theodore, the future bishop of Mopsuestia, was a part of this group before his own episcopal election in 392, while Nestorius was in turn a student of Theodore at Antioch. Despite not having much direct contact with these luminaries, Theodoret did have roots in the city, perhaps resulting in the similarities between their theological leanings. At the least, the opponents of "two-nature" Christology sought to group together these clergymen as part of a quasi-genealogical Antiochene school of thought.[54] Moreover, all these individuals had to some extent been accused of "heterodox" belief at subsequent ecclesiastical synods, owing to their connections to Nestorius and the incompatibility of their convictions with the teachings of Cyril, bishop of Alexandria from 412 to 444.[55] As indicated by the questions raised about the "orthodoxy" of Theodore and Theodoret in the Three Chapters debate, the continued use of "Nestorian" as a pejorative term, and more pertinently Justin's anxiety about Nestorian sympathies in Cyrrhus and the Cyrrhene clergy's vociferous disavowals of the same, the doctrinal issues around these individuals continued to be relevant in the sixth century.[56] It is for this reason that Justin specifically commands Hypatius to check carefully how not just Nestorius was celebrated, but also Theodoret, Theodore, and Diodore.[57] Nevertheless, as with Theodoret, the reimposition of support for Chalcedon as a core component of imperial "orthodoxy" seemed to the Cyrrhene clergy to herald the rehabilitation of Theodore and Diodore. To be sure, Nestorius was still viewed as "heterodox" by those who gathered at Chalcedon in 451, but the council's definition of "orthodox" belief overtly supported a duophysite interpretation of Christ's person.[58] As such, to the Cyrrhenes, Justin's backing of the Chalcedonian definition and the coming of Sergius II seemed to signify that "two-nature" theology had seen a change in fortunes.

The *collectio* was thus surely perceived, by the emperor if not also the organizers and those who reported the ceremony to imperial officials, as a pointed announcement of the return of duophysite belief to the city. More

54 Sillett, *Culture of Controversy*, esp. 41–56; *Council of Ephesus of 431*, trans. Price, intro. Graumann, 59–61.

55 On the duophysite theologies expressed by these clergymen and their immediate Christological context, see the recent synthesis provided in the introductory material to *Council of Ephesus of 431*, trans. Price, intro. Graumann, 67–84.

56 Note also the disputes of the 510s about the Trisagion hymn and Theodore's theology: Devreesse, *Essai dur Théodore de Mopsueste*, 176–93.

57 *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople* 7.12 = *ACO*, 4.1:200.15–17.

58 See, in particular, *Acts of Chalcedon* 5.34.

than this, given that all the named churchmen had links to the local area, the assembly reads as a form of homecoming. As a former bishop of Cyrrhus, Theodoret has the most obvious connection to the city, but Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia were also episcopal leaders in the provinces of Cilicia Prima and Secunda, which both lay to the immediate west of Euphratensis. Before his elevation to the episcopal seat of Constantinople, Nestorius himself had lived in Germanicia, which was part of the same province as Cyrrhus.[59] Millar notes that the bishops based in the cities of Euphratensis, Cilicia Prima, and Cilicia Secunda operated by means of a well-established episcopal network.[60] Given these strong local links, it is not overly surprising to find that Sergius' assembly was held in honour of Diodore, Theodore, Theodoret, and Nestorius together. All were "local" heroes, prominent theological authorities in their respective sees and well-known combatants in the local doctrinal landscape. As such, like the procession of Theodoret's image, this ceremony was planned to mark the metaphorical return of these figures to the religious milieu of Cyrrhus. To paraphrase a noted chant repeatedly recited during international football competitions, the *collectio* celebrated that popular duophysitism was "coming home" to the area with which its most famous proponents were typically associated.

To Justin and his representatives, the procession followed shortly afterwards by this assembly highlighted the problematic Christological past of Cyrrhus and the surrounding provinces, while also pointing towards potential future issues in these areas. Association with the condemned arguments of Nestorius in particular was something with which Chalcedonians struggled into the sixth century. Severus, the exiled anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Antioch, even gestures towards Sergius' *collectio* as proof that all supporters of the council were followers of Nestorius, and thus by their own dictums were adherents of anathematized doctrines.[61] By stressing Cyrrhus' longstanding connection to questioned proponents of duophysite belief, these celebrations emphasized the city's heritage of Christological controversy at a time when Justin was emphatically seeking to enforce unity around his own doctrinal convictions. Moreover, by their public performative nature, the procession and festival asserted that this heritage would stretch into forthcoming years. Such welcome ceremonials in any context were constructed to represent, in theory if nothing else, the present and future

59 On Nestorius' early life: Bevan, *New Judas*, 39–48.

60 Millar, "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy," 128–32.

61 Severus, *Letter* 5.12.

support of the local population for the honorands. While those involved no doubt had numerous self-identifications, from the outside the rituals appeared to construct a sense of collectivism, with the parties represented by the ceremonies' participants being beholden to the authority of the celebrated figures.[62] These ecclesiastically orchestrated demonstrations thereby suggested to the imperial court that, besides those who had gotten in touch with municipal officials and the imperial court, the Cyrrhenes had collectively affirmed their current and prospective backing of the central church leaders and their theologies, notwithstanding their reception by imperial and ecclesiastical authorities at prior councils.

Justin's letter to Hypatius thus needs to be understood as an alarmed reaction to rumours not simply of "heterodox" belief, but of the re-emergence and consolidation of problematic theologies. In 519–520, the emperor sought to settle ongoing theological debates by asserting that the Council of Chalcedon had expressed the basis of true Christian "orthodoxy." However, this support for Chalcedonian "orthodoxy" and the related imposition of new bishops on Eastern sees was interpreted by the Cyrrhene clergy to vindicate their previously questioned predecessors. The public nature of the procession and the assembly, and their significations of return, popular assent, and collectivism, were understood as deliberate assertions that Cyrrhus was, had been, and would always be a bastion of duophysite theology, even when this theology did not fully align with imperial definitions of "correct" faith. Perhaps such a message of resistance and local sympathies was intended by Sergius II and the churchmen involved, hence the deliberate orchestration of the procession and festival as forms of traditional welcome ceremonial. Nevertheless, Justin construed the apparent appropriation of typical rituals in Cyrrhus to be emphatic demonstrations of the city's Christologically troubling past, present, and future. To the emperor, then, the ceremonies themselves were just as much of a problem as the core assertion of "heterodox" belief.

62 Brubaker and Wickham, "Processions, Power, and Community Identity," 182–87. However, note that concepts of pre-modern (self-)identification continue to be debated: (most recently) Stewart, Parnell, and Whately, eds., *Routledge Handbook*.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicum. Edited by Eduard Schwartz and Johannes Straub. 4 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1914–71.

Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Edited by Eduard Schwartz. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962.

The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Translated by Richard Price and Michael Gaddis. 3 vols. Translated Texts for Historians 45. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.

The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553, with Related Texts on the Three Chapters Controversy. Translated by Richard Price. 2 vols. Translated Texts for Historians 51. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.

Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople. Edited by Johannes Straub. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971.

Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449, Syrisch mit Georg Hoffmanns deutscher Übersetzung und seinen Anmerkungen. Edited by Johannes Flemming. Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Neue Folge 15.1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1917.

Ammianus Marcellinus. *Res gestae*. Edited by Wolfgang Seyfarth, Liselotte Jacob-Karau, and Ilse Ulmann. 2 vols. Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1999.

Codex of Justinian. Edited by Paul Krüger. Berlin: Weidmann, 1877.

Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. *Book of Ceremonies*. Edited by G. Dagron, B. Flusin, and D. Feissel. 5 vols. Paris: Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisations de Byzance, 2020.

The Council of Ephesus of 431: Documents and Proceedings. Translated by Richard Price and Thomas Graumann. Translated Texts for Historians 72. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2020.

Cyril of Scythopolis. *Life of Sabas*. Edited by Eduard Schwartz. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939.

Eusebius, *Church History*. Edited by Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen. Berlin: Akademie, 1999.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *Orations*. Edited by Justin Mossay. Paris: Cerf, 1980.

Latin Panegyrics. Edited by R. A. B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.

Novels of Justinian. Edited by Rudolf Schöll and Wilhelm Kroll. Berlin: Weidmann, 1895.

Philostorgius. *Church History*. Edited by Joseph Bidez. Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1913.

Rufinus. *Church History*. Edited by Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen. Berlin: Akademie, 1999.

Sacrorum Conciliorum: Nova et Amplissima Collectio. Edited by Giovanni Mansi. 31 vols. Florence: Antonio Zatta, 1758–98.

Severus. *Letters*. Edited by E. W. Brooks. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1902–04.

Socrates. *Church History*. Edited by Günther Hansen. Berlin: Akademie, 1995.

Sozomen. *Church History*. Edited by Günther Hansen. Berlin: Akademie, 1995.

Theodoret. *Church History*. Edited by Günther Hansen. Berlin: Akademie, 1998.

Secondary Works

Bevan, George. *The New Judas: The Case of Nestorius in Ecclesiastical Politics, 428–451 CE*. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.

Brown, Peter. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Brubaker, Leslie, and Chris Wickham. "Processions, Power, and Community Identity: East and West." In *Empires and Communities in the Post-Roman and Islamic World, c. 400–1000 CE*. Edited by Walter Pohl and Rutger Kramer, 121–87. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Croke, Brian. "Justinian under Justin: Reconfiguring a Reign." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 100, no. 1 (2007): 13–56.

Devreesse, Robert. *Essai dur Théodore de Mopsueste*. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948.

Dufraigne, Pierre. *"Adventus Augusti, adventus Christi." Recherche sur l'exploitation idéologique et littéraire d'un cérémonial dans l'Antiquité tardive*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1994.

Frank, Georgia. "Picturing Psalms: Pilgrims' Processions in Late Antique Jerusalem." In *Visibilité et présence de l'image dans l'espace ecclesial: Byzance et Moyen Âge occidental*. Edited by Sulamith Brodbeck and Anne-Orange Poilpré, 63–76. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2019.

Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Graumann, Thomas. *The Acts of Early Church Councils: Production and Character*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Gray, Patrick. "The Legacy of Chalcedon: Christological Problems and their Significance." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*. Edited by Michael Maas, 215–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Greatrex, Geoffrey. "Flavius Hypatius, *quem vidit Parthus sensitque timendum*: An Investigation of his Career." *Byzantion* 66 (1996): 120–42.

——. "Moines, militaires et défense de la frontière orientale au VI^{e} s." In *The Late Roman Army in the Near East from Diocletian to the Arab Conquest*. Edited by Ariel Lewin and Pietrina Pellegrini, 285–97. BAR International Series 1717. Oxford: BAR Publishing, 2007.

Halleux, André de. "Nestorius: Histoire et Doctrine." *Irénikon* 66, no. 1–2 (1993): 38–51, 163–78.

Harries, Jill. *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Hefele, Charles, and Henri Leclerq. *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*. 16 vols. Paris: Letouzy et Ané, 1907–52.

Honigmann, Ernst. *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^{e} siècle*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 127, Subsidia 2. Louvain: Durbecq, 1951.

Kaegi, Walter. *Byzantine Military Unrest: An Interpretation*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1981.

Kahlos, Maijastina. *Religious Dissent in Late Antiquity, 350–450*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Kritzinger, Peter. "The Cult of the Saints and Religious Processions in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages." In *An Age of Saints? Power, Conflict, and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity*. Edited by Peter Sarris, Matthew Dal Santo, and Phil Booth, 36–48. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Latham, Jacob. "*Adventus*, *occursus*, and the Christianization of Rome." *Studia Patristica* 92 (2017): 397–409.

——. *Performance, Memory, and Processions in Ancient Rome: The "Pompa Circensis" from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Lavan, Luke. *Public Space in the Late Antique City*. Late Antique Archaeology, Supplementary Series 5. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Lehnen, Joachim. *Adventus Principis: Untersuchungen zu Sinngehalt und Zeremoniell der Kaiserankunft in den Städten des Imperium Romanum*. Prismata 7. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1996.

MacCormack, Sabine. *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 1. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Maraval, Pierre. "La réception de Chalcédoine dans l'empire d'orient." in *Histoire du christianisme des origines à nos jours. Tome III: Les Églises d'Orient et d'Occident (432–610)*. Edited by Luce Pietri, 107–45. Paris: Desclée, 1998.

Menze, Volker-Lorenz. *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Millar, Fergus. "Imperial Government and the Maintenance of Orthodoxy: Justin I and Irregularities at Cyrrhus in 520." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 28 (2009): 117–37.

——. "Not Israel's Land Then: The Church of the Three Palestines in 518 CE." In *Israel's Land: Papers Presented to Israel Shatzman on His Jubilee*. Edited by Joseph Geiger, Hannah M. Cotton, and Guy D. Stiebel, 147–78. Jerusalem: The Open University of Israel and Israel Exploration Society, 2009.

Rance, Philip. "The Third *Equites Stablesiani* at Cyrrhus." *Chiron* 42 (2012): 347–60.

Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 37. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Sillett, Helen Marie. *Culture of Controversy: The Christological Disputes of the Early Fifth Century*. PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1999.

Slootjes, Daniëlle. *The Governor and his Subjects in the Later Roman Empire*. History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity, Mnemosyne Supplements 275. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Stewart, Michael, David Parnell, and Conor Whately, eds. *The Routledge Handbook on Identity in Byzantium*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2022.

Teitler, Hans C. *The Last Pagan Emperor: Julian the Apostate and the War against Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Testa, Rita Lizzi. "The Late Antique Bishop: Image and Reality." In *A Companion to Late Antiquity*. Edited by Philip Rousseau, 525–38. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Vasiliev, A. A. *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950.