How considerable, or inconsiderable, was the theological contribution made by the West to the ecumenical councils of the fourth to eighth centuries? Standard presentations play this down. For not only were the councils held in the East, but in addition very few westerners attended, apart from the papal representatives, and the debates involved theological issues that were in dispute in the East but not in the West. Admittedly it was often asserted a generation ago that Nicaea and Chalcedon were exceptions. It was common to assert that the ὁμοούσιον adopted at Nicaea implied a strong doctrine of divine unity that was distinctively western, while in the East the emphasis was on the distinction between the persons. Christopher Stead, however, demonstrated that this represented too crude an interpretation of the ὁμοούσιον and too simplified an account of eastern Trinitarianism.¹ It was also commonly asserted that the two nature formula of the Christological definition of Chalcedon was taken from the Tome of Leo. This formula does not actually occur ipsis verbis in the Tome; nevertheless we know from the acts of the fifth session of the council that an unambiguously dyophysite formula was indeed adopted as a result of insistence by the Roman legates.² But the formula adopted – that Christ is to be “acknowledged in two natures” (ἐν δύο φύσεων [...] γνωρίζομεν) – was of eastern provenance,³ while the eastern bishops took no interest in, and indeed had no knowledge of, western Christology, beyond what was said in the Tome, and this they interpreted as simply confirming the Creed and the teaching of the Council of Ephesus.⁴

1 Ephesus and Chalcedon

Did western Christology influence Greek Christology, or vice versa? Let us take the key theological issue at Chalcedon: are the human actions and experiences of Christ to be attributed to the divine Logos as their personal subject? We all know that Theo-

---

¹ See Stead (1977).
³ The formula was first used by Basil of Seleucia at the Home Synod of 448. See Acts of Chalcedon, Session 1,301, ACO 2,1,1 (117,22 Schwartz). As Sophronius of Jerusalem later pointed out in his Epistula synodica (ACO, ser. 2, 2,1 [438,16–18 Riedinger]), it derived from the phrase “perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood” (τέλειος ὄν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειος ὁ ἀνθρωπότητι) in Cyril of Alexandria’s letter Laetentur caeli to John of Antioch, ACO 2,1,1 (110,4–5 Sch.).
⁴ See the approval of the Tome expressed by the bishops in turn at Session 4, ACO 2,1,2 (94,4–101,39 Sch.).
dore of Mopsuestia and his followers, including Nestorius and Theodoret, denied this: it was obviously the divine Word who became flesh, but they attributed the multiple and particular human experiences that resulted from the incarnation not to the Word but to a distinct human subject. In contrast, the main contention of Cyril of Alexandria was that it was the Word himself who underwent the sufferings, while remaining changeless and impassible in his divine nature. What had been the practice of the great fourth-century theologians in this regard? It was not only Athanasius but also Gregory Nazianzen who attributed the human experiences to the Logos. The same is true of the great Latin fathers. A letter of Augustine’s mentions someone who formerly refused to admit that God was born of a virgin, that God was crucified and endured other human sufferings, but who afterwards came to know that God the Word became son of man in such a way that, with each of them remaining in its own substance, God suffered in the man what was human in such a way that he retained in himself what was divine without impairment.

Pope Leo in his Tome, while insisting on a distinct human operation, nevertheless refers to Christ’s divine nature as “his” nature and his human nature as “ours”, thereby excluding a symmetrical Christology of two united subjects. This amounts to a consensus of West and East, with neither dependent on the other. The Tome was a reaction (may we say an over-reaction?) to Eutyches rather than a balanced and comprehensive presentation of western Christology. This was realized by the fathers of Chalcedon, who in their definition presented the synodical letters of Cyril as providing “instruction for those who with pious zeal seek the meaning of the saving Creed” (ἐρμηνείαν δὲ τῶν εὐσεβείς ζῆλῳ τοῦ σωτηρίου συμβόλου ποθούντων τὴν ἐννοιαν), while commending Leo’s Tome simply as “a universal pillar against those with false belief” (κοινὴν τινα στήλην ὑπάρχουσαν κατὰ τῶν κακοδοξούντων) –

6 The key text is Cyril’s Epistula secunda ad Nestorium, ACO 2,1,1 (104,15 – 106,29 Sch.), since it was this text of Cyril’s that was formally approved at Session 1 of Ephesus, ACO 1,1,2 (13,8 – 31,5 Schwartz) and most cited in the subsequent debate.
7 Note how in distinguishing the sayings about Christ in the Gospels Gregory Nazianzen attributes the lowly ones not to Christ’s manhood as a distinct subject but to “the one who emptied himself and became flesh” (Orations theologicae 29,18 [216,24 Gally]: τῷ διὰ σὲ κενωθέντι καὶ σάρκωθέντι) and “the possible God” (Orations theologicae 30,1 [226,10 G.]: θεὸν παθήτῳ).
8 Augustine, Epistula 219,3 (430,18 – 28 Goldbacher): Nolebat fateri deum datum ex femina, deum crucifixum et alia humana perpessum [...]. sed posteaquam cognouit [... ] dei filium sic esse factum hominis filium, ut [...] utroque in sua substantia permanente sic deus in homine pateretur humana ut in se ipso integra duina seruaret.
9 Leo I, Tomus ad Flavianum 3, ACO 2,2,1 (27,7 – 8 Sch.): In integra ergo uesti hominis perfectaque natura uestus natus est deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris.
10 Leo’s Epistula 165, the so-called Second Tome (ACO 2,4 [113,2–119,14 Sch.]) corrected the First Tome in this respect, and betrays Leo’s awareness of the unsatisfactory character of the latter.
that is, for its condemnation of Eutychianism and not for any positive Christological doctrine it contained.¹¹

### 2 Constantinople II (553)

Proceeding to the Three Chapters Controversy and the Second Council of Constantinople (553), do we find a difference between West and East in the interpretation of Chalcedon and its work, or evidence of the exertion of an influence in either direction? The theology of Constantinople II has often been seen as a specifically “Cyrillian” or “Neo-” Chalcedonianism that represented a narrowing of Chalcedon, a departure from its mediating position between the antagonistic poles of Alexandria and Antioch.¹² I have argued elsewhere that the Chalcedonian Definition is essentially Cyrillian, and was not intended to supplement or correct Cyril by adopting elements of Roman or Antiochene theology.¹³ But what was it that led the western churches of Italy and Africa to view the condemnation of the Three Chapters with such alarm – the condemnation, that is, directed against Theodore of Mopsuestia and against anti-Cyrillian writings by Theodoret of Cyrhhus and Ibas of Edessa? The evidence makes it clear that western opposition had nothing to do with a liking for Antiochene Christology, and everything to do with the danger of undermining Chalcedon, if fathers whom Chalcedon had either been silent about (namely Theodore of Mopsuestia) or actually reinstated (namely Theodoret and Ibas) were now to be condemned.¹⁴

The stance of deacon Rusticus of Rome is particularly interesting, and has still to be fully investigated and successfully interpreted. The puzzle is that in his collection of texts related to the Council of Ephesus he included a mass of material by those north Syrian bishops who rejected compromise with Cyril in the wake of the council; some of the material selected is seriously damaging to Cyril’s reputation, to the extent of suggesting sympathy with his Syrian opponents.¹⁵ Yet at the same time, in his treatise against the Monophysites, Rusticus sets out what is essentially a Cyrillian Christology, where the personal subject in Christ is unambiguously divine rather than the product of the union, and the symmetrical Christology of the Antiochene school.

---

¹¹ Acts of Chalcedon, Session 5,34, ACO 2,1,2 (129,11–15 Sch.).
¹² See in contrast, however, the highly appreciative treatment of Constantinople II in Hausammann (2004) 90 – 108.
¹⁴ Ferrandus of Carthage, Epistula 6 to Pelagius and Anatolius (921–928 Migne), is a particularly clear and eloquent expression of this position.
¹⁵ Rusticus’ Collectio Casinensis is in ACO 1,3 – 4. As an example of a document damaging to Cyril’s reputation take the list of bribes paid by Cyril to members of the imperial household, Collectio Casinensis 295, ACO 1,4 (224,4 – 225,11 Schwartz).
is rejected.\textsuperscript{16} By the time of Rusticus a Cyrillian Christology had become the common teaching of the imperial Church in both East and West.

3 Constantinople III (680–681)

Let us proceed to Constantinople III (680–681), which defined that there are two operations and two wills, divine and human, in Christ. At the beginning of the council both the patriarchs who attended (those of Constantinople and Antioch) were on the monothelete side (holding to one will in Christ) and, to judge by the minimal attendance at the early sessions, bishops were reluctant to attend the council. The \textit{Acts} reveal in addition that there was strong support for monotheletism in Constantinople, in both the court and the army and among the general population.\textsuperscript{17} This arose not from the purely doctrinal issue (which was a mere matter of terminology) as from the way in which the council was coerced into anathematizing the great monothelete patriarchs of the earlier seventh century, most notably Sergius, one of the most impressive figures ever to be patriarch. It is clear from the \textit{Acts} that throughout the council it was the Roman legates who made the running – with the support of the emperor Constantine IV, who chaired most of the sessions in person. The huge florilegium, on which the council based its claim that the dyothelete position was the orthodox one, had been compiled at Rome and was presented at the council by the Roman legates.\textsuperscript{18} In all, the victory of the dyothelete cause was brought about by the imperial imposition on a reluctant Byzantine Church of the teaching of the Roman see, as expressed by Pope Agatho in his letter to the council. The final oration delivered at the council spoke of his letter in memorable terms: “The city of Elder Rome presented you with a confession inscribed by God, and made the day of doctrine dawn in the west: there shone forth paper and ink.”\textsuperscript{19}

But how had that teaching developed? What was the origin of dyotheletism, the doctrine of two wills in Christ? The key biblical text were Christ’s words at Gethsemane – in the Lukan version, “Father, if you wish, take this cup from me, but let not my will but yours be done.”\textsuperscript{20} A key passage attributed (falsely) to Athanasius interpreted this as follows: “He here exhibits two wills, one human, which is of the flesh, and the other divine. For the human will deprecates the passion because

\textsuperscript{17} This will be shown in the translation and commentary of the acts of this council by myself and Marek Jankowiak (Liverpool, forthcoming).
\textsuperscript{18} This florilegium comes in \textit{Session 10} of the \textit{Acts}, ACO, ser. 2, 2,1 (288,1–390,9 R.).
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Acts of Constantinople III, Session 18}, ACO, ser. 2, 2,2 (816,21–818,1 Riedinger): ὁμολογίαν σοι θεοχάρακτον ἢ Ῥώμη πόλις ἢ πρεσβύτις ἀνέτεινε, τὴν τῶν δοχμάτων ἡμέραν ἐκ τῆς ἐσπέρας ἀνέτειλε, χάρτης καὶ μέλαν ἐφαίνετο.
of the weakness of the flesh, while his divine will is ‘eager’.²¹ Of course Christ’s human will soon submitted to the passion, in the words of Cyril of Alexandria: “You will find that the emotions of the flesh were excited in Christ so that, once excited, they might be quelled by the power of the Word who dwelt in the flesh.”²² We find the same in the Latin Fathers. Augustine’s interpretation runs as follows:²³

> “Father”, he said, “if it is possible, let this cup pass from me.” This was the human will, wanting something individual and as if private. But because he wanted man to be upright of heart, so that he could direct towards the one who is always upright whatever in man is somewhat contorted, he added, “Yet not what I will, but what you will, Father.” [...] Their Godhead is one, and so there cannot be any disparity of will; but in his human persona changing into himself those who are his own, he displayed a will that is proper to man; he displayed you and corrected you.

Here the submission of the human will is attributed to the dominance of the divine will: a free human response is attributed to us in our imitation of Christ, but not directly to Christ himself.

It was Maximus the Confessor who pointed out the real force of Christ’s words “Not my will but yours be done”: it is Christ in his manhood who is speaking, and with these words his manhood is not resisting but accepting the divine will – and accepting it not out of compulsion by the divine will, but because an uncorrupted human will freely and spontaneously leaves to the source of its existence and its well-being.²⁴ The teaching of Maximus reached Pope Agatho through the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649, which had been compiled and in part composed by Maximus himself, at that time in Rome. As Agatho summed up the matter in his letter read out at Constantinople III:²⁵

---

²¹ Ps-Athanasius, De incarnatione Verbi Dei et contra Arianos 21 (1021B – C Migne): δώο θελήματα ἑν-ταῦθα δεῖκνυν, τὸ μὲν ἀνθρώπινον, ὑπὲρ ἑστὶ τῆς σαρκὸς· τὸ δὲ θεικὸν, ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ. Τὸ γὰρ ἀνθρώπι-νον διὰ τὴν ἀσθενεῖαν τῆς σαρκὸς παρατείται τὸ πάθος· τὸ δὲ θεικὸν αὐτὸς πρόθυμον.

²² Cyril of Alexandria, Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantialia Trinitate 24 (397C Migne): εὑρήσεις ἐν Χριστῷ τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς πάθη κεκινημένα, οὐχ ἵνα κρατήσῃ ὡσπερ καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ ἵνα κινηθέντα καταργηθῇ τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἐνοικησάντος τῇ σαρκὶ Λόγου.

²³ Augustin, Enarratio in psalmum 32,2, Sermo 1,2 (248,18 – 31 Dekkers/Fraigont): Pater, inquit, si fieri potest, transseat a me calix iste. Haec humana voluntas erat, proprium aliquid et tamquam priva-tum ulens. Sed quia rectum corde voluit esse hominem, ut quidquid in illo aliquantium curuum esset, ad illum dirigeret qui semper est rectus: Verum non quod ego uolo, ait, sed quod tu, Pater. [...] Quorum una est diuinitas, non potest esse dispars voluntas. Sed ex persona hominis transfigurans in se suos, [...] ostendit quandom hominis propriam voluntatem; ostendit te, et correxit te.

²⁴ See Price (2014) 96 – 100.

²⁵ Acts of Constantinople III, Session 4, ACO, ser. 2, 2,1 (69, 21 – 24 R.): Orat quidem ad patrem ut homo, ut calicem passionis transageret, quia in eo nostrae humiliatis natura absque solo peccato perfecta est; pater, inquiens, si possibile est, transeat a me calix iste, uerumtamen non sicut ego uolo sed sicut tu uis. et in alio: non mea voluntas sed tua fiat.
Indeed he prayed to the Father as man that he might accomplish² the cup of the passion, because in him the nature of our manhood was complete and without sin alone, saying, “Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not as I will but as you will”, and in another place, “Let not my will but yours be done.”

What does this imply about relations between East and West? There are notable affinities between aspects of Maximus’ theology and those of Augustine. Maximus’ understanding of will in Christ was that the human will was fully submissive to the divine will, but in perfect freedom, since this submission arose from the natural bent of Christ’s perfect and uncorrupted human will. We have seen that Augustine did not interpret the agony in the garden in this way; but there remains a marked likeness between Maximus’ understanding of will in Christ and Augustine’s teaching on the way in which the will of those transformed by grace obeys God, in virtue of its natural drive towards the one who is at once its source and its goal. Maximus spent a long time in Africa, and it has been suggested that he had direct knowledge of some of the writings, or ideas, of Augustine.²⁷ But there is no evidence that he had ever read Augustine for himself, and no parallels in idea or expression so close as to show that he learnt from Augustine. The florilegia in the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649 were compiled by Maximus and his assistants, and contain a number of passages from Augustine; but these could well have been provided by Latin monks or clergy in Rome.²⁸ Maximus, on receiving these passages, will have recognized Augustine as an ally, but this does not mean that he learnt from Augustine.

We are still without evidence of an influence of Latin theology on Greek theology, but this should not be confused with the distinction between West and East. Greek culture and language had a strong presence in central and still more in southern Italy. Rome received an influx of Greek monks in the mid-seventh century; many later popes were Greek by birth, including the two great papal champions of dyotheletism, Pope Theodore (642–649) and Pope Agatho (678–681). Rome and Italy bridged the divide between West and East. Maximus, for so long unacceptable in the East and so welcomed in Rome, placed himself on the western half of the divide – not least in the way in which he stressed papal authority, while at the same time

²⁶ It is significant that the Greek version of this passage in the Acts translates the Latin transageret by παραγάγῃ (Acts of Constantinople III, Session 4, ACO, ser. 2, 2,1 [68,24 R.]), which is etymologically the equivalent Greek word, but has the contrary meaning – “avert” rather than “perform”. The latter is what is required in this context, but the error was facilitated by the fact that the dominant interpretation of Christ’s prayer in the Greek tradition was indeed that it expressed aversion from the passion.
²⁷ See now Börjesson (2015).
scandalizing Byzantium by claiming that the emperor had no right to interfere in church affairs.²⁹

But the language barrier between Greeks and Latins remained, and this deprived Maximus of any longer-term influence in the West. None of his writings on the will, whether in us or in Christ, were translated into Latin. Nor could his interpretation of the agony of the garden reach Latin speakers via Agatho’s letter in the Acts of 680–681, because this document (even in its Latin version) was little read in the West; and even if it had been, its key theological statements were too concise and undeveloped to have had an impact. Western interpretations of Gethsemane did not progress beyond the earlier patristic consensus. We have two substantial Latin commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew dating to the first half of the ninth century, those by Rabanus Maurus and Paschasius Radbertus. They both attribute Christ’s acceptance of the passion to his divine will, while his human will is stated baldly to have set itself against the passion.³⁰

This is not to say that either Agatho’s letter or the Acts of Constantinople III were convincing documents. They both ran into the same difficulty. We ourselves may choose to see the emergence and victory of dyotheletism as a development of Chalcedonian Christology. Such a development certainly occurred, but the ecumenical councils did not recognize the development of doctrine. By the time of Constantinople III the councils insisted that they were simply restating the teaching of the church fathers of the golden age between Nicaea and Chalcedon. Novelty, indeed, was seen as heretical. This is why, from the First Council of Ephesus, argument proceeded not by means of theological debate and analysis, but via the presentation of florilegia, intended to prove that the doctrine to be defined was traditional, and the heresy to be condemned was either novel or to be found only in past heretics who had already been condemned.³¹ But the great Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, to whom prime authority was attributed, were singularly unhelpful when it came to the question of

²⁹ For Maximus’ stress on Roman authority see Booth (2014) 269–277, and for his denying the emperor any priestly authority, and by implication any authority over the Church, see Relatio motionis (25,182–29,208 Allen/Neil).


³¹ Admittedly, florilegia played only a minor role at Chalcedon. There is no evidence that the florilegium attached to the Tome of Leo was read out at the council (see Acts of Chalcedon, ACO 2,1,1 [20,6 – 25,6 Sch.] and ACO 2,1,2 [81,21 – 22 Sch.]), while the council’s “address to the emperors”, which closes with a florilegium (ACO 2,1,3 [473,4 – 475,12 Schwartz]), is not likely to have been formally read out before, or approved by, the bishops. See Price/Gaddis (2005b) 105 – 107.
will, or wills, in Christ. None of them had produced an adequate interpretation of the agony in the garden. And to shift the discussion away from this single episode was impossible, since it was only in relation to Christ’ words “Not my will but yours be done” that any of the Fathers had used the actual expression “two wills” in relation to Christ. The conciliar definition declared: “Likewise we also proclaim two natural wills, which are not contrary (God forbid!), as the impious heretics asserted, but his human will follows and does not oppose or resist, but instead is subject to, his divine and omnipotent will.”\(^{32}\) Yet the texts that are cited so copiously in the Acts, as stating or implying a human will in Christ distinct from his divine will, were all talking about a case of opposition between Christ’s human will and his divine will. Again and again the Fathers had proceeded to state that this opposition was no more than the instinctive recoil of the flesh from suffering and death; this was true enough, but it made Gethsemane irrelevant to the issue of whether Christ had a proper human will. In fact, what the Fathers had been talking about was not the presence in Christ of two faculties of will, but the simple fact of a clash in volitions in Christ during the agony in the garden. The attempt to prove dyotheletism by citing the Fathers was a failure.

I make this point in order to show how the ecumenical councils by the seventh century had finished up, because of their claim to be simply traditional, in an intellectual cul-de-sac. This is also apparent in the work of the Second Council of Nicaea (787), to which I shall now proceed.

### 4 Nicaea II (787)

A common religious culture between Italy and the East was notable in the iconoclast controversy of the eighth century. From the very start of imperial iconoclasm in 726, the papacy gave its support to the iconophile cause. Only St Catherine’s monastery on Mt Sinai can rival Rome in the presence there even today of early icons dating to the iconoclast era or before. The contrast with the western churches on the other side of the Alps is notable. Charlemagne and the Franks rejected the decree of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) defining that images are to be venerated, for the veneration of images or simply the production of images suitable for veneration, though traditional in Rome, had not crossed the Alps. Pope Hadrian responded by defending the decisions of the council.

Was he defending an authentic Roman tradition? The key texts for the latter were two letters of Gregory the Great, which deplored the destruction of images, but for-
bade their veneration. So in his letter to be read out at the council Hadrian included a florilegium of thirteen different extracts. It is striking that only one of these thirteen passages is taken from a Latin Father (namely St Ambrose); even this is a Latin retroversion of a passage taken from a Greek florilegium.

A problem for all the defenders of images, in the East as well as the West, was that a number of the Fathers of the patristic golden age (from Nicaea to Chalcedon) had indeed spoken appreciatively, or at least without disapproval, of religious images, but none of them had spoken of venerating them. They still provided effective ammunition at Nicaea II, since they told against the prohibition by the Byzantine iconoclasts of even the making of images. But in contrast the Franks accepted the existence of images but simply condemned their veneration. This meant that Hadrian’s florilegium, though it sounded impressive to the Byzantines, was totally ineffectual in the context of the debate that followed between Rome and the Franks. It was indeed subjected by Charlemagne to devastating criticism in the Libri Carolini.

We can say that Hadrian contributed to the victory of the iconophile cause in Constantinople, but lost the debate in the West. The victory of iconophilism on the northern side of the Alps had to wait a long time – for developments in French and German piety in the eleventh century.

And yet the papal iconophile stance was essential for the victory of the iconophile cause in the East. The continuing strength of iconoclasm is shown by the failure of the attempt to hold an iconophile council in Constantinople in the summer of 786, when it had to be abandoned in the face of opposition by many bishops and by soldiers in Constantinople. Why then did the empress Eirene adopt the iconophile cause and abandon the iconoclasm of her great father-in-law Constantine V? One may surmise that the main reason was the need to end the isolation of Byzantium from the other parts of the Christian world, and principally the West. The empire still looked on Italy as part of its dominions, and Sicily was probably the most prosperous part of the empire. Relations with the Franks were also of importance, and it is very possible that the Byzantines had been unaware that in their attitude to images the Franks did not follow Rome.

5 Conclusion

The time had come to draw the threads together. A first question: did western theology penetrate into the churches of the East? The Greek bishops did not speak or read Latin. Very few Latin works were translated into Greek. Latin Fathers were certainly

33 Both addressed to Bishop Serenus of Marseilles in 599–600: Gregory the Great, Registrum epistoluarum 9,209 (768 Norberg) and 11,10 (873–876 N.).
cited at the ecumenical councils, but as providing a supplement to Greek citations, rather than a source of new understanding. In the other direction, we can ask what influence the conciliar decrees had on western theology. Certainly the West adopted the Nicene orthodoxy of Athanasius and the Cappadocian Fathers. They did not have to learn from Cyril of Alexandria that Nestorius was in the wrong, because their own tradition taught them that. They adopted the formulae of the Chalcedonian Definition, but these were indeed merely formulae, made up of terms that were not defined.\textsuperscript{37} The reality of the two natures of Christ, and the dominance within Christ of the divine Word as the single subject, were established orthodoxy in the West well before Chalcedon. As for the later councils, they were never placed on the same level. The Carolingians appreciated the work of the emperor Justinian, as both legislator and theologian, but (to judge by the number of surviving manuscripts) they read his own \textit{Edict on the Orthodox Faith} in preference to the \textit{Acts of Constantinople II}.\textsuperscript{38} The dyothelete theology of Constantinople III was so undeveloped and confused as to teach no one anything. Nicaea II made slightly more of a contribution, because one passage in its acts (part of a document not of a decree) was incorporated into western canon law in the twelfth century, namely: “In remembrance and commemoration of their archetypes (\textit{primitiuorum}) they (Christians) venerate and adore them, but they do not serve with divine cult either them or anything created.”\textsuperscript{39} But the iconophile decrees of Nicaea, even though approved by the pope, only penetrated across the Alps a few centuries after the council, and by this time images had already become important in the devotional practices of northern Europe.

Where, however, Rome had a decisive influence was on the politics of the councils. At Chalcedon it was Roman insistence that had led to an unambiguously dyophysite formula being included in the Definition. It is arguable that this would not in itself have led to the monophysite schism, since other parts of the definition was unmistakably Cyrillian, and that more decisive in exciting opposition in the East was the rehabilitation and reinstatement of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who had been Nestorius’ ally and a bitter critic of Cyril; and the main reason for Theodoret’s reinstatement was the fact that Rome had already declared his condemnation at the Robber Council of Ephesus null and void.\textsuperscript{40}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[37] The attempts by Boethius and Rusticus in the sixth century to give them a more definite meaning are as notable as the contemporary attempts by Leontius of Byzantium and Leontius of Jerusalem in the East.
\item[38] See Schieffer (1972).
\item[39] \textit{Decretum Gratiani} 3, \textit{De consecratione, distinctio} 3,28 (1790B Migne): \textit{Ad memoriam et recordationem primitiuorum uenerantur eas et adorant, sed non serviunt eis cultu divino, nec alicui creaturae.} The Greek to which this corresponds is \textit{Acts of Nicaea II, Session 6, ACO, ser. 2, 3,3} (628,15 – 18 Lamberz).
\item[40] At the first session of Chalcedon, the lay chairmen defended Theodoret’s participation on the grounds that he had been restored to his see by the pope (ACO 2,1,1 [70,1–3 Sch.]).
\end{footnotes}
Constantinople II was an example of papal resistance, and then capitulation, to Byzantine pressure, which left Rome humiliated and the churches of Italy divided. But Constantinople III is a prime case of a theology (in this case dyotheletism) being imposed on the Byzantine Church as a result of Roman demands. The case is similar, though less extreme, in the case of Nicaea II: doubtless the restoration of icon veneration was generally popular, but its adoption, despite opposition among both bishops and the army, was motivated primarily by the desire of a weak imperial regime to win the support of Rome and the West; that the aim of the council was primarily to please Rome is suggested by the fact that the sole early copy of the Acts was produced for despatch to Rome.\textsuperscript{41} To conclude, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the principal work of many of the ecumenical councils was not to advance and vindicate Greek theology, but to impose the doctrines championed by Rome on a reluctant Byzantine Church.
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ACO 2,1,3 = Eduard Schwartz (ed.), \textit{Concilium Universale Chalcedonense 1,3: Actiones VIII–XVII. 18–31} (ACO 2,1,3), Berlin 1935.

ACO 2,2,1 = Eduard Schwartz (ed.), \textit{Concilium Universale Chalcedonense 2,1: Collectio Novariensis de re Eutychis} (ACO 2,2,1), Berlin 1932.


\textsuperscript{41} In Rome it was immediately translated into Latin, and thereby reached the Franks. There is nothing to suggest similar circulation in the East prior to the ninth century.


*Libri Carolini* = Ann Freeman (ed.), *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini)* (MGH.Conc 2, Suppl. 1), Hanover 1998.
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