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More than a hundred years ago Friedrich Loofs compiled and published the extant parts of Nestorius’ writings, and soon afterwards Paul Bedjan published a Syriac translation of his work Liber Heraclidis. Those two publications had commenced, on a broad scale, a new stage in the research on Nestorius and his teaching. The successive monographs, published frequently in the atmosphere of hot debate, as well as the regular publishing of the Syriac sources, had caused that the figure of Nestorius, and particularly his theological views, are better known today than a century ago. Due to the theological significance of the Nestorian dispute, the questions regarding his biography had been relegated into the background and, with a few exceptions, did not constitute the primary aspect of the research devoted to him. This article is an attempt to represent the life of the bishop of Constantinople (Istanbul) after his deposition in 431.

Sources

We possess a sufficiently ample collection of source information concerning Nestorius, which is due to the importance of the Christological dispute, of which he had been a protagonist. However, the items of information relevant to his life are most often dependant on the Christological option of their authors. Throughout the centuries, Nestorius had continued to be the person arousing extreme emotions, which had left a clear trace in the sources. His figure had been shaped, by both his adherents and opponents, so as to create either an image of a heresiarch or a saint. The Nestorian tradition portrays the bishop as a second John Chrysostom - a martyr, another victim of Egyptian hubris. On the other hand, the Monophysite and Chalcedonian tradition depicts the figure of Nestorius as a second Arius, making him resemble one of the greatest heretics in history. One should
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3 About the research done thus far, devoted to biographical aspects of the figure of Nestorius, see R. Kosiński, “Dzieje Nestoriusza, biskupa Konstantynopola w latach 428-431”, [in:] Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia Źródłoznawcze, ed. P. Janiszewski, R. Wiśniewski, Warszawa 2008.

therefore approach the credibility of the information contained therein with considerable caution.

The oldest source describing the story of Nestorius is the account by Socrates of Constantinople. Although the author’s attitude towards Nestorius is negative, his dislike has no dogmatic grounds, as it results from the politics that he had pursued towards heterodox groups\(^5\).

The sources of the Nestorian origin comprise, first of all, the works written by Nestorius himself; they are however preserved only in few fragments. The most important of them is the autobiographical Tragedy, mentioned by Ebed-Jesu, metropolitan bishop of Nisibis and Armenia (died in 1318), in his index of biblical and ecclesiastical writings\(^6\). There are only some extant fragments contained in Evagrius Scholasticus and Severus of Antioch\(^7\). The Tragedy, nevertheless, had probably served Barhadšešabba (along with Ecclesiastical History of Socrates, Liber Heraclidis and, probably, the History of the life of Nestorius; by Ireneus of Cyrus) in writing his Ecclesiastical History, written at the end of the 6th or in the beginning of the 7th century\(^8\). Barhadšešabba presents the story of Nestorius’ life in chapters 20 - 30. The story is constructed in the form of an apology of the bishop of Constantinople. An earlier source is an anonymous letter to Cosmas, written probably after 451\(^9\). In his letter, the author describes the life of Nestorius, with a particular emphasis on proving his sanctity, especially through descriptions of miraculous interventions of the saint. The so-called Syriac legend of Nestorius, published in 1910 from a 16-th century manuscript, which appears to draw on Barhadšešabba’s History, has a similarly apologetic character\(^10\). It provides the information on Nestorius’ reformist activity in Constantinople, his conflict with Cyril, as well as his life during the exile in Egypt. Another source is the Chronicle of Seert, or the so-called Nestorian History, written in Arabic by an anonymous author after 1036. Unfortunately, the extant pieces of the work describe the periods from
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\(^8\) La seconde partie de l’histoire de Barhadšešabba ‘Arbāia et controverse de Théodore de Mopsueste avec les macédoniens, text syriaque édité et traduit par F. Nau, PO 9, Paris 1913, pp. 493-677. About the author and his work, see L. Abramowski, Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius, pp. 33-73.

\(^9\) The letter consists of two parts: the first had been written probably after 435, and afterwards it was elaborated after Nestorius’ death, cf. F. Nau, „Introduction“, [in:] Documents pour servir à l’histoire de l’Église nestorienne, textes syriaques édités et traduits par F. Nau, PO 13, Paris 1916, p. 273 (the text of the letter published on pp. 275-286).

251 to 422 and from 484 to 680. It contains therefore only some minor mentions referring to Nestorius, in a purely hagiographic style.

On the other hand, in a broad collection of Monophysite tales about Nestorius, one of the most interesting is certainly a collection of anecdotes – *Plerophoria* – by John Rufus, written at the time of Severus’ episcopacy in Antioch (Antakya), i.e. in the years 512-518. The image of Nestorius represented therein is overwhelmingly negative. Other accounts of the Monophysite origin can be found in a Syriac translation of the *History* by Zachariah of Mytilene, written probably in the years 492 – 495, *History of the Patriarchs of the Church of Alexandria*, attributed to Mawhub ibn Mansūr, dating back to the 11-th century and based on the older texts and the *Chronicle of Michael the Syrian*, dating to the second half of the 12-th century.

Similarly, the Chalcedonian tradition has a distinctly negative approach towards Nestorius. Evagrius Scholasticus, one of the chroniclers mentioned above, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, had included, along with the sections of the Nestorian origin, also other traditions devoted to Nestorius. Other chroniclers writing on the subject of Nestorius’ life are Theodorus Anagnostes (died after 527) and Theophanes the Confessor, who had used Theodorus’ work (died after 947). Another Chalcedonian source – *Spiritual Meadow* by John Moschos, dating back to the beginning of the 7-th century, presents one of the versions of the bishop of
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Constantinople’s death\textsuperscript{19}. There is less information about Nestorius in the \textit{Universal History}, written in Arabic around 942 by Agapius (died in 941), melchite bishop of Hierapolis at Osrhoene\textsuperscript{20}.

The above-mentioned sources are supplemented by an assortment of minor mentions, collections of epistles, polemic writings and council documents, in which there is plenty of information important for the biography of Nestorius\textsuperscript{21}.

**The Council of Ephesus and the deposition of Nestorius\textsuperscript{22}**

Nestorius was deposed from the see of Constantinople on 22 June 431 as a result of the resolutions passed by the assembly of 155 bishops at Ephesus, led by the patriarch of Alexandria - Cyril\textsuperscript{23}. The bishops had placed an anathema both upon him and those who would remain in communion with him\textsuperscript{24}. Subsequently, Cyril announced a deposition of Nestorius\textsuperscript{25}. Cyril had also sent a series of letters addressed to the priests of Constantinople\textsuperscript{26} and to the people in the capital city close to Cyril, informing them of the decisions taken by the assembly\textsuperscript{27}. The deposition


\textsuperscript{23} Cf. ACO I,4, pp. 31-32. On the subject of the first session, see A. de Halleux, „La première session du concile d’Éphèse (22 juin 431)“, \textit{Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses} 69 (1993), pp. 48-87.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. ACO I,1,2, pp. 31-36. Nestorius makes an excuse in \textit{Liber Heraclidis} that appearing before the Cyrilian assembly would have put his life in jeopardy. \textit{cf.} Nestorius, LH p. 134. For an account of the fruitless attempts of calling Nestorius to appear, see ACO I,1,2, pp. 10-12.

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. ACO I,1,2, pp. 54-64. The deposition of Nestorius was signed by 197 bishops; therefore, the number of participants in the assembly had increased since the moment of its opening.

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. ACO I,1,2, pp. 64-65: the letter was addressed to the bishops Comarios and Potamon, who had come to Constantinople from Alexandria in December 430, archimandrite Dalmiatos and the presbyters Timotheos and Eulogios.
decree had also been presented in public, on the Ephesian agora. However, a representative of the emperor Theodosius II, Candidianos, had considered the first session of the Council as invalid; it was also contested by Nestorius and the second episcopal assembly, led by the patriarch of Antioch, John.

At the end of June the letters of Nestorius and patriarch John had reached the capital. Theodosius responded by sending, on 29 June, a letter to Ephesus, in which he had rejected the decisions taken by Cyril’s assembly. On the first of July, however, the news of Nestorius’ deposition reached Constantinople, which resulted in demonstrations of his adversaries, who had begun to celebrate the news by praising God and singing psalms. When the demonstration had arrived at the imperial palace, Theodosius II invited the leaders of the monks, led by Dalmatios, to come inside. After the meeting at the palace, Dalmatios and the crowd went to St. Mokios’ church, where Cyril’s letter, addressed to his followers at the capital, was read out; also recounted was the meeting with Theodosius, who, according to the archimandrites, had not taken any binding decision – even though Nestorius himself claimed that as a result of the meeting the emperor had changed his attitude towards him and agreed to his deposition. According to Nestorius’ account, the arrival of the famous archimandrite, who had not left his monastery for 48 years, had made a great impression on the emperor; in my opinion, however, the important thing was - most of all - to display, in a mass street demonstration, the scale of the opposition to Nestorius, which the emperor could not ignore.

On the same day, a delegation of Cyril’s assembly had departed from Ephesus to Constantinople. The delegation arrived at the capital on 3 July. The representatives of Cyril had endeavoured to gain for him various officials in authority, which they managed to achieve with at least partial success. Some of the officials did not see the point in supporting Nestorius when his position was becoming weaker and weaker, especially with the opponents of the bishop gaining the dominance in the city. This state of affairs may be confirmed by an account of comes Ireneus, Nestorius’ friend, who had arrived at Constantinople on Sunday, 5 July. He claims that he could not reach the palace for a long period of time for fear of losing his life.

Upon hearing the news of the arrival of Cyril’s delegates, the people and the clergy had gathered on Saturday, the fourth of July, at the Great Church, where
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28 That decree was torn up by comes Candidianos, who announced that the deposition of Nestorius had been passed in violation of the emperor’s orders, cf. ACO I,1.5, p. 120.
29 Cf. ACO I,4, p. 33.
30 Cf. ACO I,1.5, pp. 119-124. John’s synod had also commenced with the formal reading of the sacra by comes Candidianos.
31 Cf. ACO I,1.3, pp. 46-47.
32 Cf. ACO I,1.3, pp. 9-10. The sacra had been brought to Ephesus on the first of July, cf. ACO I,1.5, p. 131.
34 Cf. Nestorius, LH pp. 272-278.
35 Cyril and his bishops had greatly appreciated Dalmatios’ anti-Nestorian activity, which they expressed in their letter to the archimandrite, cf. ACO I,1.7, pp. X-XI.
36 Cf. ACO I,1.5, p. 135. About Ireneus, see PLRE II, pp. 624-625.
they called on the emperor to read out in public the deposition of Nestorius. Theodosius sent referendarios Domitian to the assembled with the information that the deposition of Nestorius had indeed been received from Ephesus and it would be announced on the following day. On 5 July, Domitian had officially read out the depositions of Nestorius, as well as Cyril and Memnon.

After these events the emperor, accompanied by his officials, had met with the representatives of both parties, trying to convince them to cooperate. However, the emperor’s officials were divided on the issue of taking appropriate measures. One group had suggested that all three depositions be accepted, whereas others were of the opinion that they should be made invalid and the representatives of both parties should come to Constantinople and continue to discuss the matters of faith. Others also proposed that a special emperor’s commission be sent to Ephesus. According to Ireneus’ account, the emperor had not taken any binding decision yet at the time of the meeting.

Around 10 July the pope’s legates had come to Ephesus, - the bishops Arcadius, Projectus and the presbyter Philip, who had signed their names on the resolutions of Cyril’s assembly, concerning Nestorius. It was only after 22 July that John, comes sacrarum largitiorum, had arrived at Ephesus from Constantinople, who had been appointed to watch, from then on, over the events at Ephesus, on behalf of the emperor. He decided to remove the most controversial people from the assembly, in order to resume the proceedings. He had called therefore on the leaders of both parties to come to his seat for a meeting, where he read out the sacra of Theodosius II. The document had recognized the depositions of Nestorius, Cyril and Memnon, who had been ordered to be put in custody. Comes John had then encouraged the rest of the bishops to proceed with the joint session in the interest of peace and unity. On the same day Nestorius had been placed in custody by the guard of comes Candidianos. John of Antioch and the bishops had written letters to the churches of the East, where they expressed their contentment at the arrest of Cyril and Memnon, with no mention of the fact that the same fate also concerned Nestorius.

Nestorius had remained in custody only for a little more than one month, as on 4 September 431, upon Nestorius’ repeated requests, the emperor had agreed to his leaving Ephesus and returning, as soon as possible, to Euprepios’ monastery at
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38 This figure is not known in other sources, cf. PLRE II, p. 370.
41 On Projectus, see Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, pp. 1855-1857.
42 On Philip, see Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, pp. 1786-1792.
44 Cf. ACO, I,4, pp. 57-58.
Antioch. Withdrawing to the monastery not in consequence of the council’s resolutions but on his own request, had been a sort of blow to the plans of Nestorius’ opponents. Maximian, consecrated on 25 October 431, had become the new bishop of Constantinople.

The fate of Nestorius after the deposition

Despite the consecration of the new bishop of Constantinople, it was until 433 that the majority of the Eastern bishops had refused to put an anathema upon the deposed bishop and accept his deposition. In a dialogue, however, maintained after the Council between John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria, the latter had demanded that categorically. Finally, the patriarch of Antioch, along with the bishops loyal to him, had signed the document called the Formulary of Reunion, which had finally sealed Nestorius’ fate. Despite that act many bishops continued to refuse to condemn him: among them, Theodoret of Cyrus, Alexander of Hierapolis (Manbij), Andrew of Samosata (Samsat).

Nestorius himself was of the opinion that the Formulary of Reunion of 433 had been enforced by the emperor, even though we do not know anything about any Nestorius’ attempts to oppose it. He continued to be a moral authority for his followers, and his presence in Antioch had posed a certain threat to implementing the signed agreement. Many bishops continued to refuse to accept the Formulary of Reunion, what is more, after the death of bishop Maximian in April 434 the rumours appeared of Nestorius’ being restored to his former bishopric. It became clear for the court that the situation would not calm down as long as Nestorius, staying at Antioch, could have any influence on the affairs of the church. This situation was also troublesome for the patriarch John, who is accused explicitly by

46 Cf. ACO I,1,7, p. 71, and also Nestorius, LH pp. 280-281, Nestoriana: die Fragmenta des Nestorius, p. 194, Barhadbešabba Arbaïa, HE 25 (pp. 555-556) and La légende syriaque de Nestorius, p. 21. See also N. N. Seleznyov, Nestorij i Cerkov’ Vostoka, Moscow 2005, p. 32.


52 Cf. ACO L, p. 170 and Vita Hypatii 39,1 (p. 232). Cf. also N. N. Seleznyov, Nestorij i Cerkov’ Vostoka, p. 34.

the Nestorian sources of being envious of Nestorius’ popularity and involved in causing his exile.\footnote{Cf. \textit{La légende syriaque de Nestorius}, p. 21. In his \textit{Ecclesiastical History} Evagrius writes that John informed the authorities that Nestorius continued to teach his views, suggesting that John had been behind banishing his former friend from Antioch, cf. Evagrius \textit{HE} I 7. Theophanes writes explicitly that John had asked the emperor to banish him (Nestorius) from the East, cf. Theophanes AM 5925.}

The actual situation had been the basis for a series of depositions of those who had been consistently against the 	extit{Formulary of Reunion} and led to the issue of the emperor’s constitution, on 3 August 435, directed by Theodosius II against Nestorius’ adherents, called “simonians” by the emperor.\footnote{Cf. ACO I,4, pp. 203-204 – the deposition of the fourteen bishops who refused to enter into communion with John of Antioch. Some of them had also been put in a place of exile: Alexander of Hierapolis at Fomothin in Egypt, Doroteus of Markianopolis (Devnya) at Caesarea (Kayseri) in Cappadocia, and Meletios of Mopsuestia (Misis) at Melitene (Malatya) in Armenia.} The constitution had forbidden both possessing and reading Nestorius’ writings against the orthodox religion or decisions of the Ephesus Council; such works were ordered to be burnt. Nestorius had been deprived of his material property and had to move to a place of exile at Petra.\footnote{Cf. \textit{CH} XVII,66 and \textit{CJ} I,3.6. Cf. also the Greek text in ACO I,1,3, p. 68. Following the emperor’s constitution, a letter of three prefects had also been issued against Nestorius’ adherents and his works, cf. ACO I,1,3, pp. 69-70.} The date of his banishment remains disputable; most probably, however, the exile followed and supplemented the emperor’s constitution, and therefore it should be dated in the second half of the year 435.\footnote{Cf. ACO I,1,3, p. 67. In Nestorius’ times Petra was situated in Palæstina Tertia; it was also the capital of that province, cf. W. E. Kaegi, A. Kazhdan, “Petra”, [in:] \textit{The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium}, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, New York – Oxford 1991, pp. 1642-1643.} Also sentenced to the exile at Petra was Nestorius’ friend, \textit{comes} Ireneus, most likely in the same period as Nestorius.\footnote{However, Eduard Schwartz recognized that the most probable date of Nestorius’ exile is 436, cf. ACO, I,4, p. XL. A similar view is also shared by André-Jean Festugière, \textit{cf. Ephèse et Chalcédoine, Actes des conciles}, trad. A.-J. Festugièrè, Paris 1982, note 2 on p. 414 and Fergus Millar, cf. F. Millar, \textit{A Greek Roman Empire. Power and Belief under Theodosius II} (408-450), Los Angeles 2006, pp. 176-179. The imperial decree had been addressed to the praetorian prefect and consul Isidor, who had held that latter office in the year 436, cf. PLRE II, pp. 631-633. Agapius mentions that Nestorius had been exiled during the twenty-ninth year of Theodosius II’s reign, which would correspond to AD 436/437, cf. Agapius, \textit{Universal History}, p. 415. But Barhadbesabba mentions that after his resignation Nestorius had been staying at Antioch for 4 years, which would mean that he had been transferred to Petra in the second half of 435, cf. Barhadbesabba Arbaïa, \textit{HE} 30 (p. 586). A detailed account of the doubts referring to the datation of Nestorius’ exile in: G. A. Bevan, \textit{The Case of Nestorius: Ecclesiastical Politics in the East}, 428-451 CE, pp. 274-278.} Petra had not been the final place of exile for the deposed bishop and it appears that after a relatively brief period of time, after his first exile, sometime in 435 – 440, he was transferred to the Great Oasis (nowadays known as Khargêh) in Egypt and perhaps placed at one of the monasteries there.\footnote{According to a section of Nestorius’ letter to the governor of the Bavarne, he was supposed to stay at the oasis called Oasis of His, cf. Evagrius, \textit{HE} I 7.} According to the letter

\footnote{Socrates of Constantinople had known about the fact of putting Nestorius at the Oasis, cf. Socrates, \textit{HE} VII 34,11. Both he and the other authors do not mention placing Nestorius at Petra, mostly writing only about his exile at the Oasis, cf. Evagrius, \textit{HE} I 7, Theophanes, AM 5925, Barhadbesabba Arbaïa, \textit{HE} 30.
written by Nestorius to the comes of Thebaid, quoted by Evagrius in his Ecclesiastical History, during one of the raids by a nomad tribe called Blemmyes (or some other nomad Nubian tribe – the Nobades) the Great Oasis had been ransacked and the invaders captured many of its inhabitants, including Nestorius himself. The Blemmyes had then, unexpectedly, released their captives, warning them also that the area where they had been staying would be plundered by a Libyan tribe, the Mazici. The events mentioned here may have taken place in 444, when the Mazici had attacked and destroyed the monastery at Scetis. Nestorius had therefore gone, together with the fugitives, to Panopolis (Akhmīm), where he informed the authorities of his presence there, in order to avoid being suspected of escaping his exile. The governor of Thebaid ordered him to move, escorted, to the island Elephantine, at the southern fringes of Egypt; yet before he managed to get there, he had been called back to Panopolis and then placed near the city, perhaps in the fortress Sinbelğe. While he had been staying there, another order was issued to move him to an unidentified location.

---


63. The official to whom Nestorius had addressed his letter, called by Evagrius as hegoumenos was probably the præses of Thebaid, cf. F. Millar, A Greek Roman Empire, p. 181 (dux et comes of Thebaid).

64. In his letters to the governor of Thebaid, Nestorius calls the attackers “Blemmyes” in one letter, and “Nobades” in the other. The context, however, indicates that he describes the same event.


69. Cf. Evagrius, HE I 7. The place in question may have been Saclan, mentioned by Eutychios in the Annals as Nestorius’ place of burial, cf. PG 111, col. 1033.
The most doubts and controversies among historians arise as to the time and place of Nestorius’ death. In relating the last moments of the former bishop of Constantinople, the sources are very strongly marked with the intent of conveying the propaganda message, showing that Nestorius had died in a manner similar to the heretic Arius (Monophysite and Chalcedonian traditions), or, on the contrary, among the signs attesting to his sanctity (according to the Nestorian tradition). Hence, there are considerable discrepancies in the descriptions dealing with his death, mostly of the topical character.

However, in the sources of both Monophysite and Nestorian traditions there is corresponding information that before his death Nestorius had been recalled from exile by the emperor Marcian69. Only the Chalcedonian sources do not mention this information in order to avoid connecting the ruler, an important figure for Chalcedonians, with a heretic70. This exceptional correspondence between both traditions results from the view of the emperor held by the two parties. The Monophysites, for whom Marcian was a godless ruler, have been willing to connect that figure with Nestorius, for reasons completely different than the Nestorians. Only the Chalcedonians are in opposition here – Marcian had restored orthodoxy, but as there was no place for Nestorius within its framework, the information on the recalling from exile had not been mentioned in the Chalcedonian tradition.

The correspondence of the Monophysite and Nestorian traditions in the question of calling Nestorius to come to the Council does not mean, however, that such an event had actually taken place. We do not find a relevant mention in any official documents; what is more, there was not the slightest reason to do so – his rehabilitation was not desired by either Augusta Pulcheria, the initiator of the Council, or the Pope Leon, or the overwhelming majority of the participants in the Council. I think, therefore, that this tradition is not authentic, maintained by the both parties of the conflict for purely “propaganda”-related reasons. For the Nestorians, calling Nestorius to appear at Chalcedon (Kadıköy) signified his rehabilitation, for the Monophysites, on the other hand, it was the proof that the Council had restored “Nestorianism”.

Apart from the question of calling Nestorius to the Council of Chalcedon, the most doubtful issue is connected with determining the date of his death: whether he had died before the beginning of the Council, or later. The most frequently mentioned date is around the year 451, and it is broadly accepted (in conformity with the Monophysite and Nestorian traditions) that Nestorius had died on the way
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70 Cf. Evagrius, HE 1 7. Likewise, Theophanes does mention that Nestorius had been recalled from the Oasis before his death, but only to put him in another place of exile, cf. Theophanes, AM 5925. On the other hand, John Moschos mentions that messengers with the imperial letters visited Nestorius, but he does not inform about the contents of the letters, cf. John Moschos, Pratum Spirituale (Nissen) 1 (p. 355).
to the Council. Having rejected the thesis of recalling Nestorius by the emperor Marcian, there is no need to maintain the version of Nestorius’ death on the way to the Council, or recalling him from exile in consequence of the Council decisions, especially as the Council had confirmed his condemnation, even compelling a previously adamant Theodoret to accept it. Therefore, Nestorius had died at the place of his exile, which is accepted even by a majority of the sources informing about his recall, probably somewhere near Panopolis, or at that fourth, unknown, place of exile.

Determining the year of Nestorius’ death is possible thanks to the calculations by Barhadbešabba, who provides the facts of Nestorius’ life in chronological order: he was supposed to hold the office of the bishop of Constantinople for three years, then stayed at Antioch for four years, eighteen years at the Oasis – in total, 25 years of episcopacy. It would mean that Nestorius had lived until the Council of Chalcedon and died after its completion, in 452 or 453. The evidence may be found in Liber Heraclidis, where, next to recounting the events connected with the Council of Ephesus (449) and the information about the death of Theodosius II in 450, we have a mention referring to Dioscorus’ well-deserved punishment. It may be considered to be a later interpolation, or as evidence of Liber Heraclidis being written in the days of the Council, perhaps in order to present the author’s apology in connection with the Council. It is additionally confirmed by the Syriac Christological texts of the Nestorian origin, which provide that Nestorius died 22 years after the Council of Ephesus; it would also confirm that the date of his death falls around the year AD 453.

71 As stated in Monophysite sources: Zachariah of Mytilene, HE III 1 (p. 42) and Michael the Syrian, Chronicle VIII 9.
74 Cf. Nestorius, LH, p. 375. The evidence of the fact that Nestorius had lived in the period of the pivotal events of the years 449-450 is a letter he had sent to the people of Constantinople, in which he expressed his support for the teachings of the Pope Leon and Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, regarded by François Nau as authentic, cf. La lettre de Nestorius aux habitants de Constantinople, éditée par E. W. Brooks, Revue de l’Orient Chrétien 15 (1910), pp. 275-281. There is no doubt in the fact that Nestorius had lived until the Council of Ephesus in 449, which is confirmed by the outcries appearing at the Council, demanding the burning of Nestorius together with Ibas of Edessa, cf. J. Flemming, Akten der Ephesinischen Synode von Jahre 449, syrisch mit G. Hoffmanns deutscher Übersetzung und seinen Anmerkungen herausgegeben, Berlin 1917, pp. 54-55.
75 On the subject of the authenticity of the particular parts of Liber Heraclidis, see L. Abramowski, Untersuchungen zum Liber Heracleidis des Nestorius, pp. 118-134 and L. I. Scipioni, Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso. Storia, dogma, critica, Milan 1974, pp. 299-308.
Abbreviations:

- PO – *Patrologia Orientalis*, Paris 1903-
- SCH – *Sources Chrétiennes*, Paris 1941-
- CSCO – *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, Paris 1903-1949, Louvain 1950-
- CTh – *Codex Theodosianus*, edidit T. Mommsen, Berolini 1905.

Bibliography

- *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum (ACO)*
- Barhadbešabbage Arbaia, *HE* 25 (pp. 555-556).

---


Doctons pour servir à l’histoire de l’Église nestorienne, textes syriaques édités et traduits par F. Nau, PO 12, Paris 1916.


F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire*.


• Koptische Akten zum ephesinischen Konzil vom Jahre 431.
• L. Abramowski, Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius
• L. Abramowski, Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius, CSCO, t. 242.
• L. Abramowski, Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius, pp. 33-73.
• La légende syriaque de Nestorius.
• La légende syriaque de Nestorius”, Revue de l’Orient Chrétien 15 (1910)
• La seconde partie de l’histoire de Barhadbešabba ‘Arbaia et controverse de Théodore de Mopsueste avec les macédoniens, text syriaque édité et traduit par F. Nau, PO 9, Paris 1913.
• N. N. Seleznyov, Nestorij i Cerkov’ Vostoka, Moscow 2005
• Nestoriana: das Fragment des Nestorius.
• P. Allen, Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian, Louvain 1981.
• Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire.
• Pseudo-Dioscorus, A Panegyric on Macarius, Bishop of Tkōw 12, 7.