

Approved by

CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES IN THE EAST

428 to 482

Director

Examining Committee

by
Millicent Browne

Submitted as an Honors Paper
in the
Department of History

Woman's College of the University of North Carolina
Greensboro
1963

Approved by

Director

Examining Committee

History 274
June 1, 1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES IN THE EAST

428-482

I. General introduction to subject	1
II. Previous approaches to nature of Christ	2
III. Theology of Nestorian heresy	22
IV. Political world of fifth century	25
V. Religious institutions of fifth century	26
VI. Events of overthrow of Nestorian heresy in Persia, 481 A.D.	28
VII. Political history of Byzantine Empire, 481-527 A.D.	30
VIII. Temporary cessation of orthodox orthodoxy in Persia, 481 A.D.	30
IX. Nestorian reaction to Chalcedon, 451 A.D.	32
X. Reestablishment of Nestorianism in Persia, 481 A.D.	39

History 494
June 1, 1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. General introduction to subject	1
II. Previous approaches to theological questions concerning nature of Christ	4
III. Theology of Nestorian heresy	21
IV. Political world of fifth century	25
V. Religious conditions of fifth century	30
VI. Events of overthrow of Nestorian heresy to Council of Ephesus, 431 A.D.	34
VII. Political fortunes of Eutychian heresy to Council of Ephesus, 449 A.D.	40
VIII. Temporary imposition of orthodoxy on East at Council of Chalcedon, 451 A.D.	50
IX. Monophysite reaction to Chalcedon, 451-482 A.D.	55
X. Establishment of Monophysite tendency in East with publishing of <u>Henoticon</u> , 482 A.D.	59

... of Pulcheria and Marcian
... announced to creed put forth
... Eutychian populace, 477
... Timothy Salafiol for
... by court as bishop, 477, because
... and clergy of Egypt denuded a
... Monophysites led by Peter the Fuller,
... was called three times
... 481

DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES

428-482

I. Nestorianism, 428-431

- A. Nestorius made Patriarch of Constantinople, 428
 - 1. Attack by Cyril of Alexandria
 - 2. Condemnation of Nestorius and his doctrine at Council of Ephesus, 431

II. Growth of ultra-Cyrrilline or Eutychiean party, 431-451

- A. Reunion of Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch (friend of Nestorius), 433
- B. Alignment of bishops of important sees
 - 1. Eutyches--control at court through godson Chrysophius
 - 2. Dioscorus of Alexandria, pro-Eutyches
 - 3. Flavian of Constantinople, anti-Eutyches
 - 4. Domnus of Antioch, anti-Eutyches
 - 5. Leo of Rome, anti-Eutyches
 - 6. Theodoret of Cyrros, Ibas of Edessa, Irenaeus of Tyre, anti-Eutyches
- C. Attack of Eutychieans on rivals--Irenaeus, Ibas deposed; Theodoret confined to his diocese
- D. Attack on Eutyches, his condemnation at Council of Constantinople, 448
- E. Triumph of Eutychieans at Council of Ephesus, 449

III. Establishment of Eutychiean tendency in East, 451-482

- A. Temporary triumph of anti-Eutychieanism
 - 1. Death of Theodosius II, 450; accession of Pulcheria and Marcian
 - 2. Council of Chalcedon, 451, bishops acquiesced to creed put forth by pope and enforced by court
- B. Reaction to Chalcedon
 - 1. Alexandria
 - a. Dioscorus, d. 454
 - b. Proteruis, massacre by pro-Eutychiean populace, 457
 - c. Struggle between Timothy Aelurus and Timothy Solofaciol for see, 457-477
 - d. Peter Mongus recognized by court as bishop, 477, because populace of Alexandria and clergy of Egypt demanded a Monophysite.
 - 2. Antioch
 - a. Martyrius, 460-470, Monophysites led by Peter the Fuller, who was bishop three times and was exiled three times
 - b. Stephen killed by populace, 481

Patriarchs of Constantinople

c. Peter the Fuller finally installed by government to get peace

3. Jerusalem

- a. Juvenal, d. 458, pro-Eutyches
- b. Anastasius (458-478), pro-Eutyches
- c. Martyrius (478-486), anti-Chalcedon

4. Constantinople

- a. Anatolus, (449-458), anti-Eutyches
- b. Gennadius (458-471), anti-Eutyches
- c. Acacius (471-489), wrote Henoticon for Zeno, realized must compromise with strength of Monophysites

Dioscorus, 444-454

C. Henoticon, 482, issued by Zeno--retreat from Chalcedon, to pacify East. All important sees held by Monophysites at this time.

Timothy II Aelurus, 457, exiled 437-479, 475-477

John Talis, 482

Peter Mongus, 477-490

Patriarchs of Antioch

Theodotus, 421-428

John, 428-441

Domnus, 441-449

Maximus, 449-455

Isidore, 455-458

Acacius, 458-460

Martyrius, 460-470

Peter the Fuller, 470, (kept by monks 470-475), 475-476

Julian, 470-475

John Codonatus, 477

Stephen, 478-480

Calandion, 481-485

Patriarchs of Jerusalem

Juvenal, 418-458

Anastasius, 458-478

Martyrius, 478-486

Bishops of Rome

Celestine I, 422-432

Sixtus III, 432-440 (Sixtus)

Leo I, 440-461

Silvester, 461-468

Simplicius, 468-483

Felix III, 483-492

Patriarchs of Constantinople

Nestorius, 428-421
Maximian, 431-434
Proclus, 434-446
Flavian, 446-449—power 441-450 THE EAST
Anatolius, 449-458
Gennadius, 458-471
Acacius, 471-489

Patriarchs of Alexandria

Cyril, 412-444
Dioscorus, 444-454
Proterius, 454-457
Timothy Salofaciol, 457-482
Timothy II Aelurus, 457, exiled 457-475, 475-477
John Talia, 482
Peter Mongus, 477-490

Patriarchs of Antioch

Theodotus, 421-428
John, 428-441
Domnus, 441-449
Maximus, 449-455
Basil, 455-458
Acacius, 458-460
Martyrius, 460-470
Peter the Fuller, 470, (kept by monks 470-475), 475-476
Julian, 470-475
John Codonatus, 477
Stephen, 478-480
Calendion, 481-485

Patriarchs of Jerusalem

Juvenal, 418-458
Anastasius, 458-478
Martyrius, 478-486

Bishops of Rome

Caelestine I, 422-432
Sixtus III, 432-440 (Sixtus)
Leo I, 440-461
Hilary, 461-468
Simplicius, 468-483
Felix III, 483-492

doctrinal development.

Since the beginning of the Christian era, the Church has

CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES IN THE EAST

428-482

Few periods of history have had as wide and as lasting an effect on the thinking of the post-Greco-Roman world as the fifth century. Politically and economically in almost continual confusion, religiously at the mercy of selfish men and jealous factions, this era nevertheless gave to the Christian world one of her most solid and essential foundations of faith. Had the minds of this century not turned to the questions inherent in the Church's yet dimly-defined views on the nature of Christ, the task of definition and clarification would have been left to theologians of later generations with poorer preparation under more difficult circumstances or would have been set aside--perhaps permanently--to the bewilderment of masses of Christians and the confusion of centuries of philosophers and saints. Whether or not the majority of twentieth-century Christians find problems of a Christological nature of vital interest; whether or not the great number of unbelievers produced by the philosophical and scientific developments of the modern era find little of value in any aspect of an out-dated religion, the fact is inescapable that the concept of the founder of the faith held by the whole Christian world for sixteen centuries was a paramount and basic factor in molding every phase of Western religious thinking and in touching the lives of centuries of Christians in a way so fundamental as to seem indescribable. If Christianity's uniqueness as a religion lies in her constant belief that God became man and for the salvation of humanity lived on earth in an historical time, then the working out of the problems involved in this belief is surely one of the most vital to the story of Christianity's

doctrinal development. replaced by the divine logos, the intelligence existing

Since the beginning of the Christian era, the followers of Jesus have remembered Him through tradition as a man who lived on earth, working, teaching, and suffering; and at the same time they have looked to Him through faith as the Son of God, interceding, hearing prayers, and touching the hearts of men. The belief that Christ partook equally of the natures of both God and man, that He was at the same time completely divine and completely human lies at the very center of the Christian religion; and Christians in nearly every age have accepted the mystery of the God-man as something inexplicable but true, too paradoxical to be understood but too essential to be ignored. A paradox as powerful as that of a being's combining in one Person the two sharply antithetical essences of Godhead and manhood simply could not have passed through nearly twenty centuries of acceptance without undergoing at least once a thorough and even violent examination, when all logical explanations were brought to bear upon it in an effort to define and clarify the seemingly inadequate teachings of Scripture and tradition. Accepting the recording of Christ's earthly life, His miracles, and the teaching of His Sonship with the Father from both the Scriptures and from tradition, the Christian is still left with many questions regarding the relationship of God and man in Christ and the union of the divine and human natures in Him. Did God in becoming man assume a human body only--was earthly flesh enough to assure His identification with humanity, or was another element of man needed to complete this? Did Christ have a human soul as well as human flesh? Did He partake, too, of the rational spirit or logos of man, and did He possess the necessity to grow in moral stature, the ability to make free decisions, and the freedom to sin? If it were impossible for Him to have had these faculties and thus for Him to have had provided an age ready to make final decisions with a stepping-off place from which

a human logos, was this replaced by the divine Logos, the intelligence existing with God from eternity? Assuming these points concerning His humanity to be settled, many more arise about the degree to which His divinity and humanity combine and relate to each other. Did they remain separate and distinct--even parallel--so that certain qualities and actions could be attributed to one nature and not to the other; or did the Godhead engulf and transform the manhood so that it (the Godhead) was essentially the only vital part of Christ's person? Answering these questions to the satisfaction of the most active minds of an age acutely sensitive to theological problems, and defining the orthodox position to the satisfaction of both East and West was the task with which theologians of the fifth century were faced and into which they were called upon to pour all their energies, skills, and passions. *the man Jesus?* were the

Not since the upheavals caused by the trinitarian heresies of the preceding century had the beliefs of the Church been so challenged and the passions of the faithful of all positions been so aroused as they were by attempts put forth from 428-482 to obtain logical yet pious answers to the questions concerning Christ's role as both God and man. Indeed, flowing necessarily and logically from conclusions reached in wrestling with the fourth-century Arian heresy, the Christological problems themselves were far more complicated than the trinitarian; and they called forth discussions of a more subtle nature than the Church had seen before. The "razor-edge of orthodoxy," always precariously thin, was even more hazardous when only the slightest intonation of phrasing could, in hostile eyes, throw the entire meaning of an argument into the category of heresy. The figures participating in these debates had need of the background of Christology which the Church had already come to possess: even though the explanations put forth up to this time were confusing or incomplete, they nevertheless provided an age ready to make final decisions with a ~~stepping-off~~ place from which

to begin. Previous Christological development had heretofore fallen roughly into four general periods--that in which all ideas of Christ as relating to either God or man were extremely primitive, nebulous and ill-defined; that in which the reality of His earthly flesh was accepted; and that in which His consubstantiality with the Father, or His full deity, was affirmed. These movements forward in the building of a complete conception of the nature of the Son of God were at times so simple as to seem to later generations almost ridiculous, while at other times they offered major additions to the body of doctrine which the Church was steadily accumulating. For this reason it is imperative that each of these developments be examined in sufficient detail to furnish background for the problems of the fifth century.

The earliest answers to the question "Who was the man Jesus?" were the explanations of simple people who had had personal contact with Him themselves or whose information about Him had been gathered from sources equally close and equally unspeculative. To them He was the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies of suffering servant¹: He was certainly as completely human as anyone else--having lived with Him they could not doubt this--but His relationship with God was uncertain, undefined. The writers of three of the gospels explained this relationship by making Him the Son of God by adoption. St. Mark dated this adoption of Jesus to sonship with the Father from the time of His baptism--by virtue of His sinless life, He was rewarded by a share in the divinity.² St. Matthew and St. Luke go farther back in Christ's life and explain His sonship as existing from the very moment of His supernatural conception--God anticipated the virtue of this man and rewarded Him from the beginning of His life with divine insight and power. These early theories were, however, only the simple explanations of minds that were unversed in either

theology or philosophy and that were not primarily concerned with developing a systematic Christology. More thorough and more subtle developments were to come.³

The identification of Christ with the concept of the Logos (Word) from Greek philosophy was one of the earliest and—given the attention of educated minds—one of the most logical developments in Christology. First mentioned in the sixth century B. C. by Heraclitus, the Logos was explained to be the universal principle which animates and rules the world. Heraclitus did not, as did the later Stoics and neo-Platonists, conceive of the Logos as some imperfect manifestation of God or as an intermediary agent between God and His universe: rather, he simply identified it with fire. Neither Plato or Aristotle concerned themselves with the idea of the Logos, since their systems pictured the universe as dualistic and God as transcendent, whereas the Logos theory fitted into a system of materialistic monism. The Stoics in the third century B. C. accepted the Logos from Heraclitus and added the idea that through it, God penetrates and lives in the universe. God "did not make the world as an artisan does his work, but it is by wholly penetrating all matter that He is the demi-urge of the universe."⁴ At the same time, the neo-Platonists adopted the Logos idea, harmonizing it with their concept of a transcendent God by making it the intermediary agent by which God governs the world. These, then, were the early ideas of the Logos. Having added to the primitive beginning of Heraclitus, the Greek world passed to Christianity the concept of the Logos as an intermediary between God and the world through which He created and rules it and through which, too, men can approach Him. In the New Testament the term Logos itself is found only in the works of St. John; but writing before him, St. Paul was the first to identify the Greek concept of the Logos with the man Jesus of

Christian faith. In his epistles to the Corinthians, the Colossians, and the Hebrews, St. Paul goes far beyond the primitive beliefs of the gospel writers: his knowledge of Greek philosophy provided him with a more satisfactory explanation to the mystery of Christ's relation to God than that of adoption. He attributed to Christ two of the important functions of the Logos—that of assisting in creation⁵ and that of mediating between God and His creatures.⁶ While Paul never used the actual term Logos in referring to Christ, he definitely had the Logos concept in mind that there can be no doubt that his Christology introduced a new element into Christian thinking. It was St. John, however, who made the transition complete by not only referring to Jesus in terms of the earlier philosophy but by actually naming Him as God the Word. John calls Christ the "Word of life" in 1 John 1:1; and in the best-known and perhaps most beautiful passage in his writing, the first chapter of his gospel, he makes the identification of Jesus with the Word of God that gives Christians of all times a simple and profound summation of their belief in Him. John calls Him the Word, says that He created and sustains the world, and rejoices in the fact that He will mediate between the Father and His creatures.⁷ To John, however, the important issue was not so much to show Christ as the Logos of Greek tradition but to prove Him to be a personal savior, the Son of God. He says that "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us....full of grace and truth."⁸ John saw that the Christian concept of Christ as an actual person, a living being, must of necessity differ from those parts of pre-Christian philosophy which thought of the Logos as only an impersonal idea, a creative power or a regulatory principle. The Jesus of Christian experience had actually become man and had lived on earth; He was remembered vividly by hundreds of people as a Person with Whom they had worked and talked; He had been experienced

by hundreds more since His death as a powerful savior—He was to Christians a "concrete and living personality."⁹ Neither did John accept Christ as an intermediary between the divine and human in the same sense that the neo-Platonists pictured the Logos—a being with neither full divinity nor full humanity, partly creature and partly creator, neither without beginning as God is nor created in time as man was. Christ was to John not an intermediary, but a mediator: He did not share incompletely in divinity and humanity but partook fully of them both, uniting them in His Person.¹⁰ From St. John the Christian world received a very essential foundation for her Christology—a full identification of Jesus with the Logos and an expression of faith in the reality of Christ as a Person and in His role as complete God and complete man. Subsequent theologians found his expression of these ideas to be invaluable in providing a foundation upon which to expand their own ideas and a guide by which to measure the value of each addition to the body of doctrine concerning the nature of Christ.

The Logos Christology itself as introduced to the Church by St. Paul and St. John was, for at least a century after these writers, the only satisfactory interpretation of the Person and the nature of Jesus. In this period of Church history, when consolidation, organization, and relief from persecution were of primary importance, the development of Christology remained at a standstill except for attempts of several Christian writers to explain and justify their faith to non-Christians. The apologists, as they are known, who wrote during the mid-and late second century, referred to Christ as the Word but were often less than orthodox in their application of the Logos theory to Christianity. While they always held to the divine generation of the Word, as opposed to the later Arian heresy of His having been a created being subordinate to the Father, they frequently went astray in speaking of when this generation took place and

why the act of generation was necessary. Theophilus, writing g. 180, and Athenagoras, composing g. 177, "represent the Word as uttered by the Father when the Father wished to create and in view of this creation."¹¹ Such a view violates the doctrine of the Trinity, which in essence holds that the Son and Spirit were generated by the Father in the deep recesses of eternity and that the Father had no other reason for their utterance than an overflowing of divine love. St. Irenaeus, writing g. 175, holds with this orthodox interpretation and finds it necessary to reaffirm the identification of the Logos with the man Christ. He writes against those who maintain that Christ was not eternally pre-existent with His Father but was brought into being in time, at the moment of His incarnation in His mother.¹² The great theologian of the primitive Latin Church, Tertullian, and Justin Martyr, a well-known apologist, fell into difficulties concerning the Logos Christology by assigning to Christ, as the Greeks did to the Logos, a somewhat subordinate position in relation to the Father; but these particular parts of their writings are usually overlooked in view of their contributions to other phases of Christian thought. Thus we see that the pattern of adopting the Logos concept of Greek philosophy to the Christian idea of Christ was established early in the Church and was until the end of the second century the best, if not the only really satisfactory, explanation of the nature of Christ. The Church's Christology was by no means near completion, however, and many more Christological systems had to be submitted before the Church could obtain, by patient examination and evaluation, a fully-satisfactory interpretation of the nature of the Son of God.¹³ It was overthrown

Into this immaturely-developed state of doctrine existing in the mid-second century came a heresy which was at once very powerful and very pre-Christian in both its origins and its teachings. Simply because it had its roots in a

background of non-Christian, non-Jewish thinking, Gnosticism,¹⁴ when adopted to Christianity, was composed of many phases of heresy besides that concerning the nature of Christ. Although the whole Gnostic system is fascinating to the scholar of Christian doctrine, there is time here to touch on only that part of it which offers an explanation to the fact of Christ's earthly life and to His relation to God. Derived largely from Persian and Babylonian sources, Gnosticism taught a dualistic view of the universe, a sharp division between the pure world of spirit and the evil world of matter. The material world Gnostics thought to be ruled by a demi-urge; the spiritual world was presided over by an all-perfect—and as yet, unknown—God. Here it is that Gnosticism found an opening through which to adapt itself to Christianity. It gave to Christ the function of the Nous, or soul, of God which God sent to earth to reveal Himself to those few spiritually-inclined men capable of receiving this saving gnosis. Christ in this system was thus a purely spiritual being, partaking in no way of human nature (which had been corrupted by its close association with the body), nor in the flesh of man. His life on earth had thus been only an appearance, a seeming reality, and His body had been only docetic, or ghostly.¹⁵ This concept of Christ obviously ran counter to the two primary, though as yet incompletely formulated, beliefs of the Church concerning Him: by assigning to Him the role of Nous it made Him a spiritual being without giving Him full divinity, and by denying the reality of the incarnation—of His taking on human flesh and human nature—it denied His humanity also. Such a perversion of the most essential belief of Christianity was sure to be rejected by the Church. It was overthrown by the pens of orthodox writers, among whom Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria were prominent, leaving the Church stronger in hierarchical organization and surer in doctrinal teaching. After this,¹⁶ the major heresies that arose to²²

question the teachings of the Church were always of Christian origin and when they touched on Christological topics were deeper and more complex. Christians could no longer consider accepting a Christ who was obviously the adaptation to Christianity of a philosophical system or an oriental religion: beginning in the late second century, they at least started from original sources in their attempts to explain Christ, and soon their attention passed from elementary concerns such as whether He was in any way human or divine to more complicated questions as to the degree of His divinity or humanity and their relationship to each other.¹⁶

A heresy to arise soon after Gnosticism and to concern itself primarily with Christology was Monarchianism, which offered two possible solutions to the question of how Christ shared in the divinity of God. One of these was a return in more fully developed form of the primitive theory of adoption, while the other was a somewhat incomplete explanation of Christ's position in the Trinity. Although the Monarchian heresy proved a great temptation to Christian minds during the late second century and throughout the third, in the larger history of Christology it offers little that is new or challenging. Therefore there will be developed here only those phases of Monarchianism that do present Christ's divinity differently than it had heretofore been treated. Monarchians saw in the Christian assertion of the divine nature of Jesus a threat to the unity of God; and in avoiding making two gods of the One, they thought of the divine nature either as an impersonal power which entered into Christ at the time of His baptism¹⁷ or as a Person Itself, to which Christ was related only as one of the three manifestations of its activity.¹⁸ Those holding the former views were known as Dynamic¹⁹ Monarchians or Adoptionists; those holding the latter were called Modalistic Monarchians,²⁰ Sabellians,²¹ or Patripassians.²²

The Christology of Paul of Samosata and the Dynamic school was essentially the addition of Logos terminology to the teachings of St. Mark, with the strange outcome that the Christ into Whom the Logos entered at baptism was at all times less than the Logos, not fully divine as the Logos of St. Paul and of St. John had been. The position to which the Dynamic Monarchians assigned Christ was taken to its logical conclusions later by the heretic Arius and was the subject for stormy debate throughout most of the fourth century. During the third century, however, its views were simply those of adoptionism and as such were not new. The Modalistic school, in granting no distinction among the three Persons of the Trinity other than that of function, was in a strange way simply denying the existence of the Person Christ: if the divine aspect of His existence were the only one that mattered (and neither school of Monarchians spoke much of Christ's humanity), then His reality as a Person depended entirely on His divine identity; but if He were in relation to God only as a ray of sunshine is to the sun,²³ His divine identity itself would be lost and would leave Him as a very strange entity incapable of being understood or accounted for. Thus we see that although the Monarchian heresy offered several new viewpoints concerning Christ's divinity, it gave to the Church no major ideas to use in the development of her Christology. Its chief value for scholars of Christian doctrine is the fact that it assumed historical importance in the second and third centuries because of its longevity and because of the fact that in the teachings of Paul of Samosata it furnished a beginning to the great Arian heresy of the fourth century. It was another step in the evolution of the Church's Christology.²⁴

In the late second century and early half of the third (c. 185-255), the Christian world received from the pen of Origen penetrating and original contributions to nearly every phase of her thinking. Teaching at the famed catechetical

school of Alexandria from 203-233²⁵ and possessing a wide range of knowledge and interests in the field of Christian doctrine, Origen left the Church many and varied works. As will be seen in glancing at the fourth and in studying the fifth century, these periods (the fourth and fifth centuries) were quite chaotic where issues of varying theological opinion were concerned. They demanded settlement of contending opinions and forced strict conformity to one viewpoint whenever possible. Such conditions did not exist to any comparable degree in the first three centuries, when most of the Church's attention was focused on self-preservation and organization and when doctrine was still in the formative stage. The writings of many fathers of this earlier period who were later regarded as orthodox reveal on close examination portions whose contents have subsequently been rejected as unorthodox,²⁶ and Origen is one such writer. The very fact that a theologian could touch on so wide a range of topics as he did would make the finding of flaws an easy task in a lesser thinker; and although Origen was arraigned later for his writings on universal salvation, on God's eternal creation of the universe, and on the pre-existence and pretemporal fall of each soul, there is much in the vast masses of his allegorical commentaries on Scripture that has been found both orthodox and useful to the Church. Origen's Christology, however, is one area in which he fell short of what the Church later stated to be orthodox. As a member of the Alexandrian catechetical school, Origen accepted and taught the view of Christ as Logos--but his concept of the Logos differed considerably from that held by St. Paul, St. John, and the early apologists. He held strongly to many Platonic ideas, and thought of Logos in terms of the Nous or mind of God (different, however, from the Gnostic concept of Christ as Nous), which made the world and serves as mediator between it and the all-perfect God. While Origen did accept the

eternal generation of the Logos,²⁷ he assigned to it a secondary position in relation to God and thus denied full divinity to Christ.²⁸ His Christology seems closely akin to that of Paul of Samosata; and while it does differ in some aspects (Paul regarded the Logos as fully divine but did not identify Christ completely with the Logos), the conclusion—that Christ is less than God—is the same. In this way, Origen, too, contributed to the later heresy of Arianism. In another aspect of his Christology, however, Origen made a significant contribution to the position defined as orthodox in the Nestorian controversy. Although he did not develop his idea fully, Origen admitted the existence of a human soul in Christ—probably he considered a human soul to be the necessary link between the Logos and matter to bind them together. Origen also attributed free will to Christ—another issue that was later to be debated in the Christological controversies.²⁹ Although he had lost his standing as orthodox in the fourth century trinitarian controversies and in the early fifth century debates surrounding his name and thus was not valued as a trustworthy authority during the fifth-century, this great writer deserves a place in the study of Christology because of the great quantity and quality of learning which he demonstrated in the formulation of his ideas and because of the important place which he holds in the general development of Christian thinking.

The great Arian heresy, which threw the whole religious world of the fourth century into near chaos for the better part of fifty years, was a development essential for the definition of the Church's doctrine. Although it belongs usually under the heading of trinitarian, rather than Christological, discussion, a knowledge of it is indispensable to a study of fifth-century Christology. By far the most important doctrinal debate raised to date, it stirred the minds of Christian theologians to examine honestly the different interpretations of the

relationship of Christ to the Father: it settled the Church's views of this relationship with authority and raised a whole series of problems related to and of equal importance to itself. The crux of the Arian controversy was the question as to whether or not Christ was fully divine. Having been raised previous to this time in varying forms by the early gospel writers, by Tertullian, and Justin Martyr, by the Gnostics, by the Dynamic Monarchians, and by Origen, the problem had never before received the full and simultaneous attention of all the best minds of the Church. Given at this time (from c. 325-383) the proper doctrinal antecedents, a man to develop them to their logical conclusion and to publish his views, a religious world settled in external affairs and prepared to turn her attention to the internal matter of dogma, and the will of all the personalities concerned to press their views to immediate victory, a question as essential as that raised by Arius could not have failed to be solved in the fourth century. Arius' views on the nature of Christ, although they differ in detail from any that had preceded him, arrived at the same conclusion as those of Paul of Samosata and Origen—that Christ's divinity was incomplete and that He was subordinate to the Father. With the Monarchians, Arius asserted the oneness and the indivisibility of God and feared any explanation of His Son which would do violence to this oneness. He, like most theologians, turned to the Logos idea for a satisfactory way to solve this difficulty; but his concept of the Logos was quite different from any that had preceded it. Arius' system consisted of two separate Logoi, one existing eternally with the Father, uncreated, and divine; the other existing only in time, created, and God only in a secondary sense. It was this latter Logos that Arius taught became incarnate in Jesus, taking the place of His human personality and His rational soul.³⁰ Thus Arius, like many others before, offered to the Christian

world a being only semi-divine and semi-human, incapable of bringing God to man or of elevating mankind to God. Arius, like many others, had formulated an unworkable interpretation of Christ. Unlike previous instances in which such unsatisfactory theologies had been offered, however, at this time the Church was prepared and anxious to settle the question permanently and authoritatively. The vigor with which Arius' orthodox opponents expressed Christ's consubstantiality³¹ with the Father and the reverence with which the orthodox creed--when equality formulated and finally accepted--was held by the Christian world of both East and West assured the ancient Church that an epoch had passed in the history of Christian doctrine. From the fourth century until modern times, any teaching that denied Christ's divinity in any way was rejected with vigor: this area was henceforth closed to the questioning of Christians.

The passage of one epoch was followed closely and necessarily by the opening of a new one, however. From the early gospel writers' attempts to explain Christ's relationship to God by the theory of adoption; to the identification of Him with the divine, pre-existent, creating, and mediating Logos; through making Him the soul and revealer of an all-perfect God; through interpreting Him either as the subordinate temple of the divine Logos or as one of three barely distinguishable manifestations of the divine Person; to viewing Him as sharing in a partial, secondary kind of divinity, Christian thinkers had finally arrived at a definition of the Church's belief concerning the full and absolute divinity of Jesus. It had been a long and often a painful process, lasting for over four hundred years and involving the minds and energies of the Church's most able men. The creed formulated at the Council of Nicaea in 325³² and accepted by the Christian world in 382 at the Council of Constantinople³³ had at last, backed by the authority of the Church of both East and West and of the Emperor Theodosius

of the East, brought the problem to a close. Now the active minds of Eastern theologians turned immediately to the new but intimately related problem of the humanity of Christ. ~~surrounding His divinity, and they had not touched on His~~

Already raised as the discussion concerning the Arian heresy came to a close, it was soon recognized to be of equal importance to—and of greater complexity than—the question of Christ's relation to God. With the belief now unquestioningly established that Christ's relation to the Father was one of complete equality of honor and of absolute consubstantiality—He was begotten of the Father in eternity, not as a secondary or inferior God but separate in personality and ~~ity~~; identical in nature—with this belief universally accepted, the next question raised was certain to be whether or not Christ was really human too. Such a question, involving as it did factors such as the rational human soul, the freedom to make decisions, and the relationship between humanity and divinity within one Person, would have scarcely been an easy one even if it had had a long and complicated history of treatment—which it did not have. Certainly Christ's ~~with~~ humanity had been one of the most basic articles of faith underlying the Christian religion since its conception, and men for nearly four hundred years had accepted the comfort that it gave them even if they had not appreciated the complexities that it contained. At the time of Christ's earthly life and for many years after His death, it was not the fact that He was man that His followers doubted—it was His divinity which they could not understand.³⁴ He had hungered and thirsted, had talked and wept, and had lived among them in such a way as to raise no suspicions that He was not as completely human as they were themselves. For nearly a century and a half no question concerning His humanity had been raised by any major thinker; and in the mid-second century, the interpretation that Gnosticism offered was so far removed from the faith of tradition that it could never have

been accepted without making a mockery of almost two hundred years of Christian teaching. The heresies that had arisen around the nature of Christ were efforts to solve the mystery surrounding His divinity, and they had not touched on His humanity except when doing so would explain their theory of His Godhead more clearly: the adoptionists had taken for granted that He was no different from any other man with regard to the human side of His nature; the Logos theologians of the first and second centuries assumed that it was a Person with complete humanity Who was the bearer of the divine Logos; the Gnostics, making Him an intermediary, denied His full humanity much as they took away His full divinity; one school of Monarchians made Him completely human, while the other would have found any degree of humanity impossible to imagine for Him; Origen assigned to Him two of the most essential attributes of humanity; and Arius, like the Gnostics, pictured Him as midway between the two natures. By the time that the Church had emerged from the Arian heresy with a definition, she had developed a definite tendency to allow Christ as God to overshadow Christ as man. With a background of almost steady concern with the divine and without the fresh memory of the human which the apostles had possessed, she was in danger of slipping into the heresy of ignoring His humanity completely or of allowing it to be virtually swallowed up in the divine.

The Christological discussions which culminated in the fifth century had their beginning, then, in the closing years of the fourth century and were characterized by the tendency at work in the Church to belittle or to ignore Christ's humanity. Begun by a staunch opponent of Arianism, a man to whom the idea of Christ's being less than fully divine was blasphemy, the Christological battle was immediately taken up and developed quickly. Fearing for the "full true deity and perfect sinlessness of Christ by very nature,"³⁵ Apollinaris,⁴⁰

bishop of Laodicea (361-377), began his plea for Christ's absolute divinity by asserting that a real incarnation--a real uniting of divinity and humanity in one Person--was impossible because of the vast difference between the two natures.

"A perfect God and a perfect man can never make a uniform being,"³⁶ reasoned Apollinaris, for either the manhood will preserve its separateness and its own free will; the two will live separately side by side in the person, making two persons of him; or the divine will swallow up the human, allowing the person to remain perfect God but making no pretense of His being a perfect man.³⁷ Apollinaris saw Christ as the unique Person in whom the Logos was the principle of self-determination and self-consciousness: the divine Logos, perfect, all-knowing, and unchangeable, left no room for growth, change, or freedom of choice in Christ. God in Christ "assumed our nature in such a way that He made it the organ of His Godhead."³⁸ Apollinaris did not understand Biblical references to the flesh as meaning the entirety of human nature, and he interpreted St. John's "the Word was made flesh" as meaning that the Logos took on no more of humanity than its bodily appearance. Christ's life and death, he felt, could have no efficacy for us unless it was the divine alone in Him which was responsible for his actions--"death could be overcome only if it was God who suffered and died. The human is purely the passive element only, the organ of the Godhead and the object of redemption."³⁹ he can enjoy the Divine Presence for eternity. The

Objections to Apollinaris may be seen readily. By replacing the human soul in Christ by the Logos, he robbed Him of the most important element in human nature and emptied the Incarnation of its meaning: he had said in effect that God had really not become man but had only assumed human flesh. If, too, Christ had taken on the body but not the soul of man, then His death could have redeemed only the flesh, leaving to perish that which stood most in need of salvation.⁴⁰

There are several arguments in favor of Apollinaris, however. In rejecting the personality of the human nature in Christ and assigning the center of His personality to the Logos instead, Apollinaris agreed in advance with the Church's ultimate decision in these matters.⁴¹ In another respect, too, Apollinaris was in harmony with a large number of Christians, even though this agreement was more nebulous than that found in a creed or a written statement of belief. Apollinaris, in finding in Christ a perfect union of natures in which the divine was by far the more vital and more awe-inspiring, was expressing one of the most basic and subtle characteristics of the Eastern religious outlook—that of seeing Christianity as the revelation to man of God—His majesty, His power, and His perfection—and as the means by which man can cast off his humanity and be merged with God. A concept as deep and basic as this can never be systematically proven, even though it be widely felt and frequently expressed. In an effort to clarify this feeling about Greek Christianity,⁴² writers usually contrast it with Latin Christianity and characterize the latter as concerned primarily with the establishment of right relations between man and God. The Latin Church emphasizes punishment and reward, it is said, and thinks of grace as the sure payment for deeds and prayers of merit. The Roman Christian looks forward, through the accumulation of grace and the suffering of punishment due for sin, to heaven, where he can enjoy the Divine Presence for eternity. The Greek Christian, on the other hand, views grace as a share in the divine which God may permit to His creatures; and he desires to enter heaven not simply by a process of predetermined merit but by the filling and overflowing of his soul with divine love and power so that his humanity disappears and he becomes as fully pure and divine as is granted him to become. These characterizations are of course much too general in scope to be completely accurate or fully applicable—

every Greek Christian is by no means a mystic, and all Latins are certainly not hard legalists—but insofar as they indicate very broad tendencies, very general differences between East and West, they are often accepted pointing out the tendency of the Eastern Church to overlook the human in order to focus better on the divine or to merge the human into the divine.

This doctrine, [that of Apollinaris] estimated by the presuppositions and aims of the Greek conception of Christianity as a religion, is complete. Apollinaris set forth in a way that cannot be surpassed, energetically developed and numerous works untiringly repeated, with the pathos of the most genuine conviction, what at heart all pious Greeks believed and acknowledged. Every correction made on his Christology calls in question the basis or at least the vitality of Greek piety. Only this perfect unity of the person guarantees the redemption of the human race and its acquiring of a divine life. 'Oh new creation and wondrous mingling. God and flesh produced one nature! '....All else in the Redeemer is non-existent for faith. The assumption of a human separate personality in Christ does away with His power as a Redeemer. Thousands before Apollinaris felt this and had a vague idea of its truth.⁴³

Thousands after him, too, must have felt a basic sympathy with the outlook of Apollinaris, for in the long continuance and bitterness of the struggle between beliefs which seemed to exclude, on the one hand, Christ's divinity or, on the other, His humanity, the majority of the Greek world, following thinkers like Apollinaris, Cyril, or Eutyches, sided with Christologies which kept the divinity at all costs. If forced to choose between two extremes, Christologies which were Apollinarian in aim were preferred by the Greek Church because they better expressed the feelings of piety and devotion which the East felt belonged to the Savior.

Condemned in 377 by a council in Rome and again in 381 by that in Constantinople,⁴⁴ Apollinarianism as such became a heresy to be rejected under pain of excommunication. There were as yet, however, no alternate definitions

to be chosen from; and those who first attempted to counter Apollinaris only floundered in language which was itself open to question. Such was the case of the learned Cappadocian theologian, St. Gregory of Nyssa, who likened the relationship of the human nature to the divine in Christ to "a drop of vinegar mingled in the deep....sea,....the natural quality of this liquid does not continue in the infinity of that which overwhelms it."⁴⁵ This simile was later declared to contain the elements of heresy but, due to his reputation for orthodoxy in other matters and to the fact that he did not develop this idea to completion, Gregory was not condemned.

In the middle and closing years of the fourth century another Christology was being formulated which was to contain the roots of the Nestorian heresy of the next century. Produced by the general trends of the Antiochian catechetical school and developed by two of its most respected theologians, this Christology was to remain throughout the century the opposition to the Christology which found its extreme expression in Apollinarianism, Eutychianism, and Monophysitism. Diodore of Tarsus (378-394) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (392-428), in emphasizing the human nature of Christ and the separateness between the divine and the human in His Person, were following the general tendency of the school of Antioch, which has as its two main premises the belief that, on the one hand, Christ as a human being possessed a free will and that on the other the Godhead in Him was absolutely unchangeable and incapable of suffering. Quite different from the Christology of the Alexandrian school, which paid special attention to Christ's divinity and sought to prove the absolute unity of the two natures in Him, Antiochian Christology did not have as its primary basis a concern for the redemption of mankind through the death of the Incarnate Son of God. Instead, it was more speculative in nature,

seeking only to explain the contradictions inherent in the idea of God and man in one Person. Diodore and Theodore, therefore, approached the problem in the following way: since freedom of will is one of the most essential elements of human nature and unchangeability is one of the necessary attributes of the divine, the human and the divine can never, because of the incompatibility of their characteristics, combine to make a substantive union in one person. If human free will were exercised, it would limit the divine omniscience, whereas if the divine unchangeability were to be kept intact, it would prevent the exercise of the moral growth and freedom necessary to true humanity. Diodore, in attempting to explain the union of natures in Christ without doing violence to the attributes of either, held the belief that God dwelt in Jesus in the same kind of way that He did in the saints, though to a much different degree. Christ was not primarily God become man, therefore, but a man in Whom the divine chose to dwell. Diodore taught that at the time of Jesus' conception (which he, of course, attributed to the Holy Spirit) God, foreknowing that Jesus would throughout His life desire nothing but His (God's) will, bestowed on Christ the divine approval or good pleasure, allowing it to remain with Jesus for the whole of His earthly life. Thus the divine in Christ was not a substantive but a moral quality, and there was no danger either of destroying His humanity or of limiting the Godhead within Him: the human nature remained free to develop morally and the divine was neither transmuted nor limited. The core of this teaching—that God accepted Jesus by adoption—is remarkably like that of the first-century adoptionists. The theory of Diodore is of greater importance than that of the early theologians, however, because it was the product of a mature theology gleaned from a history of long discussion on the subject.⁴⁶

Diodore's viewpoint in Christology was inherited by his pupil Theodore, who developed it more fully and gave it characteristics which would later be labelled as Nestorian. Theodore's reasoning ran something like the following:

In Jesus of Nazareth the invisible Word, the Only-Begotten of the Father, manifested Himself, dwelling in the Man, and inseparably united to Him. The Man Christ...is thus the visible image of the invisible Godhead; and on account of his union with the true Son of God, he possesses the privileges of a unique adoption, so that to him also the title Son of God belongs....But if it be asked, in what sense God dwelt in this Man, we must reply that it was by a special disposition towards him, a disposition of entire complacency. God, in His uncircumscribed nature and essence, fills the universe, nay, is all in all; in Christ He dwells in the person of the Word by a moral union, so unexampled and complete, that the divine Word and the humanity which He assumed are constantly regarded as being one person.⁴⁷

Theodore, then, brought to its logical conclusion the Antiochian view that the two natures in Christ cannot, without limiting each other seriously, be brought into a true union. They were united in a moral sense only, i.e., in will, not in substance or nature, so that neither nature ever desired or willed anything except in harmony with the other. This belief in a moral union resulted in fact, if not in statement, in a distinct separation of the manhood and Godhead in Jesus and in a division of Him into two different Persons. Theodore separated the attributes, the experiences, and the acts of the two, assigning, for example, the birth, sufferings, and death to the human in such a way as to exclude any divine participation in them whatsoever.⁴⁸ Such a view violated the religious feelings of the East, since by attributing "the redemptive work of Christ....to the man Jesus and not to God,"⁴⁹ it denied the divine a share in the securing of our redemption. Such a view also led to trouble when it came into contact with the term *Theotokos*,⁵⁰ a word used by the great majority of the Greek world to express reverence and devotion to her who bore the Son of

God and thus to Him Who became incarnate through her. While its use may have been abused both before and since the fifth century, it certainly was generally understood to mean that Mary was the mother of the Person Jesus, Who united in Himself both the divine and the human natures. She gave to Him His human nature only--it would be absurd to say that she was the mother of God qua God--but in view of the true union of natures in Him she may be called "mother of God" without fear of misinterpretation. With such an understanding of the term Theotokos, the fifth century reacted to a denial of its appropriateness by seeing beyond the quarrel over the word a basic fault in Christology. Those who refused to call Mary the mother of God were immediately suspected of denying the true unity of natures that existed within His Person and were viewed askance as violators of the unidentified but strongly felt Greek religious feelings.

Theodore was the final liason between the Arian controversies of the fourth century and the Nestorian and Monophysite struggles of the fifth. In intent he identified himself with the latter fourth century, since his teachings were a protest against Apollinaris in particular and against the whole Alexandrian tendency in general. Theodore felt, as had Diodore before him, that in putting down the Arian teaching of Christ as a lesser god, the Alexandrian theologians had gone to the opposite extreme and had over-emphasized Christ's divinity to the point where His humanity seemed unreal or unnecessary. He was shocked, too, by the attempt of Apollinaris to merge the natures into a union so close that the human virtually disappeared. Both Diodore and Theodore, by asserting the real humanity of Jesus--at the expense, perhaps, of His divinity--and by guarding against the disappearance of His human nature by making a distinct separation between the two natures, were protesting against what

they felt to be a real distortion of the Christian faith. Diodore gave the first systematic expression to these feelings and Theodore developed them fully; but it was left to another man at a later date to publish them. It was left to Nestorius to accept in their entirety the teachings of his predecessors and to assert them at a time when the proper forces had culminated and the right personalities had appeared. There is little if anything in the teachings of Nestorius that differs from those of Theodore: one must assume that it was the fortunes of history which allowed the earlier man to live and teach with the blessings of the Church⁵¹ but which brought upon the latter from the beginning of his public influence the harassment and intrigue which was possible only in fifth-century Byzantium. In order, then, to appreciate fully the circumstances under which Nestorius was deposed and his teaching permanently condemned in the East, we must glance briefly at the political and religious situation of the East at the beginning of the fifth century.

It is perhaps unimaginative to state that the fifth century was an age of transition, yet that is the most accurate term that can be used to describe the political, social, and economic situation of the times. Forces which had been at work since the second century reached fuller development than they had known since their beginning, many of them coming to a culmination at this time and others resting at an intermediary stage between the ancient and the medieval eras. Of paramount importance, of course, is the fact of the collapse of the Roman Empire in the West and its continuance in the East. It is one of the most intriguing mysteries in all of Western history that, given the same conditions and the same elements in the same situation, one half of the empire that had ruled the world for centuries should succumb to the destructive forces while the other half should resist—and remain an entity

with which to reckon for the next thousand years. Divided in half administratively by Diocletian in the third century A. D., the Empire nevertheless remained a single unit in effect and in the thinking of its citizens until the end of the fourth century. With the death of Theodosius the Great in 395, it was permanently split into Eastern and Western sections, and the unexplicable chances of history gave to each of them separate histories from this time forward. At the beginning of the fifth century, both East and West had for the past two hundred years experienced distresses that indicated the speedy disintegration of the existing economic system and social order. Both had witnessed a decline in population, production, and trade; both had seen the coinage debased and inflation come about; both had had their agricultural systems change from control by small farmers to control by owners of large estates; and in both parts of the Empire it had been found necessary to make occupations hereditary, lest certain essential trades be deserted completely. Both had been Christianized--indeed, the Church was as yet undivided between East and West--and both had thus received a new religious outlook and a new organization of potential power with which contending forces must reckon. And finally, both parts of the Empire had over a period of two hundred years been gradually letting in the tribes of uncivilized peoples at their borders; and they now found these men rising to positions of power in the Roman army to which they had been admitted. A point needs to be cleared, however, with regard to the barbarian incursions in the West. In bringing about the collapse of Roman civilization in the West, these Germanic tribes acted more as a catalyst which brought together all the forces of slow disintegration than as the sole and overwhelming factor of destruction.

The notion of vast hordes of warriors, numbered by hundreds of thousands, pouring over the frontiers is...perfectly untrue. The total number seldom exceeded 1000,000, and its army of fighting men can rarely have been more than from 20,000 to 30,000. They were not a deluge, overwhelming and irresistible, and the Empire had a well-organized military establishment at the end of the fourth century, fully sufficient in capable hands to beat them back.⁵²

If the Empire was in much the same condition in its Eastern half as it was in the West, and if the fall of the West cannot be finally attributed to the myth of vast, destructive barbarian hordes, then the historian is prompted to ask exactly what did cause the West to fall and the east to stand. This, unfortunately cannot be given a specific answer: it must be attributed again simply to the chances of history.

The truth is that the success of the barbarians in penetrating and founding states in the western provinces cannot be explained by any general considerations. It is accounted for by the actual events and would be clearer if the story were known more fully. The gradual collapse of the Roman power in this section of the Empire was the consequence of a series of contingent events. No general causes can be assigned that made it inevitable.⁵³

The political setting of the fifth century is, then, the history of the steady progress of the Germanic peoples in moving into the once-Roman West and the history of the East in keeping off the enemies that surrounded her. (Persia to the east of Constantinople and the Huns to the north were peoples with which the West did not have to contend.) Thus we find the Vandals, Suevians, and Alans invading Gaul and Spain from c. 406 to 411;⁵⁴ the Sueves and Vandals remained in Spain but were driven from Gaul by the Visigoths from 415 to 423.⁵⁵ From 429 to 435 the Vandals moved to Africa, where they had settled themselves by 442.⁵⁶ These peoples were now not only an important factor in

the political scene of Western Europe—they were the primary factor in molding the fortunes of this part of the world. Western emperors ruled nominally, but the day had definitely passed when their leadership was indispensable in the government of the Empire. Stilicho, a Vandal, controlled the fortunes of the West from 395 until 408 under the Emperor Honorius;⁵⁷ Valentinian III was ruled in turn by his mother Placidia (425-437)⁵⁸ and by an army officer Aetius (437-454);⁵⁹ Ricimer, of Visigothic and Suevian parentage, controlled Italy from 461 to 472 under puppet Roman rulers;⁶⁰ and finally the pretense of figurehead Romans was done away with when Odoacar, of Germanic descent, ruled Italy from 473 to 489 directly under the Eastern emperor Zeno⁶¹ and when Italy was in the hands solely of Theodoric, an Ostrogoth, from 490 to 526.⁶² In the East, while numerous barbarians had risen to positions of military power, and while throughout the fifth century they frequently gained influential positions by marrying into the imperial family, the barbarians did not sit on the throne and did not for any prolonged length of time exert powerful and undisputed influence over the monarch. The line of Roman rulers is continuous from Theodosius the Great, the last sole ruler of both East and West, through his son Arcadius (395-408) and his son Theodosius II (408-450). The line was transferred by marriage to Marcian, who ruled from 450 to 457; and then a new dynasty, the Isaurian, was founded. This house, begun by Leo I (457-474), was continued by his grandson, Leo II (474-475), and his father Zeno (475-491).⁶³ Thus throughout the fifth century the East, in contrast to the West, was ruled by men of Roman rather than of Germanic parentage; and although these men often fell under the influence of wives, sisters, prefects, and other palace figures, they presented no picture comparable to their fellow-rulers in the West, who were either completely controlled by strong barbarian figures

or were themselves Germans. Even intermarriage with members of high-ranking barbarian families, while it gave German blood to Eastern sovereigns, cannot be said to have had the same effect as the actual control of government by barbarians. These happenings were to the political development of the Empire. This

Thus we may, in viewing the fifth-century political setting generally, characterize it as an age of much unrest, of deep changes, and of constant uncertainty. It was a century characterized by the complete transfer of power in the West from the hands of the old Roman ruling class to the more capable hands of Germanic warriors. It was characterized in the East by the less forceful but still unmistakable presence of the barbarian peoples, whose influence was felt in the positions of military leadership and in places of marital kinship with the nobility. Eastern emperors were, though of Roman descent, quite susceptible to influence outside themselves: long minorities and long regencies left them prey to the influence of strong female relatives and ambitious palace figures, thus beginning the Byzantine characteristic of strong-willed, capable, colorful women taking active, if behind-the-throne, parts in the history of their times. The fifth century can be said to have given to both East and West the major factors in determining later development of each and can be pointed to as the time at which each began the slow process of evolving into the separate entities that it is today. At the close of this period the West was experiencing a complete disruption of her old economic and political patterns, leaving as foundations on which to survive and build only her new and as yet incompletely-expanded Christian faith and whatever ideals and customs might be introduced by her conquerors. This period leaves the East, too, facing new problems but possessing, nevertheless, the Roman tradition, the Hellenic culture, and the Christian faith as the three cornerstones on which

to build a civilization that would last a thousand years.

The religious setting of the fifth century was as turbulent as the political, and its events were as important to the future of the Christian world as the political happenings were to the political development of the Empire. This century closed the period of ancient Church history and opened what was later recognized as the medieval period in the West and the early Byzantine in the East. At the beginning of this century, although tendencies were appearing which indicated a difference of religious temperament between East and West, the two parts of the Roman world were firmly united as to their religion. Indeed, the Christian Church was one of the strongest ties between East and West. Both had felt with equal harshness the persecutions which emperors had inflicted on Christians everywhere; both had rejoiced equally, too, when their Church was first granted toleration⁶⁴ and shortly afterwards was raised by Constantine to the status of the state church. Each recognized and reversed the apostolic foundation of the other's great sees. Each was careful to admit to communion only those members of the other who were in communion with their own bishop. Each aided the other, whenever possible, in putting down heresies, whether of a disciplinary or a doctrinal nature; and both felt a definite responsibility in keeping the faith of Christ pure wherever there were Christians. The Easterners and Westerners saw no division between them regarding their faith at the beginning of the fifth century: they were all members of a church which taught the same beliefs, exercised the same discipline, and administered the same sacraments. Yet by the end of this century, a wedge had been driven between the Church of the East and that of the West; the political divergencies of the two sections prevented the former relatively close communication between the two parts of the Church, emphasizing the differences between Eastern and

Western Christianity until the vast number of similarities disappeared beneath confusion and jealousy. As the Church of the West began her own separate development, she found it necessary to take upon herself the task of preserving order and upholding the ideals and customs of the vanishing Roman civilization. Left with many of the duties of the civil power to perform, western bishops became strong, resourceful, and independent and gave these characteristics to their Church to develop to fullness in the coming centuries. The Church of the East, in the entirely different situation of having a strong, established state with which to live, and with the pattern of giving in to the civil power a steadily growing occurrence since the days of Constantine the Great, scarcely could have followed the Western example of independence and separation from the state. Instead, the fifth century saw the Eastern Church become more firmly entrenched in complete dependence on the throne and palace and witnessed the final establishment of Caesaro-papism in Byzantium.

Beyond this observation on the general condition of the Eastern Church, the scholar of fifth-century Church history must be aware of much else in the makeup of the Eastern religious scene of this period. Chief among the inner tensions of the Church of the East was the rivalry among the prominent sees of Alexandria, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The latter two claimed a right to positions of honor in the Christian world because of the antiquity of their Christianization: the Church of Jerusalem had been founded by Peter, John, and James and had witnessed the stoning of the first Christian martyr, Stephen. Antioch had been of nearly equal importance in the apostolic age, since it was here that the followers of Jesus had first been called Christians.⁶⁵ Antioch, too, was noted for her catechetical school which, in combination with and often in opposition to the school of Alexandria, played a major part in

moulding the religious thinking of the East from the second to the fifth centuries. Alexandria had been the second city of the ancient world since before the time of Christ, and although the time and circumstances of her Christianization are obscure, she had a flourishing catechetical school by the end of the second century A. D. Anxious to continue her theological leadership and the great political influence that accompanied it, Alexandria was throughout the fifth century aggressive and jealous, and was responsible for much of the bitterness that was felt during the Christological controversies.⁶⁶ Constantinople, built by Constantine the Great in the early fourth century,⁶⁷ received her status as a see of importance when the second ecumenical council⁶⁸ declared that since she was the new Rome politically, all the privileges of ecclesiastical leadership were to go to her too. Thus there was a two-way rivalry among the sees of the East: Alexandria and Antioch vied for the recognition of their scholars and their catechetical tendencies; Alexandria and Constantinople fought for the place of top ecclesiastical—and thus of political—leadership in the East; and Jerusalem remained an essential part of the scene, always able to exert an influence because of her honorable past rather than because of her powerful present situation.

These jealousies among sees contributed a large portion of tension within the fifth-century Eastern Church, but they were not solely responsible for the strain. Another source of much disturbance, though it was only spasmodic, was the monasteries and hermitages around Constantinople, Alexandria, and other large cities. The monastic system of the East was very unlike that of the West, in which discipline early became a main feature and obedience to one's religious superior and to the religious rule followed by one's monastery was a carefully cultivated virtue. The religious of the East had no corresponding experience

with obedience to a fixed rule and did not place equal value on obedience to one's abbot or other spiritual leader. Highly individualistic, given to excesses in self-inflicted penance and self-mortification, the monks of the East were little educated and highly excitable. Easily aroused by religious issues which seemed to threaten their conception of Christianity--and easily influenced as to what this conception should be--these men often in the course of fifth-century controversies took upon themselves the task of proclaiming, and of trying to force upon others, their Christological beliefs. They left their monasteries and deserts and, making their way toward the cities where councils were being held or where major leaders were preaching, they congregated and noisily demanded that decisions be made according to their opinions. Quite unmanageable and often quite violent physically, the monks were hated by archbishops, patriarchs, and emperors alike for their lack of patience and charity and for their ability to stir the city mobs to treachery. Far from exerting a calming, peaceable influence on the religious scene, the fifth-century monks of the East were another source of tension and of trouble.

This, then, was the religious setting of the world in which the major Christological decisions of the Christian faith were made. Divided in half by political misfortunes, separated into smaller factions by rivalries among important cities, controlled in part by weak emperors and their ambitious favorites, and susceptible to suasion and violence at the hands of uneducated monks and excitable city crowds, fifth-century Christendom was less than ideal for making fair, level-headed decisions and for assuring understanding and sympathy among those involved. An observer separated from this by a long period of time cannot help marveling at the fact not only that decisions were made but that they were made with wisdom and acuteness sufficient to satisfy

the Christian world for the entirety of her medieval period and into the modern era. While we can only wonder at the chances--or the grace--that brought this about, we must acknowledge that the men of this era, no matter how un-Christlike they may seem in personal actions or motives, performed an invaluable service. The story of the Christological discussions, of those who participated in them, and of their outcomes is at once highly complicated and simply told. It is the story of emperors, patriarchs, and popes; of palace favorites, monks, and city mobs; of tumultuous councils and sharp letters; of persuasion, scheming, and force; of victories and reactions; and of the emergence of strongly-felt religious convictions. From the condemnation of Nestorius in 431 to the publication of the Henoticon in 482, it is filled with excitement, intrigue, and mystery and presents constant challenge to the student because of the vast amount of knowledge which it teaches him about the Eastern Church. The account of fifth-century Christological controversies is challenging and exciting: it is also highly important in revealing the doctrinal tendencies of the East and in understanding the important characteristics of Byzantine Church history.

The man for whom the first Christological heresy of political importance was named and at whose instigation the whole problem was brought forward was made patriarch of Constantinople in the year 428. It is significant that it was the Emperor, Theodosius II, who was responsible for his attaining this position: upon the death of Nestorius' predecessor, Sisinnius, there had been much rivalry between two other candidates for the vacated see; and the emperor had stepped in to settle the quarrel by appointing Nestorius. Formerly the archimandrite of a monastery near Antioch and noted both for his skill in preaching and for his zeal for orthodoxy, Nestorius soon indicated his anxiety

for the latter. He is reported to have said, in his inaugural sermon of the April 10, 428: "Give me, O Emperor, the earth purged from heretics: and I will repay you with heaven. Help me to harry the heretics; and I will aid you to harry the Persians."⁶⁹ The heretics to which he referred were the Arians, who, despite laws prohibiting their existence, had still managed to retain a chapel in the imperial city. Nestorius had them routed five days after his installation; but under his display of zeal, people of more moderate temperament saw a spirit of excess which would manifest itself, they reasoned, in other ways. Shortly, indeed, Nestorius was called down by a fellow bishop for immoderacy in preaching; and "this scourge of heretics came quickly to be regarded as a heretic himself."⁷⁰ The agressor in this instance was, as may be expected, the patriarch of Alexandria, Cyril; and the point which he disputed with Nestorius was the latter's objection to the term Theotokos. In finding fault with this word, Nestorius was only following the example of his friend and teacher, Theodore, and of the Antiochian school. Nestorius' objections were identical to those raised by his predecessors: Mary could not possibly have given Jesus His divine nature--she gave Him the human only; and since the two were completely distinct from each other, she should not be called the mother of God.⁷¹ It should be noted, however, that Nestorius objected to the term only if it were understood in an Apollinarian sense, i.e., if the divine nature in Christ were thought of as the only real nature and thus Mary were thought of as giving Christ His divinity. If Theotokos were understood to mean what the Antiochians thought of--and indeed, what orthodox Christianity thinks of it as meaning--Nestorius found no fault with its use. He was espousing a losing cause in objecting to a term sanctioned by long use and popular sentiment, however. By arousing the anger and mistrust

of both clergy and people in this, he opened himself to suspicion as to the orthodoxy of the rest of his beliefs. He gave indication of differing from the general Eastern religious outlook, and left himself prey to whatever personal jealousies and animosities might be at work. Such animosity was to be found in the Alexandrian patriarch. Cyril, disturbed over what he believed to be the seed of heresy in Nestorius, wrote, in an encyclical letter of Easter, 429,⁷² that to object to calling Mary the mother of God was in reality to deny the divinity of her Son.⁷³ The effect of this letter was, however, rather to draw the attention of the clergy and people to possible heresy than to change the views of the potential heretic himself. Nestorius, as patriarch of the imperial see, had the emperor and court on his side; and as long as he could keep this favor, Nestorius was safe on his throne. He rapidly lost support, however, from several sources, among which was the West: Pope Caelestinus, informed by Cyril that the Patriarch of Constantinople had given refuge to Pelagian heretics from the West, became very suspicious of Nestorius' orthodoxy.⁷⁴ In November of 430, Cyril, in a letter to the Constantinopolitan patriarch, set forth his own beliefs and anathematized those of Nestorius.⁷⁵ Finding that Nestorius still refused to retract his teaching, Cyril sought to obtain the backing of a Church council. Holding a diocesan council in Alexandria in November of 430, Cyril obtained a condemnation of both Nestorius and his doctrine.⁷⁶ Previously, in August of 430, Pope Caelestinus had held a council in Rome which had arrived at the same decision as that of Cyril. Church councils, backed by the weight of ecclesiastical authority, were not to be overlooked lightly, and soon Nestorius was demanding a chance to present his teachings himself. Accordingly, the Emperor Theodosius called a council to meet at Ephesus in the spring of 431, and in preparation for this, both Nestorius and

Cyril began to collect allies. Nestorius could count on the support of John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Count Candidian, captain of the imperial guard; and he had behind him what was known at this period in Byzantine history as "the East"—that area around Antioch, east of both Alexandria and Constantinople. Cyril, on the other hand, had the sympathies of the majority of the other important bishops of the Byzantine Church—Memnon of Ephesus (431-440) and Juvenal of Jerusalem (418-458)—and he was also backed by Caelestine of Rome (422-432). Starting for Ephesus shortly after Easter, Cyril and his supporters arrived there on June 7 and waited for the Easterners, as the bishops of Nestorius' area were called. After waiting for them for two weeks, at the instigation of Cyril they began the council without the presence of Nestorius and his supporters. This action was certainly one of the most underhanded of Cyril's career as Alexandrian patriarch. It is true that the weather in Ephesus was hot and that living expenses there were high,⁷⁷ but surely Cyril realized that business as important as that of deciding the fate of a leading patriarch and the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of his teachings demanded the presence of all those summoned. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that he feared that the friends of Nestorius might be able to exert an influence over the council stronger than that which he himself could command. Afraid of not being able to control the decision of the council and afraid of having his twelve anathematizations revised,⁷⁸ Cyril took the offensive and called the council to order before the arrival of the Easterners. In one day, June 22, the Council of Ephesus declared Nestorius to be heretical; accepted the faith of Nicaea,⁷⁹ of Cyril and of Caelestine; and laid sentence of deposition and excommunication on the patriarch of Constantinople.⁸⁰ Greatly delighted at first by their easy triumph, Cyril and his friends soon became uneasy when John of Antioch, arriving at Ephesus

CORRECTION



***PRECEDING IMAGE HAS BEEN
REFILMED
TO ASSURE LEGIBILITY OR TO
CORRECT A POSSIBLE ERROR***

Cyril began to collect allies. Nestorius could count on the support of John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Count Candidian, captain of the imperial guard; and he had behind him what was known at this period in Byzantine history as "the East"—that area around Antioch, east of both Alexandria and Constantinople. Cyril, on the other hand, had the sympathies of the majority of the other important bishops of the Byzantine Church—Memnon of Ephesus (431-440) and Juvenal of Jerusalem (418-458)—and he was also backed by Caelestine of Rome (422-432). Starting for Ephesus shortly after Easter, Cyril and his supporters arrived there on June 7 and waited for the Easterners, as the bishops of Nestorius' area were called. After waiting for them for two weeks, at the instigation of Cyril they began the council without the presence of Nestorius and his supporters. This action was certainly one of the most underhanded of Cyril's career as Alexandrian patriarch. It is true that the weather in Ephesus was hot and that living expenses there were high,⁷⁷ but surely Cyril realized that business as important as that of deciding the fate of a leading patriarch and the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of his teachings demanded the presence of all those summoned. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that he feared that the friends of Nestorius might be able to exert an influence over the council stronger than that which he himself could command. Afraid of not being able to control the decision of the council and afraid of having his twelve anathematizations revised,⁷⁸ Cyril took the offensive and called the council to order before the arrival of the Easterners. In one day, June 22, the Council of Ephesus declared Nestorius to be heretical; accepted the faith of Nicaea,⁷⁹ of Cyril and of Caelestine; and laid sentence of deposition and excommunication on the patriarch of Constantinople.⁸⁰ Greatly delighted at first by their easy triumph, Cyril and his friends soon became uneasy when John of Antioch, arriving at Ephesus

on June 26, gathered the Easterners around him that same day and held a council of his own. This alternate council promptly pronounced a sentence of deposition on Cyril and Memnon until they should renounce the twelve anathematisms of Cyril.⁸¹ At this point, with two bodies of clergy assembled in the same city, each anathematizing the other and each claiming the authority of the Church for its decisions, a factor indispensable to the workings of Eastern Church politics came into play—the imperial favor. The decision as to which council would be recognized as valid rested upon the emperor, and whoever could gain the imperial ear could assure his side of both the immediate victory and strong support in the struggle sure to follow. Nestorius, with Count Candidian on his side, seemed certain of continuing in the imperial support, but at this point another typically Byzantine force came into operation to sway the emperor. An elderly monk from a monastery near Constantinople, Dalmatius by name, who was held in reverence by Theodosius, left his monastery for the first time in forty-eight years and, heading a procession of all the monks of the city, went to ask the emperor to listen to Cyril and his followers.⁸² Theodosius was impressed by Dalmatius and his delegation; and he realized that it would be unwise to decide against Cyril, who had the majority behind him. In this instance, however, he made no clear-cut decision; he proclaimed neither support nor condemnation of either side. Theodosius did, however, uphold de facto the decision of Cyril's council as regards the deposition of Nestorius. The patriarch was sent back to his monastery near Antioch in September of 431; and a successor, Maximian, was appointed in his place and consecrated the following month. Thus the man whom his enemies labelled as arch-heretic was effectively and permanently desposed of. Nestorius spent the remaining twenty years of his life in exile and died in June of 451, shortly before the Council of

of Chalcedon.⁸³ Whether or not Nestorius was really a heretic—or whether he merely represented a tendency unpopular in the fifth-century East, there can be no doubt of the fact that, innocent of any scheming against his fellow bishops, he was greatly mistreated at their hands. His contemporaries may have spoken very harshly of him as a theologian, but there is no blot on his personal character. Rather than a sly, unscrupulous man, ambitious for power and careless in doctrine, we find in Nestorius more a person thrust into a position in which his doctrinal opinions were a severe handicap and his enemies were formidable. The "tragedy of Nestorius"⁸⁴ must, therefore, be attributed to the historical situation in which he found himself.

Whatever the reasons were behind the fate of Nestorius, his deposition and excommunication ensured the stifling of whatever chances his beliefs might have had to spread⁸⁵: within two years after his deposition there was a uniting of his former allies with those of Cyril. Immediately after the Council of Ephesus, realizing that he needed both imperial support—to make his side more attractive to the Easterners⁸⁹—and a statement of doctrine which would conciliate them, Cyril began planning his strategy. He first assured himself of the favor of the court—through Maximian of Constantinople and through the monks Dalmatius (*supra*, p. 36) and Eutyches (*infra*, p. 39), Cyril convinced Theodosius and his sister Pulcheria, who at this period possessed much influence over the emperor of the correctness of his cause⁸⁶: with the imperial favor behind him, he could now count on receiving overtures from the Antiochians. In the winter of 432 these overtures came. John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrus, and the other Easterners sent to Cyril and his party for their approval a statement of faith known as the Formulary of Reunion or the Reunion Creed of the Antiochenes.⁸⁷ Conciliatory in tone, it acknowledged the absolute divinity

and the absolute humanity of Christ and accepted the use of the term Theotokos, but it insisted on the separateness of the two natures. It was accepted and signed by Cyril and his faction early in 433; and in return, the party of John and Theodoret gave their approval to the condemnation of Nestorius. Thus it seemed that the question raised in 428 by Nestorius had been quickly settled to the satisfaction of all concerned--the teaching of Nestorius and of the extreme Antiochian school had been repudiated and a moderate solution had been found between the extreme of Nestorianism and that of Apollinarianism. The fact that the Christological question raged through the East unsolved for the next forty-nine years proves this assumption wrong, however. As was nearly always the case in such theological issues in the East,⁸⁸ a decision imposed this early in the discussion solved nothing--instead, it only imposed unwanted restrictions on both thinking and terminology. The Reunion Creed never became widely accepted and used as a test of Christological opinions; it merely served to bring about a short period in which each side gathered strength and fresh arguments.⁸⁹

During this period of peace, there was a general change in personalities, though not in alignment, throughout the important sees of the East and West. Maximian of Constantinople was replaced in 434 by Proclus (434-446), who in turn was succeeded by Flavian (446-449). Cyril was succeeded on the Alexandrian throne by Dioscorus (444-454); and John of Antioch, having died in 441, was replaced by Domnus (441-449). Pope Caelestine was succeeded by Xystus (Sixtus) III (432-440), and Leo I (440-461) came after him. Thus it was a completely different group of men who faced the next stage in Christological history, that in which the heresy of Eutychianism was introduced and made its initial gains. This period, dating roughly from 441 to 450, in which the followers of Eutyches

controlled the Eastern Church, is everywhere spoken of as one of the most disgraceful moments in the political history of the Byzantine Church. "What is rily known as the Eutychian controversy is less a dogmatic controversy than a struggle between the patriarchs of the East for supremacy, using party theological differences as a support. Few passages in the history of the Church are more painful."⁹⁰ This period bears all of the characteristics typical of Eastern Church history—control of the monarch by a palace figure, influence of the monks, and political maneuvering to bring disfavor and deposition upon prelates not in agreement with those in power. Ended—typically—by a change at the imperial level, it was renewed in its political make-up, even though not in name, by a second shift of rulers. The final victory of the rightist tendency in the Greek Church in 482 was the outcome equally of the deep-seated Eastern feeling towards emphasizing the divine Christ (Eutychianism was an extreme manifestation of this) and of the decades of struggle for power among Byzantine prelates. The study of the establishment of this tendency in the East will begin with a look at the first stages of its success.⁹³ Ibas of Edessa, and The man for whom the second politically important Christological heresy was named is Eutyches, archimandrite for thirty years of a large monastery near Constantinople and godfather to the Chrysaphius, the grand chamberlain to Theodosius II (441-449).⁹¹ Able to hold the court and weak emperor in his sway through Chrysaphius—a position in itself of almost unlimited power—Eutyches controlled as well the entire monastic population in and around the imperial city. For eight years he was one of the most powerful men in the empire, and during this time he and his party were impossible to defeat. The heresy which bears his name is not, considering the background of Christological theories with which Eutyches must have been familiar, a difficult one to understand or

to place in context. It is primarily a reaction against Nestorianism, and it follows the mainstream of Greek religious thinking in seeing Christ as primarily a divine Person. Eutyches carried the Greek position to extremes, however, in denying Christ's true humanity, or consubstantiality with mankind. He looked upon Him as possessing the divine nature only; and his formula, like that of Cyril, was "two natures before the union, the incarnation; one afterward."⁹² Clearly Eutyches was in error in ignoring completely the humanity of Jesus,⁹⁴ yet he erred on the side most attractive to Greek piety and thus was able to elicit the support of the devout but uneducated monks and city masses. It is quite ironical to the historian to realize that a man so obviously in error, theologically could, backed by power and popular support, throw the odium of heresy upon men whose beliefs showed no heretical traces. Soon after Eutyches' rise in court influence in 441, the sees of the East could be seen to align themselves into the following factions: the Alexandrian patriarch, Dioscorus, and Eutyches were on the same theological-political side; while Flavian of Constantinople, Domnus of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrus,⁹³ Ibas of Edessa, and Irenaeus of Tyre were of like views. Leo of Rome, too, sided with the latter group. The fact that two patriarchs (and doubtless numerous minor bishops) could stand against--and defeat--a group the size of this latter one indicates the extent to which the court, the monks, and the masses controlled politics within the Byzantine Church. By convincing these factions of the heterodoxy of the opposing group (the hated label "Nestorian" was given to his adversaries), Eutyches had little trouble in depriving his enemies, one by one, of their offices and their power. He began by attacking several bishops of lesser importance, Ibas of Edessa, Irenaeus of Tyre, and Theodoret of Cyrus. By means of an imperial rescript of February 448, Irenaeus was removed for teaching

unwilling prelates; these scholars feel that the Council of 449 was indeed a Nestorian tendencies; and Photius (448-451), of the properly yielding religious gathering of robbers and that its decisions were not at all representative of views, was installed in his place. Ibas was accused before a council in the true beliefs of its participants." On the other hand, others who have studied the subject regard the reports of mistreatment and force as the later verdict on his behalf, the monks of the area stirred popular feeling to declare attempts of weak men to justify actions of which they were ashamed. These February 449; and although the clergy of his diocese petitioned for a favorable him a Nestorian. He was accordingly deposed and banished in June of 449. An scholars regard this council as being the true expression of the Eastern imperial order was used to confine Theodoret of Cyrus to his diocese in 449, religious feeling; they feel that, far from being a forced decision, the thus severely restricting his ability to communicate with other of his party.⁹⁴ direction taken by this body of men was much more in harmony with the majority

Thus far Eutyches and his party had made much headway, but in November of opinion than the later decision of Chalcedon. Since this question deals on 448 they received a setback: Eusebius of Dorylaeum (which was within the the one hand with evidence which is difficult to evaluate without access to archdiocese of Constantinople) accused Eutyches of heresy. This procedure the full documents themselves and on the other hand with nothing more specific involved a formal accusation before the patriarch, Flavian, and developed into than a vague "feeling" about an element of Eastern Christianity, it cannot, bringing the matter before a diocesan council for settlement. Such a council by its very nature, be answered with complete logic and objectivity. The was already in progress to deal with other business: at a session on November 22, present-day scholar can here, as in many other instances, only study the Eutyches was asked to answer the accusations against him. (See footnote No. 92 evidence which has come down to him from antiquity and evaluate it according for an account of Eutyches' answer on this occasion regarding his beliefs.) to his own particular insight into the subject. He must exercise special Finding these views to be heretical, the council excommunicated Eutyches and caution in doing this, however: he must possess sufficient general knowledge removed him from his position as archimandrite. For any lesser personage, such of fifth-century ecclesiastical politics to recognize factors common to all a sentence would have remained final: for Eutyches it could be easily circum- situations of this type, and he must have judgment acute enough to understand vented. He presented his cause to the emperor; and in March of 449, Theodosius in what ways, if any, this council differed from these other.

issued a summons to a general council to be held in August of that year at It is to be expected, given the position of influence held by Eutyches, Ephesus to re-examine the case of Eutyches. This is the council to which that this man would fall into the typical Byzantine pattern of using his Pope Leo addressed his famous Tome to Flavian and to which Leo gave the name influence to bring pressures of conformity upon those in opposition to his of Latrocinium, or Robber Council, by which it has been known to history. and to prevent his enemies from gaining in power or favor. This is exactly There is a great deal of disagreement among historians concerning the character what Eutyches did; through his influence with Chrysostomus and with the of this gathering. On the one hand there are scholars who point to the emperor's wife, Eudocia, he gained the imperial ear and was assured by Theodosius contemporary reports of violence and pressure used to extract obedience from of whatever help he might need before or during the council to aid in ridding

unwilling prelates: these scholars feel that the Council of 449 was indeed a gathering of robbers and that its decisions were not at all representative of the true beliefs of its participants.⁹⁵ On the other hand, others who have studied the subject regard the reports of mistreatment and force as the later attempts of weak men to justify actions of which they were ashamed. These scholars regard this council as being the true expression of the Eastern religious feeling; they feel that, far from being a forced decision, the direction taken by this body of men was much more in harmony with the majority opinion than the later decision of Chalcedon. Since this question deals on the one hand with evidence which is difficult to evaluate without access to the full documents themselves and on the other hand with nothing more specific than a vague "feeling" about an element of Eastern Christianity, it cannot, by its very nature, be answered with complete logic and objectivity. The present-day scholar can here, as in many other instances, only study the evidence which has come down to him from antiquity and evaluate it according to his own particular insight into the subject. He must exercise special caution in doing this, however: he must possess sufficient general knowledge of fifth-century ecclesiastical politics to recognize factors common to all situations of this type, and he must have judgment acute enough to understand in what ways, if any, this council differed from these other.

It is to be expected, given the position of influence held by Eutyches, that this man would fall into the typical Byzantine pattern of using his influence to bring pressures of conformity upon those in opposition to him and to prevent his enemies from gaining in power or favor. This is exactly what Eutyches did: through his influence with Chrysaphius and with the emperor's wife, Eudocia, he gained the imperial ear and was assured by Theodosius of whatever help he might need before or during the council to aid in ridding

the empire of the Nestorian heretics. In his summons to the council, circulated in March of 449, Theodosius forbade the attendance of both Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa. This was within his rights to do, since they were deposed and no longer capable of performing ecclesiastical functions; but those who did not hold his sympathies interpreted this action as fear that these two—especially Theodoret, who was one of the most able theologians of the East—might be able to sway to their side the opinions of the council. Invited instead was Barsumas, a violently anti-Nestorian abbot, who had behind him hundreds of zealous and fanatical anti-Nestorian monks. Just as it was to be expected that political pressures would be used whenever possible in the Eastern Church, it was the pattern, too, for councils to be under the definite direction (control in many cases) of the bishop who presided over them;⁹⁶ and in this way, also, the Council of Ephesus of 449 did not deviate from the well-established Eastern pattern. Thus it is not surprising that under the leadership of the Alexandrian patriarch Dioscorus, this council was decidedly anti-Nestorian or Eutychian in tone and in decision. Dioscorus was the leader under whose guidance the council performed its functions and enacted its decrees—had he not been available for this job, doubtless Eutyches would have found it difficult to get someone else to hold the position with equal force and directness. Dioscorus opened the council on August 8 with its outcome firmly determined: he knew that he must rehabilitate Eutyches and depose Flavian and his faction, and to these ends he directed all the actions of the gathering.

It was customary to open an ecumenical council with a reading of the imperial summons followed by a reading of whatever messages the bishop of Rome might have addressed to the council—the pope, as the most important Western bishop, spoke for the West; but since precedent forbade his attending in person any

deposition were doctrinal, he reasoned; but he could not condemn Flavian at councils held in the East, he always sent legates carrying letters to any body for his teaching of the two natures after the Incarnation because in Eastern councils to which he was invited. Pope Leo had composed for this council and for Flavian of Constantinople, whose doctrine he supported, a letter concerning the orthodoxy of Dioscorus, Eutyches, and their followers. Dioscorus explaining the orthodox Western view of the problem of the two natures in Christ and of their relation to each other.⁹⁷ By all rights of courtesy and precedence, Pope Leo's Tome should have been read before the council, but Dioscorus put off its reading under the pretext that there were more imperial missives to be read: he did not return to them. Dioscorus then proceeded to the justification of Eutyches' doctrinal position and to his re-establishment as archimandrite and priest. He had the minutes read of the Council of the previous year at which Eutyches' doctrine had been condemned, and by the reactions of the bishops present at this council he saw his way clear to rehabilitate Eutyches. Few objections were made at first to the proceedings of the council, but when the minutes were read of November 22, 448, when Eusebius of Dorylaeum had pressed Eutyches to confess two natures in Christ after the incarnation, the bishops became furious and raised shouts of "Burn Eusebius! let him be torn in two! as he has divided, let him be divided! anathema to every one who speaks of two natures after the Incarnation."⁹⁸ Whether or not it was really a great majority of those present who spoke this way there is no way of being sure today; but all those present did assent to the restoration of Eutyches to his role as archimandrite and to the affirmation of his orthodoxy in believing in "two natures before the union; one afterwards." With half of his purpose accomplished, Dioscorus then proceeded to the completion of the other half--the deposition of Flavian from the see of Constantinople and of Eusebius from the see of Dorylaeum. This, Dioscorus reasoned, would have to be done with both tact and a little maneuvering. Grounds for Flavian's

deposition were doctrinal, he reasoned; but he could not condemn Flavian baldly for his teaching of the two natures after the Incarnation because in this Flavian had the support of Leo of Rome and thus could arouse suspicion concerning the orthodoxy of Dioscorus, Eutyches, and their followers. Dioscorus overcame this dilemma by an indirect attack: he pointed out that the Council of Ephesus of 431, which both factions regarded as valid, had forbade adding to its own creed or to that of Nicaea. By his mention of the two natures in Christ after the Incarnation, Flavian had added to the faith of the Fathers, had disobeyed the injunction of a valid council, and had forfeited his sacerdotal offices. Dioscorus declared Flavian and Eusebius to be deposed, and immediately others of his faction rose to confirm this decision. Trouble came when friends of the accused begged Dioscorus to reconsider the deposition; and the Alexandrian patriarch, instead of listening to them, is reported to have called in the soldiers stationed around the church where the council was in session, using them to force those present to agree to the sentence. The church was locked until all the bishops, fearing the soldiers, the swarms of monks, and the mobs outside, gave way and signed the condemnation of Flavian and Eusebius. These two were then taken to prison, and on August 22 the council convened without them.⁹⁹ Also absent at this last session were the papal legates, who, angered at the refusal of the council to hear the pope's letter and in disagreement with the sentence placed on Flavian and Eusebius, had refused to attend the council any more. Domnus of Antioch was absent also--because of illness, although one can imagine that he was quite mentally distressed at having given way to the sentencing of his allies. At this session were confirmed the previous depositions of Ibas of Edessa, Irenaeus of Tyre, and Theodoret of Cyrus; and Domnus himself fell under the same sentence on charges of

ecclesiastical insubordination. Finally, the Twelve Anathematisms of Cyril were confirmed, and the Council of Ephesus of 449 was dismissed.

How, then, is one to interpret the proceedings and the outcome of this infamous council? No one can deny that trickery, intimidation, and physical force were used to a certain extent and on a number of prelates. The decision of the council had been predetermined by command of the emperor and by Eutyches and Dioscorus, and those at variance with this decision had been made to succumb. The crucial point of the matter seems to be, however, whether or not the bishops who dissented were a very large portion of those present: if they were in the majority, then the council's decision was indeed a forced one and a misrepresentation of Eastern feeling. If, on the contrary, the followers of Domnus, Theodoret, Ibas, and Irenaeus were a small minority, then to have made their opinions representative of the entire council would have been to falsify the decision equally as much. The subsequent history of Christology in the East definitely affirms that it was the majority opinion which, right or wrong, was carried in 449. Those who were put down were, indeed, orthodox; and their accusers were, it is true, the heretics—this point is not disputed—but in a study primarily historical it is as necessary to acknowledge the general feelings (even to rejoice in their expression) as it is to realize who was doctrinally correct in a given situation. In this instance, while those deposed were of the orthodox faith and those in power were definitely of the Eutychian heresy, the latter were more representative of the prominent Eastern belief, even though they carried that belief to its extreme form. Thus it is hard to consider this gathering a latrocinium or to sympathize with those who see it as one of the most blazing accounts of unfairness in the history of the fifth-century Church.

Never before at any Council had a patriarch scored such a victory. The atmosphere was cleared; the triumph of the old Confession of Nicaea and Ephesus (431) which alone was recognised by the pious Greeks as embodying their faith, had been secured; the Christology of Cyril, the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos, had been acknowledged as the true one; those who opposed it had partly been deposed and partly had submitted; arrangements had already been made for securing suitable successors to those who had been deposed, and an Alexandrian priest, Anatolius, was appointed to Constantinople. The Church of the East lay at the feet of the Alexandrian Patriarch and he had attained everything with the concurrence of the Emperor. He had doubtless made use of force; but it was the State in fact which stood behind him; the police and the monks of Barsumas had, to be sure, over-awed the Father; but far worse than the terrors of this Council were the calumnies spread regarding it on the part of those who two years later had to extenuate their dastardly treachery. If we consider who were present at the Council we must conclude that Dioscurus, to whom even Theodore on one occasion bore favourable testimony, cannot have found it necessary to employ any very great amount of actual force. That Flavian was trampled on and left half dead is anything but certain, and a Council which more than any other gave expression to the tradition of the religious feeling of the time and to what it considered of vital importance, does not deserve the name "Robber-Council". Regarded from the standpoint of the Church of the East something of importance had actually been attained, and what had been thus attained had the guarantee of permanence so long as foreign elements did not come in to disturb it.¹⁰⁰

Repercussions were soon heard from those who had received mistreatment at this council, however. Both Eusebius and Theodoret appealed to Pope Leo for redress; and Leo in turn wrote letters of appeal to the Emperor Theodosius and his sister Pulcheria and messages of encouragement to Flavian and the clergy of Constantinople. These had little effect, however, since Theodosius had issued a rescript making legal all the decisions of the council.¹⁰¹ It looked as though the situation had come to a settlement in the East with the acceptance of the formula proclaimed at Ephesus—"two natures before the union; one

afterwards"—and the rejection of that put forth by Constantinople and the West—"two natures in one person after the union." But the fortunes of political history stepped in here, reversing the entire situation and bringing about a whole new change in alignment for power. "By accident or by special providence,"¹⁰² the Emperor Theodosius fell from his horse and, on July 28, 450, he died. With his death the whole basis for the political power of Eutyches and his allies disappeared; and, with the accession of his sister Pulcheria and Marcian, whom she chose as her co-ruler, the fortunes of the opposing factions were raised. Both Pulcheria and Marcian were orthodox, and one of the primary objectives of their rule was to put down the Eutychian heresy and to establish the orthodox faith.

To this end the co-sovereigns issued a summons to an ecumenical council to be held at Nicaea in September of 451; fearing disturbance from the crowds of monks surrounding nearby Constantinople, however, plans were changed and the place of meeting was moved to Chalcedon. There on October 8, the council met that was to speak out boldly and uncompromisingly for the faith taught by Leo and Flavian and held in suspicion by the East in general. The whole doctrinal and ecclesiastical position of the East was reversed by this council, from the deposition of Dioscorus and the rehabilitation of Flavian and Eusebius to the assertion of the Western "two natures after the union." Beginning with its first session, it proceeded against the patriarch of Alexandria, trying him for supporting the heretic Eutyches (this council held the Council of Constantinople of 448, at which Eutyches had been condemned, as valid) and for condemning Flavian and Eusebius. Upon the reading of the proceedings of the Council of 449 at Ephesus, those who had been present at that council and had participated in its decision began to excuse themselves, complaining of the violence and

force used to extract obedience from them. It is from them that accounts of the unfairness of the Council of 449 have been passed down, and it is because of the situation under which these reports were given that suspicion is thrown on their complete authenticity. As Kidd puts it, "seeing how the wind had permanently changed, the weathercocks went with it."¹⁰³ Anyway, Dioscorus was deposed and Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum were re-established in their sees and the first session of this council was closed.¹⁰⁴ The second session, meeting two days later, discussed doctrinal issues and accepted the creed of Nicaea, the decision of the Council of Constantinople, and the Tome of Leo. It debated the values of Cyril's Twelve Anathematisms but did not accept them. At the third session, held on October 13, Dioscorus' case was brought up for re-consideration at the request of his followers. It was decided with the same verdict, however; and the council declared that,

Dioscorus has been guilty of many offenses. He ignored the sentence of Flavian against Eutyches. On his own authority he received Eutyches into communion, before sitting with his colleagues in synod at Ephesus. They have been excused: but he glories in what he did there--not suffering, for example, the letter of Leo to be read. Even this might have been overlooked, if he had not afterwards dared to excommunicate Leo, and to ignore our repeated citations. Leo therefore by us and by the presnet holy Synod, together with St. Peter, who is the rock of the Church and the basis of right Faith, deprives him of his episcopal dignity. 105

This issue definitely disposed of, the doctrine of Pope Leo was, on October 17, closely examined with respect to its agreement with Cyril and the East: it was found to coincide sufficiently with the decisions of Nicaea, of Ephesus, composed under the leadership of Cyril, and of Constantinople--all of these councils being now considered to be orthodox by those assembled--and Pope Leo was accepted as being in agreement with them. To speak of the orthodoxy of Leo as being in

agreement with the orthodoxy of Cyril and the East may sound peculiar; but it was a real issue, owing to the ambiguity of terms used by both and by the corresponding ability of both to veil their real opinions under safe wording. At times like this, when union between the two was felt to be of primary importance, the differences were veiled under ambiguities such as those used now: in stating that both Leo and they accepted the decisions of Nicaea (325), of Ephesus (431), and of Constantinople (448), those present at Chalcedon were being, if anything, contradictory. The creed of Nicaea had not been formulated to deal with the Christological problem and thus did not answer the questions of the fifth century. The Council of Ephesus (that portion under the direction of Cyril) had actually made no creed or dogmatic definition but had only drawn up sentences of deposition and excommunication upon Nestorius. This, of course, was a condemnation of Nestorius' doctrine; but it gave neither a specific condemnation of it nor a specific formulary of orthodoxy, and so must be classified as an ambiguous basis for a reunion. The Council of Constantinople followed the same pattern of condemning Eutyches without putting forth a formula of its own belief: and so when the assembly at Chalcedon asserted their essential agreement with Leo on these grounds, one may wonder either how clearly they saw the issue or how impressed they were with the necessity for agreeing with the faction in power--that of Pulcheria and Marcion allied with Pope Leo. Nevertheless, on October 22, the council came to a real showdown on the issue of the two natures in Christ. A committee, headed by Anatolius, the new patriarch of Constantinople (449-458), had drawn up a definition of faith and had submitted it to the council for acceptance as the final orthodox creed. It was about to be adopted by those present, when the Antiochians and the Roman legates objected to its use of the phrase "of two natures" in reference to Christ instead

of "in two natures." The majority argued long for the definition; and when it was seen that they would not give in, the imperial commissioners who had charge of the council found it necessary to send messages to Pulcheria and Marcian asking how to handle the situation. In their answer, the co-rulers left a remarkable amount of leeway, considering the absolute control which they could have exercised over the situation. They left the council with the choice of either drawing up another definition, of having each bishop present express his belief through his archbishop, or of dismissing the council and letting another council meet in the West and decide the issue--this last alternative, needless to say an unusual one for an Eastern sovereign to offer, shows the extent to which the Eastern court and the Western pope were allied. The first choice was taken and another creed was drawn up and signed in which the clause "in two natures" appeared;¹⁰⁶ it was not a compromise between the two opinions, nor was it in any way conciliatory to the Eastern desire for "of two natures."¹⁰⁷ It was a complete victory for the West and for Antiochian-oriented Christology. Thus the Christological issue was decided with authority and with apparent finality at the Council of Chalcedon--a gathering of representative prelates had, backed by emperor and pope, pronounced a definition of orthodoxy that was to remain, nominally at least, the test of Christological opinion in both East and West from this time forward. Yet it was not hard to realize at the time--nor is it difficult for the modern historian to understand--that such a settlement was far from satisfactory to Eastern feeling. Since the days of Cyril the religious figures of the East had looked to him as the expressor of their true beliefs: his formula of "two natures before the union; one afterward" embodied their real sympathies. Any slighting of the Cyrilline Christology, therefore, they felt to be a betrayal of themselves and of what they held as orthodox.

The definition of Chalcedon was such a betrayal to the Eastern faith. The years of reaction following 451, the suspicion with which the council itself and those who agreed with it were viewed, and the final position adopted by the Byzantine Church all affirm the fact that the Chalcedonian Creed fell far short of the mark of bringing satisfaction or peace to the East. In support of this contention, three leading Church scholars express their views in the following way:

Doctrinally, the Council had given a triumph to an anti-Cyrrilline orthodoxy: to the standpoint of Leo and Theodoret rather than of Cyril. True, it condemned both Nestorianism and Eutychianism alike. But it was hailed as an act of reparation to his cause, if not by Nestorius himself, at any rate by his followers; and it put Cyril into the shade by lending no countenance to his....Twelve Anathematisms; by substituting for his 'One Nature Incarnate' the formula of Proclus 'One Person in two Natures'; and by drafting its Definition in such conformity to the Tome as to show that it preferred Leo's balanced statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation to the presentation of it customary with Cyril. Certainly, the Council assumed the harmony of the official language of Cyril with its own and the Leonine formulation. But it ignored the real Cyril, and abandoned him for Leo.¹⁰⁸

To tell the truth it corresponded to a twofold capitulation of the assembly, before the Government and before the Pope. The Council did not want a Definition; one was extorted from it. At the very least it wished for one which was not fixed or precise: "A single Person resulting from the union of two natures." It had been constrained into accepting the Roman formula, "A single Person in two natures."¹⁰⁹

We have no right at all to say that possibly the "authorised moment of truth" of the Antiochian Christology triumphed at Chalcedon over the dogmatic ideas of the Alexandrians and the monks, for the representatives of this Christology had long ere this succumbed to the power of the Alexandrian Confession. The unspeakably pitiful behavior too of the bishops who were theologians in sympathy with them....proves that the members of this school conscious of their miserable powerlessness, had of their own free will long ere this

renounced all attempts to influence the Church. The disgrace attaching to this Council consists in the fact that the great majority of the bishops who held the same views as Cyril and Dioscurus finally allowed a formula to be forced upon them which was that of strangers, of the Emperor and pope, and which did not correspond to their belief.... But the Church of the East had been deprived of its faith. The natural union was not mentioned; no one could any longer unhesitatingly teach that the God-Logos had taken up the human nature into the unity of his unique substance and made it the perfect organ of His deity. The construction of a Christology based on the God-Logos was severely shaken; the "two hypostasis" were not expressly condemned. In the "coming together" each nature continues to exist in its own nor has the humanity been exalted to the height of the divinity, but the human and divine natures are simply united in the person of the Redeemer, and therefore only mediately and in an individual. No pious Greek who had had Athanasius and Cyril for his teachers could acknowledge that of the year 433; it was the abandonment of the work of developing the Christological formula strictly in accordance with soteriology. The latter itself now became uncertain. If humanity was not deified in Christ, but if in His case His humanity was merely united with the divinity by the prosopon or person, when what effect can a union such as that have for us? That formula can only be of advantage either to the detested "moralism" of the Antiochians, or to mysticism, which bases its hope of redemption on the idea that the God-Logos continually unites Himself anew with each individual soul so as to form a union.¹¹⁰

Thus at the closing of this council began thirty years of reaction in the East. The decision of Chalcedon came to be labelled as Nestorian throughout the entire Eastern Church, and a protest set in in the form of Monophysitism¹¹¹ which was to last until Chalcedon was sufficiently repudiated by the Emperor Zeno in 482. Despite the fact that the decision handed down by the Council of Chalcedon was that desired by the emperor and empress and acclaimed by the West, Christians all over the East simply refused to accept it. As was the

custom, their vengeance took the active form of interference with the enthronement of those bishops and patriarchs who upheld the Chalcedonian Creed or who were known to lean in this direction. "For thirty years, 451-482, the history of the great sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem turns simply upon the the success of Dyophysite or Monophysite in gaining or regaining possession, according to the religious policy of the prince in power."¹¹² Thus, to begin with the see of Jerusalem, the reaction began immediately upon the reception of the news concerning Chalcedon. Stirred to a frenzy by the monks of the area; by the sister-in-law of Pulcheria (Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius, who was quite jealous of the new empress); and by an ex-monk named Theodosius, who installed himself in this patriarchal chair, the populace rose and prevented Juvenal's re-entry into Jerusalem on his return from the council. Juvenal was represented, in giving his approval to what seemed to be the rehabilitation of Nestorius and the condemnation of Cyril through Dioscorus, as having betrayed the true faith and let heresy into the Church. Finding the gates of Jerusalem closed against him and Theodosius taking his place as patriarch, Juvenal fled to Constantinople where he solicited the aid of the Emperor Marcian. With the intervention of Marcian, Pulcheria, and Pope Leo, all of whom wrote to the monks of Palestine explaining the intent of the council and defending the use of "in two natures," and with the withdrawal of the empress Eudocia from the scene, the monks and the population were quieted and acquiesced to receive Juvenal once more as their patriarch. Theodosius was ousted, and Juvenal reigned there until his death in 458. He was succeeded by Anastasius (458-478), of anti-Chalcedonian leanings.¹¹³

As was to be expected, feelings against the Council of Chalcedon were much more violent in Egypt, where racial differences with the empire and fear

of being dominated by Constantinople made the tensions ordinarily to be expected in such a situation higher than ever. The populace of Alexandria, upon hearing of the deposition and exile of their patriarch Dioscorus, refused to accept the sentence placed upon him. For as long as he lived—until September of 454—they refused to receive another man in his place. With his death there began a complicated and violent struggle for control of the Alexandrian chair which lasted until the publication of the Henoticon in 482. In 454, an arch-priest named Proterius was elected to fill the place of Dioscorus: he was immediately rejected by the people of Alexandria not so much for his doctrinal stand but because he had been elected by representatives of the court of Constantinople. Rioting broke out as soon as his election was announced; it was put down by the police, and the people resigned themselves to waiting for the death of the emperor and the collapse of Proterius' support. Marcian died two years later, in January of 457, and in March of the same year the populace of Alexandria rose and murdered Proterius, committing many atrocities on his remains.¹¹⁴ Several days prior to this—and in connection with it—a monk named Timothy Aelurus, or Timothy the Cat, took possession of the Alexandrian throne. This sparked action from both sides: the Monophysites, to whose faction Timothy belonged, appealed to the Emperor Leo I (457-474) for another council to repeal the decision of Chalcedon; and the Chalcedonians appealed to both the emperor and the pope for the removal of Timothy from office. The appeal for another council was rejected—the Emperor Leo, although he sided with the Monophysites, nevertheless found it expedient, because of his relations with the pope, to insist on adherence to Chalcedon. The desire of the Chalcedonian faction to have Timothy removed from office was acted upon, however, because of Timothy's refusal to accept a doctrinal statement from the pope. He was

exiled to the Crimea until the death of the Emperor Leo in 474, at which time he returned to enter again into the struggle for power at Alexandria. During the years of his exile a mild man named Timothy (nicknamed Salofaciolus, or Wobble Cap) filled the position of Patriarch of Alexandria. Disliked in principle because he had the support of the court at Constantinople,¹¹⁵ Timothy was personally very popular. In the midst of the underhanded and unscrupulous dealings of fifth-century ecclesiastical politics, it is refreshing to find a prelate as liked and respected as Timothy was. It is reported that even his doctrinal enemies, when meeting him in the street, would say to him, "We love you well, though we do not want you for our bishop."¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, this kindly man gave way to his predecessor Timothy Aelurus when, with the ascendancy of the usurper Basiliscus,¹¹⁷ an avowedly Monophysite emperor sat on the throne. Basiliscus withdrew Timothy the Cat from exile; and when Timothy signed the emperor's Encyclical,¹¹⁸ a Monophysite document denouncing Chalcedon, he (Timothy) was once more able to establish himself in the see of Alexandria. ¹¹⁸ the Patriarch of Antioch, for long the seat of the school which was anti-Eutychian, ¹¹⁸ anti-Cyrrilline in tendency, the success of the Monophysites was astonishing. Violence, bloodshed, and daring accompanied every change of patriarchs and every act of defiance against the upholders of Chalcedon. Martyrius (460-470), the orthodox patriarch of the city, was driven out and replaced in 470 by a former monk called Peter the Fuller, an ardent Monophysite. Upon complaint of Martyrius to the Patriarch of Constantinople, however, Peter was removed from his office and interred in a monastery. Not until Basiliscus came to the throne in 475 was Peter able to return to Antioch; but again in 476, when Zeno regained his throne, Peter was exiled for the second time. A pro-Chalcedonian prelate named Stephen was installed by the government (478-482), but he was soon

killed by the Monophysite faction in the city. The government next supplied Calandion, who occupied the throne of Antioch for three years; but in 485, Peter again returned to act as patriarch until his death in 488. Thus the see of Antioch was, like those of Jerusalem and Alexandria, in the hands of the Monophysites.¹¹⁹

Violence and rioting over important sees now began to subside in the great cities of the East: it became clear that popular support was so overwhelmingly in favor of the Monophysite faction that even the emperor himself, aided by the patriarchs of Constantinople,¹²⁰ could not overthrow it. Zeno decided to compromise. Trouble between Peter Mongus, who was contending for the see of Alexandria, and the patriarch Acacius of Constantinople, who disliked Peter's being given the see because of his (Peter's) Monophysite beliefs, led to the drawing up by Acacius of a creed-like document known as the Henoticon, or Instrument of Union.¹²¹ Composed primarily to give Peter's inevitable accession to the throne of Alexandria the sanction of the government and of the Patriarch of Constantinople, it was issued by Zeno as the official stand of the Byzantine government on the subject of Cyril versus Leo and the Twelve Anathematisms versus the Tome. It brought final peace to the Eastern Church; by accepting the Twelve Anathematisms of Cyril and by being non-committal about Chalcedon and the Tome, it left room for the vast majority of Monophysites to remain within the Eastern Church.

But to approve the Twelve Anathematisms of Cyril and to leave the authority of the Tome and of Chalcedon an open question was, while nominally retaining, really to reverse the settlement there attained. It was to put Leo second to Cyril and the Anathematisms above the Tome. The Church of the Byzantine Empire thus became officially Monophysite.¹²²

Thus, while it may be over-stepping the point to say that the Henoticon made

the Greek Church officially Monophysite, it is right to recognize that this document did at last leave the East free to express her true religious feelings. The odium of a creed imposed by an agreement between emperor and pope and worded suspiciously like the dread heresy hated by every Greek was removed from the Eastern Church, and the East was given back the symbols that stood for her deepest religious feelings. It is a hard task to judge whether or not Eastern Christianity is, generally speaking, still attached to the heresy of Monophysitism; and even if such a judgment were possible, it would be rather pointless. The important issue is, rather, to understand the long years of struggle and hardship that went into the East's arriving at a position satisfying to itself and to appreciate, as much as possible, the profound piety that sees in Christ primarily the manifestation of divinity and that wishes, above all, to render His Godhead the full adoration that belongs to It.

6. I Corinthians 1:24.Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God. II Corinthians 4:4.Christ, who is the image of God.

7. St. John 1:1-5, 9-13. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him; and without him was made nothing that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shines in darkness; and the darkness grasped it not....It was the true Light, that enlightens every man who comes into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made through him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But to as many as received him he gave the power of becoming the sons of God; to those who believe in his name: Who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

8. St. John 1:14.And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

9. "Logos," Catholic Encyclopedia, p. 330.

10. St. John 1:1. And the Word was God.

11. "Logos," Catholic Encyclopedia, p. 330; and Joseph Cullen Ayer, A Source Book for Ancient Church History (New York, 1919) pp. 132-133. Theophilus, Ad Autolyrum. Before anything came into existence He had His Father as His counsellor, being His own mind and thought. But when God wished to make all that He had determined on, He beget this Word proceeding forth, the first-born of all creation, not being Himself emptied of the Word [i.e. being without reason], but having begotten Reason and always conversing with His reason.

Athenagoras, Supplicatio. He is the first product of the Father, not as having been brought into existence (for from the beginning God, who is the eternal mind [Nous], had the Logos in Himself, being eternally reasonable), but inasmuch as He came forth to be in organizing power of all material things, which lay like a nature without attributes, and an inactive earth, the grosser particles being mixed up with the lighter.

1. I Peter 3:18. Christ also died once for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. (The version of the New Testament used throughout this paper is that of the New Catholic Edition, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.) He also present with the human race, was in those last days, according to the time appointed by the Father, united to His own workmanship.

2. St. Mark 1:9-11. And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan. And immediately on coming up from the water he saw the heavens opened and the Spirit, as a dove, descending and remaining upon him. And there came a voice from the heavens, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased."

3. Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York, 1946), pp. 35, 37.

4. "Logos," Catholic Encyclopedia (1910 ed.), vol. 9, p. 329; Galen, "De qual. incorp." in "Fr. Stoic", ed. von Arnim, 11, 6.

5. From the Greek gnosis, knowledge.

6. Colossians 1:16. For in him were created all things in the heavens and on the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether Thrones, or Dominations, or Principalities, or Powers. All things have been created through and unto him.

7. I Corinthians 1:24.Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God. II Corinthians 4:4.Christ, who is the image of God. but Simon, a certain Cyrenian, was compelled and bore the cross in his stead; and this latter was the

8. St. John 1:1-5, 9-13. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him; and without him was made nothing that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shines in darkness; and the darkness grasped it not....It was the true Light, that enlightens every man who comes into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made through him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But to as many as received him he gave the power of becoming the sons of God; to these who believe in his name: Who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

9. St. John 1:14. 17; Walker, pp. 54-56.

10. "Logos," Catholic Encyclopedia, p. 330. Dissertation with Paul. Paul of 11. St. John 1:1. And the Word was God. who was born of David, who is Jesus. 11. "Logos," Catholic Encyclopedia, p. 330; and Joseph Cullen Ayer, A Source Book for Ancient Church History (New York, 1939) pp. 132-133. also Theophilus, Ad Autolyicum. Before anything came into existence He had Him for His counsellor, being His own mind and thought. But when God wished to make all that He had determined on, He begat this Word proceeding forth, the first-born of all creation, not being Himself emptied of the Word [i.e. being without reason], but having begotten Reason and always conversing with His reason.

Athenagoras, Supplicatio. He is the first product of the Father, not as having been brought into existence (for from the beginning God, who is the eternal mind [Nous], had the Logos in Himself, being eternally reasonable), but inasmuch as He came forth to be idea and energizing power of all material things, which lay like a nature without attributes, and an inactive earth, the grosser particles being mixed up with the lighter. Praxean. For, confuted on all sides by the distinction between the Father and the Son, which we make while their

12. Ayer, pp. 137-38. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. Since it has been clearly demonstrated that the Word, who existed in the beginning with God, and by whom all things were made, was also present with the human race, was in these last days, according to the time appointed by the Father, united to His own workmanship, having been made a man liable to suffering, every objection is set aside of those who say: "If Christ was born at that time, He did not exist before that time." For I have shown that the Son of God did not begin to be, since He existed with His Father always; but when He was incarnate, and was made man, He commenced afresh the long line of human beings, and furnished us in a brief and comprehensive manner with salvation; so that what we had lost in Adam—namely, to be according to the image and likeness of God—that we might recover in Christ Jesus. See Himself. Ayer, p. 171.

13. "Logos," Catholic Encyclopedia, pp. 329-331. Chief Leachman.

14. From the Greek gnosis, knowledge. that the Father, as well as the Son, experienced the sufferings of the passion and crucifixion.

15. Ayer, pp. 86-87. Irenaeus, quoting Basilides, a noted Gnostic, Adv. Haer. But the unbegotten and nameless Father, seeing their [the nations!] ruin, sent his own first-begotten Nous, for he it is who is called Christ, to set free from the power of those who made the world and them that believe in him. He therefore appeared on earth as a man to the nations of those powers and wrought miracles. Wherefore he did not himself suffer death, but Simon, a certain Cyrenian, was compelled and bore the cross in his stead; and this latter was transfigured by him that he might be thought to be Jesus and was crucified through ignorance and error; but Jesus himself took the form of Simon and stood by and derided him. For as he is an incorporeal power and the Nous of the unborn Father, he transfigured himself at pleasure, and so ascended to him who had sent him, deriding the, inasmuch as he could not be held, and was invisible to all. Those, then, who know these things have been freed from the princes who made the world; so that it is not necessary to confess him who was crucified, but him who came in the form of a man, and was thought to have been crucified, and was called Jesus, and was sent by the Father, that by this dispensation he might destroy the works of the makers of the world.

16. Ayer, pp. 76-77; Walker, pp. 54-56. vols., (Boston, 1903), Vol. IV, pp. 137-140.

17. Ayer, p. 227-228. Malchion of Antioch, Disputation with Paul, Paul of Samosata. The Logos became united with Him who was born of David, who is Jesus, who was begotten of the Holy Ghost. And Him the Virgin bore by the Holy Spirit; but God generated that Logos without the Virgin or any one else than God, and thus the Logos exists. The Logos was greater than Christ. Christ became greater through Wisdom, that we might not overthrow the dignity of Wisdom. In order that the Anointed, who was from David, might not be a stranger to Wisdom, and that Wisdom might not dwell so largely in another. For it was

in the prophets, and more in Moses, and in many the Lord was, but more also in Christ as in a temple. For Jesus Christ was one and the Logos was another. He who appeared was not Wisdom, for He could not be found in an outward form, neither in the appearance of a man; for He is greater than all things visible. with the Father....

18. Ayer, p. 179. Tertullian, Adv. Praxean. For, confuted on all sides by the distinction between the Father and the Son, which we make while their inseparable union remains...all in one person, they [Modalistic Monarchians] distinguish two--Father and Son--understanding the Son to be the flesh, that is the man, that is Jesus; and the Father to be the Spirit, that is God, that is Christ. Since we [the Monarchians, who are here introduced as speaking] teach in precisely the same terms that the Father died as you say the Son died, we are not guilty of blasphemy against the Lord God, for we do not say that He died after the divine nature, but only after the human. by this wisdom and these miracles? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? "

19. From the Greek dynamis, impersonal power. Ayer, p. 171.

20. (Modalistic) dealing with the mode in which each Person of the Trinity manifests Himself. Ayer, p. 171.

21. Sabellians: after Sabellius, one of their chief teachers.

22. Patripassians: from their belief that the Father, as well as the Son; experienced the sufferings of the passion and crucifixion. They speak of one Christ, and assert that there are two independent spiritual

23. Ayer, p. 179. Him as the Logos made flesh, who has remained in His natural unity, for they represent Him as divided into two unlike natures

24. Ayer, pp. 171-172; Walker, pp. 72-73.

25. Ayer, p. 189.

26. For example, Augustine on grace and free will, Tertullian on Christ as Logos, Gregory Nazianzus on the divine in Christ, Gregory of Nyssa on the divine in Christ.

27. Ayer, p. 193. Origen, De Principiis. Who that is capable of entertaining reverential thoughts or feelings regarding God can suppose or believe that God the Father ever existed, even for a moment of time, without having generated this Wisdom? Latin, or East from West.

28. Walker, p. 82.

29. Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, 4 vols., (Boston, 1901), Vol. IV, pp. 139-140. of God dwelt in human flesh in place of the rational and intellectual soul, but assumed and saved our soul, i.e., a rational and intellectual soul

30. in Ayer, p. 298.

31. Consubstantial: of the same substance as, partaking equally of the same nature. The acceptance of this term to express Jesus' relation to the Father was the major development to come from the struggle with the Arian heresy.

32. Creed of Nicaea, A. D. 325, in Socrates, Hist. Ec., I, 8; quoted in Ayer, p. 306. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of His Father, only begotten, that is of the ousia substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God; begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father....

33. Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, Canons, Bruns, I, 20; quoted in Ayer, p. 353. The faith of the three at Nicaea in Bithynia shall not be set aside but shall remain dominant. And every heresy shall be anathematized, especially that of....the Arians.

34. St. Mark 4:40. And they feared exceedingly and said to one another, "Who, then, is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" and Matthew 13:54-55. They were astonished, and said, "How did this man come by this wisdom and these miracles? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary?"

35. J. F. Bethune-Baker, Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine (London, 1938), p. 241.

36. Harnack, p. 151.

37. Apollinaris, Fragments; quoted in Ayer, p. 495. If God had been joined with a man, one complete being with another complete being, there would be two sons of God, one Son of God by nature, another through adoption....They who speak of one Christ, and assert that there are two independent spiritual natures in Him, do not know Him as the Logos made flesh, Who has remained in His natural unity, for they represent Him as divided into two unlike natures and modes of operation.

38. Harnack, p. 152.

39. Ibid., p. 154.

40. Bethune-Baker, p. 244.

41. Ibid., p. 243.

42. The term "Greek" is not used specifically here; it is meant to distinguish Greek from Latin, or East from West.

43. Harnack, pp. 155-156.

44. Ibid., p. 158. Pope Damasus, in 381, anathematized "those who say that the Word of God dwelt in human flesh in place of the rational and intellectual soul, but assumed and saved our soul, i.e., a rational and intellectual soul without sin."

45. Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunomium, V, 5; quoted in Ayer, p. 504.

46. Bethune-Baker, pp. 296-297; and Harnack, pp. 165-166.

54. Ibid., p. 300.

47. Bethune-Baker, p. 259. Theodore of Mopsuestia, Fragments; quoted in Ayer, p. 500. If we distinguish the two natures, we speak of one complete nature of God the Word and a complete person. But we name complete also the nature of the man and also the person. If we think on the conjunction then we speak of one person. In the moment in which He [Jesus] was formed in the womb of the Virgin He received the destination of being a temple of God. For we should not believe that God was born of the Virgin unless we are willing to assume that one and the same is that which is born and what is in that which is born, the temple, and God the Logos in the temple....If God had become flesh, how could He who was born be named God from God, and of one being with the Father? for the flesh does not admit of such a designation. The Logos was always in Jesus, also by His birth and when He was in the womb, at the first moment of his beginning; to His development He gave the rule and measure, and led Him from step to step to perfection.

48. In an issue as intricate as this, perhaps it is of value here to clarify the later orthodox decision. This decision stands midway between the two extremes of on the one hand attributing to the Godhead as a person full participation in those activities which could have been experienced only by the human (birth, suffering, death) and on the other of making an absolute distinction between the two natures with regard to the activities performed by each. Thus the orthodox decision was that both natures participated in all the experiences of Christ--the glory and the shame, the exaltation and the suffering--as part of a single Person; while the divine experienced the passion and death of Christ since it was united to His humanity, the Godhead itself--the divine nature as such--cannot be said to have suffered and died.

49. Harnack, p. 170

50. Θεοτοκος, mother of God.

51. Bethune-Baker, p. 256. Theodore died "in the peace of the Church and in the height of a great reputation"; retaining to the last the warmest affection of Chrysostom and the highest regard of the emperor....It was left for a general council after his death to condemn his teachings (though not himself) and to hunt to death his pupil Nestorius...when he gave expression to the same or similar thoughts. Not till a hundred years after his death was the anathema pronounced which marked him as a heretic.

52. J. B. Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian (New York, 1958), Vol. I, p. 309.

53. Ibid., p. 311.

54. Ibid., p. 185.

55. Ibid., p. 202.

56. Ibid., p. 244-254.

57. Ibid., p. 106-172.

58. Ibid., p. 200.

59. Ibid., pp. 249-298. inseparably united with God the Word, comes of her. Such nature must retain its peculiar attributes, and so we must, in regard to her, and exalted far above all understanding, think of her as one who bore the Son.
60. Ibid., pp. 327-340.
61. Ibid., p. 404.
62. Ibid., p. 453.
63. Ibid., xx. All dates of imperial reigns are taken from the table on page xx.
64. Edict of Milan, A. D. 313.
65. Acts 11;26. And it was in Antioch that the disciples were first called "Christians."
66. Harnack, pp. 190-191. The Alexandrian bishops from Athanasius to Dioscorus have something in common. They strove to make themselves the masters of Egypt and the leaders of the Church of the East. Their resistance to the power of the State was not less strong than their hatred of the parvenu, the bishop of New Rome, whose aspirations after power they wished to put a stop to. We can only compare them with the great Popes, and the comparison is so far a just one inasmuch as they aimed at making Egypt a sort of independent ecclesiastical State. Each bishop in the series from Athanasius to Dioscorus came nearer accomplishing this design. Footnote on p. 191: Of all the great bishops of the Empire the Roman and Alexandrian bishops alone possessed a traditional policy which was strictly adhered to, and acted in accordance with it. They accordingly really became forces in history.
67. Bury, p. 69. Constantinople was dedicated on May 11, 330.
68. Council of Constantinople in 381.
69. Socrates, Hist. Ecc. vii, xxix; quoted in B. J. Kidd, A History of the Church to A. D. 461 (Oxford, 1922), Vol. III, p. 192.
70. Kidd, p. 193.
71. Nestorius, Fragments; Loofs, Nestoriana; quoted in Ayer, pp. 501-502. Mary has not born the godhead, for that which is born of the flesh is flesh....A creature has not born the Creator, but she bore a man, the organ of divinity; the Holy Ghost did not create God the Word, but with that which was born of the Virgin He prepared for God the Word, a temple in which He should dwell. Whenever the Holy Scriptures make mention of the works of salvation prepared by the Lord, they speak of the birth and suffering, not of the divinity but of the humanity of Christ; therefore, according to a more exact expression the holy Virgin is named the bearer of Christ Christotokos. If any one will bring forward the designation, "Theotokos," because the humanity that was born was conjoined with the Word, not because of her who bore, so we say that, although the name is not appropriate to her who bore, for the actual mother must be of the same substance as her child, yet it can be endured in consideration of the

fact that the temple, which is inseparably united with God the Word, comes of her. Each nature must retain its peculiar attributes, and so we must, in regard to the union, wonderful and exalted far above all understanding, think of one honor and confess one Son.

72. Correcting him was by no means within his jurisdiction as Patriarch of Alexandria. Nestorius was Cyril's ecclesiastical equal, not his inferior; and in taking upon himself the responsibility of examining his brother's doctrine, Cyril was either being overly zealous himself or was showing too much interest in matters which as yet were not his business.

73. Ep. i; Cyril quotes Athanasius, Orat. contra Arians, iii. (Op. ii, 459, 462; P. G. xxvi, 385B, 393A); quoted in Kidd, p. 210. I am astonished that the question would ever have been raised as to whether the Holy Virgin should be called Mother of God: for it really amounts to asking, Is her Son God, or is He not? It is true that the Apostles did not make use of this expression. But the Fathers and, in particular, Athanasius employ it; nor was any one more loyal to Scripture than he... It does not occur in the Creed of Nicaea. But, in that Creed, it is not 'Jesus Christ' simply but 'Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God... of one substance with the Father' who is spoken of as having 'come down from heaven' and as 'Incarnate'.

74. From Kidd, pp. 58-64. Pelagianism, the heresy which the great doctor Augustine grappled with, concerned grace and free will and gave trouble only to the Western Church, which was characteristically more interested in these things than the Eastern Church was. Its main emphasis was on man's freedom of will, and it asserted that (1) man is capable of always choosing the good, i.e. of living without sine, (2) since sin is purely voluntary, there is no such thing as original sin or the fall of Adam. These beliefs led to a denial of the need for supernatural grace, a fundamental part of the Western religious teaching.

75. There has been much discussion as to the orthodoxy of Cyril himself. (See Duchesne, pp. 281-282; Kidd, p. 283) Throughout the whole of his participation in the Christological debates, Cyril remained faithful to the phrase "two natures before the union; one afterward"—which certainly approaches the heresy of Apollinarianism. It must be remembered in Cyril's defense, however, that in a subject as delicate as the one with which he was dealing, correct phraseology, of primary importance, was very hard to achieve. In the majority of his extant works it is evident that Cyril taught the orthodox belief concerning the union of the divine and human: in wording, at least, he taught the hypostatic union—true humanity and true divinity united in one Person not by a mere moral conjunction nor by an absorption of one by the other but by a combination unique and complete in this Person. Many scholars accept the fact that most of his official statements are above reproach but point to another Cyril, whose alignments with what became the extreme right indicate a leaning in that direction which oversteps orthodoxy. It may be true that Cyril's sympathies were on the side of those who later took the unorthodox position of ignoring the humanity of Christ; and it may be true, too, that Cyril participated in the general Eastern tendency for emphasizing Christ's divinity at all costs. We cannot, however, accuse him of the heresies of either Eutychianism or

Monophysitism on these grounds alone. Cyril doubtless followed the rest of the Alexandrian school in being zealous for the divinity of Our Lord, but in the early stages at which he participated in the Christological discussions we cannot expect him to word his beliefs in anticipation of later questions. Harnack, pp. 178-179, words it this way: Was Cyril Monophysite? It is necessary to distinguish here between the phraseology and what is actually stated. As regards their actual substance all conceptions: may be described as Monophysite or Apollinarian which reject the idea that Christ was an individual man.... According to the ecclesiastical phraseology only those parties are to be described as monophysite who rejected the deliverance of the Council of Chalcedon. But this deliverance presupposes the existence of factors which did not yet lie within the mental horizon of Cyril. In these circumstances we must content ourselves with saying that nowhere did Cyril intentionally deviate to the right hand, or to the left, from the line of thought followed by the Greek Church and its great Fathers in their doctrine of redemption. He was a Monophysite insofar as he taught that the Logos after the incarnation continues to have as before one nature only; but as the opponent of Apollinaris he did not wish to mix the human nature with the divine in Christ. The assertion of a perfect humanity, unmingled natures, must be allowed to stand, for it is really impossible to put in an intelligible form any part of the speculations which treat of substance as if they had no connection whatever with a living person.

76. Cyril of Alexandria, Anathematisms; quoted in Ayer, pp. 505-506.
- I. If any one shall not confess that the Emmanuel is in truth God, and that therefore the holy Virgin is Theotokos, inasmuch as according to the flesh she bore the Word of God made flesh; let him be anathema.
 - II. If any one shall not confess that the Word of God the Father is united according to hypostasis to flesh, and that with the flesh of His own He is one Christ, the same manifestly God and man at the same time; let him be anathema.
 - III. If any one after the union divide the hypostases in the one Christ, joining them by a connection only, which is according to worthiness, or even authority and power, and not rather by a coming together, which is made by a union according to nature; let him be anathema.
 - IV. If any one divide between the two persons or hypostases the expressions in the evangelical and apostolic writings, or which have been said concerning Christ by the saints, or by Himself concerning Himself, and shall apply some to Him as to a man regarded separately apart from the Word of God, and shall apply others, as appropriate to God only, to the Word of God the Father; let him be anathema.
 - V. If any one dare to say that the Christ is a god-bearing man, and not rather that He is in truth God, as an only Son by nature, because "The Word was made flesh," and hath share in flesh and blood as we have; let him be anathema.
 - VI. If any one shall dare to say that the Word of God the Father is the God of Christ or the Lord of Christ, and shall not rather confess Him as at the same time both God and man, since according to the Scriptures the Word became flesh; let him be anathema.
 - VII. If any one say that Jesus is, as a man, energized by the Word of God, and that the glory of the Only begotten is attributed to Him as being something else than His own; let him be anathema. (Anathematisms continue through XII.)

77. Kidd, p. 240.
78. The Twelve Anathematisms of Cyril were unpopular—many thought that they leaned too heavily toward Apollinarianism and would like to have them changed.
79. The Council of Nicaea which had been held in 325 and which had declared against the Arian heresy.
80. Decisions of the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, Condemnation of Nestorius; quoted in Ayer, p. 507. And, discovering from his letters and treatises and from the discourses recently delivered by him this metropolis, which have been testified to that he has held and published impious doctrines, and being compelled thereto by the canons and by the letter of our most holy father and fellow-servant Celestine, the Roman bishop, we have come, with many tears, to this sorrowful sentence against him: Our Lord Jesus Christ whom he has blasphemed, decrees through the present most holy synod that Nestorius be excluded from the episcopal dignity and from all priestly communion.
81. Ayer, p. 509.
82. Monsignor Louis Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church from its foundation to the end of the fifth century, (London, 1924), Vol. III, pp. 252-253.
83. Kidd, p. 267. From 431-435, Nestorius was allowed to remain at his monastery; in 436 he was sent to the Oasis of Khargh on the borders of Upper Egypt where he remained until 439. From there he was captured by bands of marauders and taken to Panopolis, to Elephantine opposite Syene, and to "a fourth place of exile," where he died.
84. Name of a chapter 10 in Duchesne, pp. 219-270.
85. Kidd, p. 270. By the year 435, Nestorianism was crushed within the Empire. It survived only beyond the Empire, in Persia, where it was adopted at a synod in 424 for political reasons as a means of protest against the hated Byzantines.
86. Ibid., p. 258. Cyril in this instance did not stop at bribery—carpets, table cloths, curtains, couches, cushions, tapestries, ostriches, etc. were given to the proper people at court to insure a friendly ear to him.
87. Creed of Antioch, A. D. 433; quoted in Ayer, pp. 510-511. We therefore acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten, complete God and complete man, of a rational soul and body; begotten of the Father before the ages according to His godhead, but in the last days for us and for our salvation, of the Virgin Mary, according to the manhood; that He is of the same nature as the Father according to His godhead, and of the same nature with us according to his manhood; for a union of the two natures has been made; therefore we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. According to this conception of the unconfused union, we confess that the holy Virgin is Theotokos, because

because they speak of two natures before the union, but after the union and God the Word was made flesh and became man, and from her conception united with Himself the temple received from her. We recognize the evangelical and apostolic utterances concerning the Lord, making common, as in one person, the divine and the human characteristics, but distinguishing them as in two natures; and teaching that the godlike traits are according to the godhead of Christ, and the humble traits according to His manhood.

88. In the fourth century, the Arian controversy did not really get underway until after the Council of Nicaea, which was to have solved the issue.

89. Harnack, pp. 197-198. If it be asked, what is the saddest and most momentous event in the history of dogma since the condemnation of Paul of Samosta, we must point to the union of the year 433. The shadow of this occurrence rests on the whole subsequent history of dogma. It bore two sorts of evil fruit. In the first place it permanently prohibited Greek piety from establishing the formula which was alone appropriate to it: one incarnate nature of the divine Logos. In the second place it introduced such a stagnation into the dogmatic question that every one who attempted to state his Christological views ran the risk of being regarded as a heretic, while on the other hand people found it possible when they so desired, to give a favorable turn to every dogmatic utterance. It threw the East into a state of confusion and made of Christology an armoury of poisoned weapons for the warfare of ecclesiastical politics. A middle party was formed from each of the two sides. To one of these Theodoret belonged, and to another Dioscorus (Cyril). But the representatives of these middle parties were no nearer each other than the two extremes. If they employed the same formulae they nevertheless gave them a different meaning, and they were at the same time intent upon protecting their extreme associates as far as possible.

90. Ayer, p. 511—introduction to the Eutychian controversy and the Council of Chalcedon.

91. Duchesne, p. 487.

92. Acts of the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 448; quoted in Ayer, pp. 513-514. Eutyches: I confess that I have never said that He is consubstantial with us. Up to the present day I have not said that the body of our Lord and God was consubstantial with us; I confess that ~~the holy Virgin~~ Florentius, the patrician, said: Since the mother is consubstantial with us, doubtless the Son is consubstantial with us. Eutyches said: I have not said, you will notice, that the body of a man became the body of God, but the body was human, and the Lord was incarnate of the Virgin. If you wish that I should add to this that His body is consubstantial with us, I will do this; but I do not understand the term consubstantial in such a way that I do not deny that he is the Son of God. Formerly I spoke in general not of a consubstantiality according to the flesh; now I will do so, because that our Lord, who is of the Virgin, is consubstantial and of two natures after the incarnation? Eutyches said: I confess that our Lord was of two natures before the union [i.e., the union of divinity and humanity in the incarnation], but after the union one nature.... I follow the teaching of the blessed Cyril and the holy Fathers and the holy Athanasius,

because they speak of two natures before the union, but after the union and incarnation they speak not of two natures but of one nature.

93. Cyrus or Cyrros—a city somewhere in Asia Minor. It is impossible to locate it at present since it has disappeared from the map; but it was probably on or near the Cyrus River, which runs through northeastern Armenia and dips up into the Caucasus Mountains.

94. Kidd, pp. 289-294.

95. Duchesne, pp. 289-294; Kidd, pp. 301-307; and Charles Joseph Hefele, A History of the Councils of the Church from the original documents (Edinburgh, 1883), Vol. III, pp. 241-262.

96. From 351-361, during the height of the Arian gains in the fourth century, every council held in both East and West during these years—and there were eleven of them—was under the definite control of the Arian faction. The Council of Chalcedon, 451, regarded by the history as the orthodox triumph over the hated Eutychians, was under the no less definite control of the imperial commissioners.

97. This document, the Tome of Leo, is considered to be the classic expression of the Western, or dyophysite, view. In essence, however, it adds nothing to the formula put forth in the third century by Tertullian: "duae substantiae in una persona—salva est utriusque proprietate substantiae in Christo Jesu": two substances in one person—the property of each substance in Christ Jesus is not interfered with. To the Latin mind this formula had been sufficient since the third century and stood in need of no alteration now. Leo's Tome, therefore, was really only an amplification of the old Western formula—it contained none of the subtleties of Greek thinking, nor did it bring much light to bear on the issue at hand in the Council of 449. To the Greek Fathers assembled there, Pope Leo's assertion of two substances seemed, if anything, to approach Nestorianism; and, fearing this heresy worse than any other, they avoided anything which might lean in its direction. Harnack, p. 114. Harnack says this about Leo's Tome: "This document, which was highly lauded in subsequent times and is to the present day, contained nothing new. What, however, is of importance in it is that the West, i.e., the Pope, has here kept in view the peculiar character of its Church. It is consequently an evidence of power, and the Christology set forth in it may at the same time have actually corresponded with the inclinations of the pope. But on the other hand it ought not to be forgotten that the situation, as represented by Nestorianism already condemned and Eutychianism about to be rejected, appeared directly to call for the old Western formula duae substantiae (natura) in una persona', and that the pope expressed himself more fully regarding it than tradition justified. The pope throughout puts the interests of our salvation in the foreground; he wants exactly what Cyril and Eutyches also want, but he goes on to give an explanation which Cyril at any rate would have entirely repudiated, (Cyril said that the idea of redemption demands the deification of the human nature, Leo went on to show that this same idea demands a true human nature which remains absolutely unchanged)." Quoted in Harnack, pp. 204-205. Leo the Great, Epistola Dogmatica; quoted in Ayer, pp. 515-516. He who was invisible in His own nature, was made visible in ours; He who was incomprehensible could not be contained, became comprehensible in ours; remaining before all

times, He began to be in time; the Lord of all, He took upon Him the form of a servant, having obscured His immeasurable majesty. He who was God, incapable of suffering, did not disdain to be man, capable of suffering, and the immortal to subject Himself to the laws of death. Born by a new nativity: because the inviolate virginity knew not concupiscence, it ministered the material of the flesh. The nature of the Lord was assumed from the mother, not sin; and in the Lord Jesus Christ, born of the womb of the Virgin, because His nativity is wonderful, yet is His nature not dissimilar to ours. For He who is true God, is likewise true man, and there is no fraud since both the humility of the man and the loftiness of God meet. For as God is not changed by the manifestation of pity, so the man is not consumed absorbed by the dignity. For each form i.e. nature does in communion with the other what is proper to it; namely, by the action of the Word what is of the Word, and by the flesh carrying out what is of the flesh. One of these is brilliant with miracles, the other succumbs to injuries. And as the Word does not depart from equality with the paternal glory, so the flesh does not forsake the nature of our race. of His Father before all worlds according to His nature; but in these last days 98. Kidd, p. 306; Hefele, p. 248. 99. There were many contemporary rumors that the immediate death of Flavian was due to his mistreatment at the hands of his enemies. This is often cited by those who have no sympathies with the Council of 449 as another instance of the atrocities committed by it: actually, there is no certainty of documentation regarding this matter. Duchesne, pp. 293-294: At the Council of Chalcedon it was said repeatedly that he had been killed; Dioscorus was referred to as the murderer: his deacons Peter (Peter Mongus) and Harpocraton and also the monk Barsumas were represented as having committed the actual assault upon Flavian. (Mansi, Conc., vi, p. 691 A, 1017; vii, p. 68): in 453 Pope Leo, writing to Theodoret (Jaffe, Regesta, 496; Migne, Patrol. Latina, liv., p. 1051), says that Dioscorus in sanguine innocentis et catholici sacerdotis... manus intinxit. Flavian, however, says nothing resembling this in his letter of appeal.... The papal legate Hilary does not seem to have had knowledge of other acts of violence, for he says nothing about them in his letter to Pulcheria. (Leonis, Ep. 46), and the Pope himself, in the letters based on the new reports made by Hilary, does not make any allusion either, not even in the letter which he addressed to Flavian. The latter's death, which happened shortly after the Council, would naturally have been attributed to the brutalities of which he had been the object, and certain details, certain complicities which had been passed over at first, would have been emphasized, with more or less exaggeration. 100. Harnack, pp. 209-210. 101. Kidd, p. 310. 102. Ibid., p. 310.

103. Ibid., p. 317

104. Charles Joseph Hefele, A History of the Councils of the Church from the Original Documents, 3 vols., (Edinburgh, 1883).

105. Kidd, p. 320.

106. Definition, Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451; Mansi, VII, 107; quoted in Ayer, pp. 519-520. For it the assembled council opposes those who would rend the mystery of the dispensation into a duad of Sons; it repels from the sacred assembly those who dare to say that the godhead of the Only begotten is capable of suffering; it resists those who imagine there is a mixture of confusion in the two natures of Christ; it drives away those who fancy His form as a servant is of an heavenly or of some substance other than that which was taken of us, and it anathematizes those who foolishly talk of two natures of our Lord before the union, conceiving that after the union there was only one. Following the holy Fathers, we all with one voice teach men to confess that the Son and our Lord Jesus Christ is one and the same, that He is perfect in godhead and perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body, consubstantial with His Father as touching His godhead, and consubstantial with us as to His manhood, in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten of His Father before all worlds according to His godhead; but in these last days for us and for our salvation of the Virgin Mary, the Theotokos, according to His manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten Son, in two natures, unconfusedly, immutable, indivisible, inseparable; the distinction of natures being preserved and concurring in one person and hypostasis, not separated or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets from the beginning have spoken concerning Him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and as the creed of the Fathers has delivered us.

107. Hefele, pp. 342-353.

108. Kidd, p. 395.

109. Duchesne, p. 308.

110. Harnack, pp. 215-216.

111. Here it is of value to clarify the difference, though slight between Monophysitism and Eutychianism. Both were representative of the tendency to focus on the divinity of Christ to the exclusion of all else in Him; and as such they may be regarded as politically the same, Eutychianism being the name given to this faction before the Council of Chalcedon and Monophysitism the name by which it was known afterwards. Doctrinally, however, there is a slight distinction between the two heresies. Eutychianism taught that Christ's human nature was completely absorbed by the divine at their coming together in the Incarnation, thus leaving no traces of humanity in Him during His earthly life or after His ascension into heaven. Monophysitism, on the other hand, viewed the human and divine as mingling into one composite nature so that neither actually disappeared.

112. Kidd, p. 399.

113. Duchesne, pp. 324-328; Kidd, pp. 400-402.

114. Conc. Chalced., iii, 22 (Mansi, vii, 526); quoted in Kidd, p. 403. The people of Alexandria are said to have dragged the body of Proterius through the streets of the city, committed cannibalism on it; and, having burnt it, scattered his ashes to the winds.

115. Timothy Salofaciolus was the first to bear the nickname of Melkite, or Royalist, since he adhered to the Chalcedonian orthodoxy of the Court of Constantinople.

116. Liberatus, Brev. xvi (P. L. lxxviii, 1021 A); quoted in Kidd, p. 406.

117. Bury, pp. 390-393. Zeno became emperor in 474, but due to intrigues from within the palace by his mother-in-law Verina, he was overthrown by her brother Basiliscus in 475. The power of the usurper lasted for only a short time, however; and in August of 476, Zeno re-entered Constantinople and captured and beheaded Basiliscus.

118. Duchesne, pp. 329-340; Kidd, pp. 402-408. *From the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian*, 2 vols., New York, Dover Publications, 1952.

119. Duchesne, pp. 340-344; Kidd, pp. 408-410.

120. The Patriarchs of Constantinople--Anatolius, 449-458; Gennadius, 458-471; and Acacius, 471-489--had, since the time of Flavian, been consistently anti-Eutychian and pro-Chalcedonian. During the years between the Council of Chalcedon and the Henoticon of Zeno, 451-482, they had on every occasion aided in trying to overthrow the Monophysites and establish those of Chalcedonian sympathies in positions of importance.

121. Zeno, Henoticon; in Evagrius, Hist. Ec., III, 14; quoted in Ayer, pp. 528-529. We confess, moreover, that the only begotten Son of God, himself God, who truly became man, namely, our Lord Jesus Christ, is consubstantial with the Father as to his godhead, and the same consubstantial with ourselves as respects his manhood; that having descended and become flesh of the Holy Ghost and Mary, the Virgin and Theotokos, He is one and not two; for we affirm that both His miracles and the sufferings which He voluntarily endured in the flesh, are of one; for we do not in any degree admit those who either make a division or a confusion or introduce a phantom; inasmuch as His truly sinless incarnation from the Theotokos did not produce an addition of a son....And these things we write, not as making an innovation upon the faith, but to satisfy you; and every one who has held or holds any other opinion, either at the present or at another time, whether at Chalcedon or in any synod whatever, we anathematize; and specially the aforementioned Nestorius and Eutyches, and those who maintain their doctrines.

122. Kidd, p. 413. Catholic Edition, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

123. Walker, Williston, A History of the Christian Church, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adeney, Walter F., The Greek and Eastern Churches, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939.
2. Ayer, Joseph Cullen, A Source Book for Ancient Church History, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939.
3. Bethune-Baker, J. F., Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine, London, Methuen & Co., 1938.
4. Bethune-Baker, J. F., Nestorius and His Teachings, Cambridge, University Press, 1908.
5. Bury, J. B., History of the Later Roman Empire, From the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian, 2 vols., New York, Dover Publications, 1958.
6. Du Bose, William P., The Ecumenical Councils, (vol. 3 in Ten Epochs of Church History), New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901
7. Dushesne, Monsignor Louis, Early History of the Christian Church, from its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century, 3 vols., London, John Murray, 1924.
8. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., The History of the Christian Church, from the Earliest Times to A. D. 461, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1933.
9. Harnack, Adolph von, History of Dogma, 4 vols., Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1901.
10. Hefele, Charles Joseph, A History of the Councils of the Church from the Original Documents, 3 vols., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1883.
11. Kidd, B. J., A History of the Church to A. D. 461, 3 vols., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922.
12. "Logos," Catholic Encyclopedia, 1910 ed., vol. 9.
13. More, Paul Elmer, Christ the Word, (vol. 4 in The Greek Tradition), Princeton, Princeton U. Press, 1927.
14. New Testament, New Catholic Edition, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.
15. Walker, Williston, A History of the Christian Church, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.