THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF

EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS

VOLUME 3

CHRIST:
Through the Nestorian Controversy

The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings provides the definitive anthology of early Christian texts, from ca. 100 CE to ca. 650 CE. Its volumes reflect the cultural, intellectual, and linguistic diversity of early Christianity, and are organized thematically on the topics of God, Practice, Christ, Community, Reading, and Creation. The series expands the pool of source material to include not only Greek and Latin writings, but also Syriac and Coptic texts. Additionally, the series rejects a theologically normative view by juxtaposing texts that were important in antiquity but later deemed "heretical" with orthodox texts. The translations are accompanied by introductions, notes, suggestions for further reading, and scriptural indices. The third volume focuses on early Christian reflection on Christ as God incarnate from the first century to ca. 450 CE. It will be an invaluable resource for students and academic researchers in early Christian studies, history of Christianity, theology and religious studies, and late antique Roman history.

MARK DELCOGLIANO is Associate Professor of Theology at the University of St. Thomas, Minnesota. He is the author of *Basil of Caesarea's Anti-Eunomian Theory of Names* (2010), and has published numerous journal articles as well as translations of Basil of Caesarea, Athanasius of Alexandria, Didymus the Blind, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory the Great.

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF
EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS

The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings offers new translations of a wide range of materials from ca. 100 CE to ca. 650 CE, including many writings that have not previously been accessible in English. The volumes will focus on selected themes and will include translations of works originally written in Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Coptic, together with introductions, notes, bibliographies, and scriptural indices to aid the reader. Taken together they should greatly expand the range of texts available to scholars, students, and all who are interested in this period of Christian thought.

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF

EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS

VOLUME 3

CHRIST:
Through the Nestorian Controversy

EDITED BY

Mark DelCogliano

University of St. Thomas, Minnesota

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107062139

DOI: 10.1017/9781107449640

First published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-06213-9 Hardback

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Anthony Briggman is Associate Professor of Early Christianity at Candler School of Theology, Emory University. He translated the selections from Irenaeus of Lyons's *Against Heresies*. Professor Briggman would like to acknowledge that his translation of Irenaeus is the result of a joint translation project shared with his graduate students Sarah Bogue, Brian Gronewoller, Brendan Harris, Micah Miller, and Devin White.

Dexter Brown is a doctoral student in the Departments of Classics and Religious Studies at Yale University. He translated the selection from the *Ascension of Isaiah* with Aaron Michael Butts.

Aaron Michael Butts is Associate Professor in the Department of Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures at the Catholic University of America. He translated the selections from the *Odes of Solomon*. He also translated the selection from the *Ascension of Isaiah* with Dexter Brown.

Matthew R. Crawford is Associate Professor and Director of the Research Program in Biblical and Early Christian Studies in the Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry at the Australian Catholic University. He translated Cyril of Alexandria's *Second and Third Letters to Nestorius*, his *Letter of Reunion to John of Antioch*, and his *First and Second Letters to Succensus*; and Nestorius's *Second Letter to Cyril of Alexandria*, his *Letter to John of Antioch*, and his *First Letter to Celestine of Rome*. He also translated the selections from John Cassian's *On the Incarnation of the Lord against Nestorius* with Thomas L. Humphries.

Mark DelCogliano is Associate Professor of Theology at the University of St. Thomas. He translated the *Gospel of Peter*; the selections of the *The First Letter of Clement*, of Ignatius of Antioch's *Letters*, and of the *Epistle to Diognetus*; the Greek and Latin *Fragments* of Paul of Samosata; the

selections of the *Tome to the Antiochenes* and of Hilary of Poitiers's *On the Trinity*; Athanasius of Alexandria's *Christological Letters to Epictetus*, *Adelphius*, *and Maximus*; Apollinarius of Laodicea's *Recapitulation*, his *Letter to the Bishops in Diocaesarea*, his *Synodical Tome*, his *Fragments of Letters to Dionysius*, *Serapion*, *Terentius*, *and Julian*, his *Fragments of Other Writings*, and his *Fragmentary Writings against Diodore and Flavian*; Basil of Caesarea's *Letters* 261 *and* 262 and his *Homily on the Holy Birth of Christ*; the Greek and Latin fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia's *On the Incarnation of the Lord against the Apollinarians and Eunomians*; Leporius's *Statement of Amendment*; the first book of John Cassian's *On the Incarnation of the Lord against Nestorius*; Nestorius's *Second and Third Letters to Celestine of Rome*; and the selections from *Acts of the Council of Ephesus*.

Emanuel Fiano is Assistant Professor of Syriac Studies at Fordham University. He translated the Syriac *Fragments* of Paul of Samosata.

Thomas L. Humphries is Associate Professor of Philosophy, Theology, and Religion at Saint Leo University. He translated the selections from John Cassian's *On the Incarnation of the Lord against Nestorius* with Matthew R. Crawford.

Ellen Muehlberger is Professor of History at the University of Michigan. She translated Aphrahat's *Demonstration* 17: *On the Son*; the *Selected Fragments* of Diodore of Tarsus; and the Syriac fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia's *On the Incarnation of the Lord against the Apollinarians and Eunomians*.

Michael Papazian is Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Berry College. He translated the Armenian *Fragments* of Paul of Samosata.

Andrew Radde-Gallwitz is Associate Professor of Liberal Studies at the University of Notre Dame. He translated the selections from Justin Martyr's *First* and *Second Apologies*; Gregory of Nyssa's *Oration on the Savior's Nativity*; Augustine of Hippo's *On Eighty-Three Different Questions. Number 80: Against the Apollinarians* and his *Letters* 137 and 219; and Proclus of Constantinople's *Homily on the Holy Virgin Theotokos*. Professor Radde-Gallwitz would like to thank Margaret M. Mitchell for her helpful feedback on his translation of Gregory of Nyssa.

Paul S. Russell is Lecturer in Theology at St. Joseph of Arimathea Anglican Theological College. He translated the selections of Ephrem the Syrian's *Hymns on Faith*.

Jared Secord is an Academic Strategist at the University of Calgary. He translated the selections from Tertullian's *Apology*, from his *On the Flesh of Christ*, and from his *Against Praxeas*.

Melissa Harl Sellew is Professor Emerita of Classical and Near Eastern Studies at the University of Minnesota. She translated the *Treatise on Resurrection*.

Bradley K. Storin is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at Louisiana State University. He translated the selections from Tatian's *Address to the Greeks* and from Origen's *On First Principles*; Apollinarius of Laodicea's *Letter to Jovian*, his *First Letter to Dionysius*, his *On the Faith and the Incarnation*, and his *On the Body's Union with the Divinity in Christ*; Gregory of Nazianzus's *Letter* 101 *to Cledonius* and the selections from his *Poems*; and Ibas of Edessa's *Letter to Mari the Persian*.

Vasilije Vranic is a priest in the Serbian Orthodox Church in Washington, DC and a Visiting Fellow in the Center for the Study of Early Christianity at the Catholic University of America. He translated Eusebius of Dorylaeum's *Protest*, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus's *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, his *Refutation of the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria*, and the epilogue to his *Eranistes*.

Francis Watson is Professor in the Department of Theology and Religion at Durham University. He translated the *Epistle of the Apostles*.

Acknowledgments

Planning for what became volumes 3 and 4 in the Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings (CEECW) series began in 2012 when Andrew Radde-Gallwitz asked Ellen Muehlberger, Bradley K. Storin, and me to join him in editing a new series of thematic anthologies of early Christian texts. A scholar cannot have hoped for more knowledgeable, hard-working, and generous collaborators. Each of us brings a truly complementary set of skills, expertise, and perspectives to this project, making each volume of the series far greater than the sum of its parts. So first of all I thank my three collaborators, Andy, Ellen, and Brad, for their tireless efforts in the countless hours spent bringing this volume to completion, with painstaking attention to detail, with patience when progress was slow, with support for me when times were tough, and always, always, with plenty of good humor: thank you, my dear friends.

No less do I thank all those who contributed translations to this volume: Anthony Briggman, Dexter Brown, Aaron Michael Butts, Matthew R. Crawford, Emanuel Fiano, Thomas L. Humphries, Michael Papazian, Paul S. Russell, Jared Secord, Melissa Harl Sellew, Vasilije Vranic, and Francis Watson. Thank you for collaborating with us as your translations went through the multi-stage checking and editing process, which I realize could seem overly scrupulous at times. It was a thrill for me to be able to work closely with you on both the nuts-and-bolts and the finer points of your introductions and translations. To those who joined the project early on, thank you for your patience with me in the years it took to get your work into print. To those who joined the project at the eleventh hour, thank you for squeezing this project into your busy schedule on such short notice and yet producing such top-notch work.

Along the way several others have also made this volume possible through their sharing of advice, expertise, and time, by giving feedback, checking translations, helping crack difficult passages, providing unpublished work, and so forth: Pauline Allen, Lewis Ayres, John Behr, Matthew R. Crawford, Philip Michael Forness, Margaret M. Mitchell, Alex Pierce, Richard Price,

Corey Stephan, Francis Watson, Robin Darling Young, and Kevin Zilverberg. Your assistance has been an immense help to me: thank you.

A special thanks to Hilary Gaskin at Cambridge University Press for encouragement and advice with this large and complex project that took longer to complete than any of us anticipated, as well as to Hal Churchman, her assistant, Lisa Carter, our content manager, and Mary Starkey, our copy-editor. This volume has benefited immensely from their efforts and attention to detail.

And finally to Amy, Iris, and Richard: I simply cannot find the words to say how grateful I am to you, my three true loves.

Note on the Texts and Translations

Our translations have been produced in consultation with published editions and, in some cases, with manuscripts. Bibliographical information for the editions used can be found in the introduction to each translated text. The numeration of each work follows that of the editions from which we have translated. Numbers in the text with no surrounding brackets indicate chapter or paragraph divisions. In the case of texts with subdivisions or multiple numbering systems, the major chapter division is indicated in bold, followed by the subdivision in regular type with a full stop. Where bracketed numbers in bold appear, these indicate page numbers in a printed edition or folio numbers in a manuscript codex.

When a text quotes earlier material, references are provided in the notes with the following format: first, the series and number within the series or the abbreviation used for the critical edition, followed by a colon; then, the page number of the edition and, after a comma, the line numbers (if any); and finally the editor's name. For example, if Basil of Caesarea's *Against Eunomius* 1.12 were to be quoted, the reference would be: Basil of Caesarea, *Against Eunomius* 1.12, 32–35 (SChr 299: 214 Sesboüé). In some cases, as in this example, the line numbering in the critical edition is tied to the subdivisions of the work itself, not to the pages of the edition.

Psalms are cited according to the Septuagint numbering and versification, with the numbering of the Masoretic text in parenthesis. Note that in many English translations of the Psalms, the versification differs from the Septuagint and Masoretic text because the psalm heading is not included in the verse numbering.

All dates in the volume are CE unless otherwise noted.

The following conventions are used in the translations:

[]	Editorial supplement within a text by the translator to improve the sense
<…>	Lacuna within a text
<aaa>	Conjectural emendation by the text's editor to fill a lacuna

*	
* *	Transition from one document or major section to another
* * *	Intentional omission of material from the translation

Abbreviations

ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum
Apollinaris	Hans Lietzmann (ed. and trans.), *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1904).
CACSS	Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
CEECW	*Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings*
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
Ep.	*Epistula*, *Epistle*
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller
GCS n.F.	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Neue Folge
GNO	Gregorii Nysseni Opera
LXX	Septuagint
Nestoriana	Friedrich Loofs (ed.), *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905).
PG	Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca
PL	Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
SChr	Sources chrétiennes

Series Introduction

The literary legacy of the early Christians is vast and spans multiple linguistic traditions. Early Christians used the written word in many ways: they sent letters, staged dialogues, reported revelations, gave advice, defended themselves, accused others, preached homilies, wrote histories, sang hymns, hammered out creeds, interpreted texts, and legislated penances – just to list the most common examples. They did these things in Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Coptic; while countless Christians would have used other languages, such as Armenian, these four are the medium of the vast majority of our surviving texts. For each text that has survived, there is a unique story. Some became part of educational curricula for Christians in medieval Byzantium, Basra, and Bologna; some were recited or sung liturgically; some were read in private devotions; some lay at the core of later theological debates such as the European Reformations in the sixteenth century or the Ressourcement movement in twentieth-century Catholicism; some suffered a literary death, being buried in the sands of Egypt only to be discovered again, quite by accident, in the past century. The question of how these works have been received over the centuries is undoubtedly important, but their later interpreters and interpretations ought not to overshadow their original significance and context.

The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings offers a representative sample of this diverse literature in seven thematic volumes: *God*, *Practice*, *Christ: Through the Nestorian Controversy*, *Christ: Chalcedon and Beyond*, *Creation*, *Community*, and *Reading*. While no series of this kind can be comprehensive, these themes allow the reader to understand early Christianity in its full intellectual, practical, ritual, and communal diversity. The theme and the selection of texts are thoroughly discussed in each volume's respective introduction, but certain principles have guided the construction of all seven volumes. Our goal has been neither to narrate the establishment of orthodox or normative Christianity as this has been traditionally understood nor to champion its replacement by another form of Christianity. Instead, we have opted to let each text speak with its own historical

voice and authority, while aiming to expand the number and range of early Christian texts available to English speakers. Because of this, many of these texts are translated into English here for the first time, while all others have been translated anew. We have combined magisterial works with neglected ones in order to show the diversity and interconnectedness of Christianity in its formative period. We are neither reproducing a canon of classics nor creating a new one. We make no claims that the included works are aesthetically or intellectually superior to other texts we have excluded. Some well-known classics have been omitted for simply that reason: they are readily accessible and widely read. Others are too lengthy and do not bear excerpting well. In some cases, we have judged that attention to a single work by an author has led to an unfortunate neglect of other works of equal or greater value by the same author. In such cases, we are taking the opportunity to cast our spotlight on the latter. In sum, by no means have we felt constrained by previous lists of "must-reads" in our own selections.

We have sought to produce translations that are literal – faithful to the original language's meaning and, when possible, syntax. If a meaningful term appears in the original language, we have aimed to capture it in the translation. At the same time, we have aimed to produce intelligible and attractive English prose. At times the two goals have conflicted and prudential judgments have been made; as part of a team of translators, we are fortunate that we have not had to make such decisions alone. Every translation that appears in our volumes has gone through a rigorous multi-stage editorial process to ensure accuracy as well as readability. We hope that this painstaking collaborative process ensures the reliability and consistency of our translations. As a team, we have come to see the value – and indeed the necessity – of such collaborative work for the academic study of early Christianity's rich library of texts.

Andrew Radde-Gallwitz
Mark DelCogliano
Ellen Muehlberger
Bradley K. Storin

Introduction

An anthology on the vast topic of "Christ" is a fool's errand. No single volume, no matter how large it is, can cover everything or satisfy everyone. Yet one can be ambitious. Indeed, the anthology compiled for this project turned out to be so large that it became impractical to publish it in a single volume. So this volume has a companion: *The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings*, volume 4: *Christ: Chalcedon and Beyond*. Though physically separate, the two volumes belong together and are intended to be used together. In fact, together they encapsulate the editor's vision for the study of Christology in the formative centuries of Christianity.

It is not the aim of these volumes to give a comprehensive or definitive account of early Christian reflection on "the full sweep of the Son's existence," as Peter W. Martens has admirably expressed it,

> beginning with his pre-existent state, eternally begotten from God the Father, to his role in the creation of an invisible and visible cosmos, his modes of ministry in the human race, especially in Hebrew saints like Moses and the prophets, his embodiment in Mary and the many details of his ministry as relayed in the gospels, through his death, resurrection and ascension, his ongoing ministry in the world, and his eschatological activities which would culminate when he handed over the kingdom to the Father.[1]

While all these topics – and more – appear in the texts in these volumes, some delimitation has necessarily been made. The focus of these volumes, then, is on Christ as God incarnate. For it was this remarkable claim above all that sparked so much early Christian reflection on – and debate over – Christ.

These volumes include only non-biblical texts, though of course the Bible itself is profusely cited in the early Christian texts selected for them.

1 Peter W. Martens, "The Development of Origen's Christology in the Context of Second and Third Century Christologies," in Ronald E. Heine and Karen Jo Torjesen (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook on Origen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 355–372.

This selection is intended to be as wide and diverse as possible in terms of theological perspective, ideological commitment, language of composition, geographical origin, literary genre, and so forth, but at the same time also focused enough to give a sense of the various traditions of thought that developed about Christ in early Christianity, whether or not these traditions were deemed orthodox or heretical by contemporaries or later generations. A primary goal of these volumes is, then, to give readers a sense of the full scope of the Christological options that developed in early Christianity. At the same time the texts chosen provide coverage of the primary debates over Christ and illustrate how the development of Christological doctrine often proceeded polemically by the clarifying of positions in response to the criticisms of opponents. Thus many of the texts chosen for these volumes are "in conversation" with one another, whether by way of endorsement, development, or contestation. Texts have often been chosen for inclusion in these volumes because of their intertextual features, which highlight the "conversational" nature of Christological development.

These volumes include texts that range from the late first century to the early eighth century. They thereby not only span a much wider chronological range than can be found in other sourcebooks on Christology, but also have the intended consequence of de-centering the Definition of Faith promulgated at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which stated that in Christ the divine and human natures were united unconfusedly, unchangeably, undividedly, and inseparably. The early story of the development of Christological doctrine should not be read through the lens of this Definition, with a retroactive Chalcedonian standard being imposed on pre-Chalcedonian authors and texts. Nor should it be assumed that the concerns and issues that animated Christological debate at Chalcedon were shared by earlier generations. The present volume therefore gives voice to the Christological concerns of these earlier generations on their own terms. Indeed, it was from these various streams of reflection on Christ going back to the first century that different traditions of Christological thinking developed in the third and fourth centuries, and from them too the pro-Nicene Christological developments of the fourth and early fifth centuries emerged. It is true that some theologians and documents from this period were later appropriated as advocates of Chalcedonianism *avant la lettre*. But presenting them in this volume in the context of preceding and contemporary reflection on Christ allows their peculiar perspectives to sound out more distinctly, making it obvious that the Chalcedonian

reception of these figures is really a selective appropriation of a Christological landscape that was far richer and more diverse in actuality.

The extended chronological range has also been deemed necessary in order to demonstrate that Christological reflection did not end in 451 with the Chalcedonian Definition, the immediate prelude to which opens the next volume (CEECW 4). Notwithstanding its achievements, the Council of Chalcedon was extremely controversial, fomenting strains of Christological thinking opposed to its settlement, whose criticisms later led even diehard Chalcedonians to admit its weaknesses. Thus, it became the impetus for centuries of further reflection on Christ and theological development. The story of the reception of Chalcedon is as important as the story of any other period before 451 not only because it was decisive in shaping the ways in which Chalcedon was understood and passed on to subsequent generations, but also because of the constructive and innovative Christological contributions made in this period, which are of intrinsic value despite the general neglect they have received by students and scholars alike. For these too have had a profound influence on Christological doctrine until the present day.

So far this introduction has deliberately used vague expressions like "reflection on Christ" to describe that key feature of the texts that merits their inclusion in these volumes. But now it is time for some specification. At the heart of early Christian reflection on Christ lies the question of identity: Who is Jesus? Indeed, in one gospel Jesus himself puts this very question to his closest disciples: "But who do you say that I am?" (Matt 16:15). But there was no easy answer to this question; or rather, there were many possible, plausible, or viable answers in the early centuries of Christianity. The question of Christ's identity was furthermore bound up with the unfolding of that identity in history, namely, what Christ did and experienced during his earthly existence, what Christ does now in the church (especially how Christ is present and active in the sacraments), and what Christ will do when the eschatological age dawns. Just as the ancient Israelites and Jews came to know their God by his repeated interventions in their history – that is, by what he did for them – so too it was for the early Christians: what Christ did and does and will do teaches who Christ is.

This sort of reflection on Christ is already evident in the earliest writings about Christ available to us, writings later canonized as the New Testament. The letters of Paul, and those attributed to him by the earliest Christians, contain numerous accounts of who Christ was, such as the so-called

Philippians Hymn (Phil 2:6–11). Furthermore, Paul's view that Christ's death and resurrection were absolutely indispensable for understanding Jesus had massive influence on later generations of Christians. The centrality of Paul for early Christian reflection on Christ was one reason that later generations of Christians called him simply *the* Apostle.

The gospels also engage in reflection on Christ, but in a narrative mode. Recall Simon Peter's reply to the aforementioned question posed by Jesus: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt 16:16) – a strong Christological affirmation indeed! The gospels became the primary resources through which early Christians processed the unveiling of Christ's identity in history, since the gospels recount his life from birth to death and resurrection and beyond. Several events in the life of Christ narrated in the gospels became privileged sites for pondering the precise details of his identity: his birth from Mary, his baptism by John, his miracles, his ignorance, his hunger, his thirst, his suffering, his crucifixion and death, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven. When reflection on Christ later entered into more technical debates, such as over the status of his knowledge or the mechanics of his willing, other events and episodes from his life were equally scrutinized.

The question of identity was always linked with what we might call the question of constitution: What is it that makes Christ the incarnate Son of God, the incarnate Word of God? In other words, once a theologian entertained a particular view about who Christ was, the issue became explaining what sort of constitution Christ had to have in order to ensure that identity. In time, when the age of the ecumenical councils dawned, discussions about Christ became more technical and refined, accounts of Christ more precise and nuanced, and debates over Christ more heated and divisive than they had been in earlier centuries. These councils sought to define the contours of Christ's identity and constitution with greater clarity, though not without violent controversy, vociferous resistance, and lamentable schisms within Christianity that have lasted until the present day. The seeming resolution of one issue only opened the door to others, each of which in turn required correction. And then the process inevitably began anew.

The fundamental conceptual problem of the incarnation was the concurrence in Christ of divinity and humanity, whose properties are, at least apparently, contradictory. For example, how can Jesus be both eternal and temporal, both immortal and have died on the cross? To claim so without

further qualification risked nonsense for most early and late antique Christians. These volumes of course do not intend to solve this conceptual problem as such by highlighting a single answer to it, but rather to provide the reader with the range of answers given in the early centuries of the church in a broadly chronological order. Though this introduction is not the place for a full account of the history of attempts to provide a resolution to this fundamental problem, in keeping with the "fool's errand" nature of these volumes, a thumbnail sketch of that history is provided in the next paragraph.

Some of the earliest approaches to solving the conceptual problem included denying the reality of either the divinity or the humanity, making Christ actually the one but in some sense not really the other. These accounts took various forms, as seen in texts of CEECW 3 Parts I and II, and even III. Another strand of the earliest Christian thinking on the issue, however, affirmed the reality of both the divinity and humanity in Jesus, that is, as constituent parts of his individual identity. By the time we get to the texts in CEECW 3 Part IV and CEECW 4 Parts I and II, the understanding of Christ that theologians of the era believed to have been articulated in the Nicene Creed provided a common benchmark for all subsequent Christological development and debate: Christ was constituted of a fully divine nature and a fully human nature (save for sin). This pro-Nicene solution, however, created a new problem: how to conceptualize Christ, the incarnate God, as the single agent of salvation while constituted of two distinct and perfectly intact natures with seemingly contradictory properties. Accordingly, approaches to Christ in this period can be described as tending toward "unitive" or "dualistic" accounts, namely, those that emphasized the oneness or unity of Christ (however defined) or those that stressed his twoness or duality (however that was defined). For example, "miaphysites" held that a single nature (*mia physis*) resulted from the union of the two natures from which Christ was constituted. In contrast, "dyophysites" held that Christ's two natures (*dyo physeis*) perdured intact even after the union. But neither "miaphysite" nor "dyophysite" were monolithic categories, and there was a host of variations under these two broad headings. Furthermore, one could advocate for a unitive or dualistic approach to Christ in other terms than "nature," such as "person," "hypostasis," "activity," and "will." Of the major Christological schools that developed, the "Nestorian," the Miaphysite, and the Chalcedonian, each was as firmly committed to the pro-Nicene tradition as the others, and all had

both unitive and dualistic elements in their peculiar Christologies, combined of course in different ways. Each of their positions had its strengths and weaknesses, its true insights and blind spots. Each of these schools was also volatile in its own way, since their individual trajectories of development veered (or perhaps self-corrected) in response to a variety of influences and underwent a process of bringing a more fine-grained precision to their Christologies. This thumbnail sketch is of course a gross oversimplification, but it is hoped that it exposes some of the key dynamics at work in Christological development in the period covered in this volume.

The following survey of the terrain covered in the present volume places each text in its historical and theological context and highlights its salient features. The purpose of this survey is (1) to help the reader see where each of the texts translated in this volume fits into the larger story of reflection on Christ, (2) to assist the reader in determining which texts are best suited to her or his interests, and, above all, (3) to clarify for the reader the interrelationships among the texts and the conversations happening between them. While the survey here is necessarily panoptic, the reader should know that the translation of each text is preceded by its own individual introduction that in short compass provides a biographical sketch of the author, a fuller account of the historical and theological context of the text, and a brief survey of the text's contents or key points. In the following survey, the titles of texts translated in this volume are in boldface the first time they appear. The order in which the texts are discussed is not necessarily the order in which they appear in the volume (which is broadly chronological).

PART I: THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTOLOGY

Part I contains a number of second-century texts that present reflection on Christ in a variety of genres: heavenly visions, gospel narratives, dialogues between Christ and his disciples, confessions of faith, letters, apologies, poetry, theological essays, exegetical tracts, and anti-heretical treatises. All these texts address, each in its own way, the key features of Christ's identity, his mission and purpose, his relation to the heavenly realm inhabited by God the Father and the angels, as well as the meaning and implications of his earthly life, passion, death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven. The texts in Part I therefore testify to the rich diversity of approaches to Christ in the earliest stages of Christianity. While it is difficult to establish

precise dates for most of these texts, in general they date to the second century. In this period there were numerous possibilities for affirming that Jesus Christ was human and divine, and the earliest Christians availed themselves of diverse ways of conceptualizing this core belief. None of the positions on Christ found in these texts was deemed by later Christians to be a satisfactory account of Christ, though some of them remained viable options for centuries and a few even served as the basis or at least the impetus for later developments.

The first three texts in Part I are today classified as "pseudepigraphical," that is, "falsely attributed" to their authors, who are typically biblical personages. Such works thus evoke a scriptural ambiance and have a scriptural "feel" to them. The selection of the ***Ascension of Isaiah*** translated here recounts the prophet Isaiah's upward journey through the heavens where he encounters Christ, who is described in "angelomorphic" terms, that is, as a kind of angel or being who assumes an angelic form. ***The Gospel of Peter*** narrates the passion, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus in a way that emphasizes his real suffering and heroism – and features a walking and talking cross. It affirms Jesus as Lord, Son of God, King of Israel, and Savior of human beings, but not as Christ or Messiah. ***The Epistle of the Apostles*** records a purported dialogue on Easter morning between Jesus and his disciples in which Jesus answers questions put to him by his disciples in preparation for their future mission. The letter also includes a confession of faith about Jesus.

The next three texts belong to the corpus of writings known as the Apostolic Fathers, a collection of works first associated with one another in the seventeenth century because traditionally the authors of these texts were believed to have personally known or been otherwise formatively influenced by one of the twelve apostles of Jesus Christ. The selections of ***The First Letter of Clement*** translated here spell out the ethical implications and obligations of Christ's advent, suffering, death, and resurrection for the Christian community in its quest for peace and harmony. The selections from the ***Letters*** of Ignatius of Antioch affirm the embodied reality of Jesus in his human descent from David, his birth from Mary, as well as in his suffering, death, and resurrection, against those who denied their reality. Such people viewed Christ as a divine being who only seemed or appeared to be a human being in an illusory manner without being so in reality. Later Christians would call this view "docetism" because it attributed to Jesus only an "appearance" (in Greek, *dokein*) of embodied existence, not

the true reality of incarnation. The ***Epistle to Diognetus*** is an early Christian apology in epistolary form that explicates the role of Christ in God's plan of salvation.

In the above-mentioned *The First Letter of Clement* there are several examples of the early Christian use of *testimonia*, passages from the Hebrew scriptures that are applied to Christ in an effort to interpret and arrive at a fuller understanding of his life, death, and resurrection. This common practice merits further explanation. The earliest followers of Jesus, all Jews, in the aftermath of the resurrection, tried to make sense of Jesus by scouring their scriptures. An instance of this approach is seen in Paul's remark that through Christ the veil over the (Hebrew) scriptures is removed and the Christ hidden therein made manifest.[2] Accordingly, early Christians reflecting on Christ saw the Hebrew scriptures, which later became the Christian Old Testament, as a key resource for understanding Christ. They believed Christ to be present and active in the Old Testament, whose narrative was but the first part of a single story of salvation that culminated in Jesus Christ. This engagement with the Hebrew scriptures is apparent in the earliest writings about Christ, such as Paul's letters and the gospels; it is also found in early Christian texts coeval with the biblical texts like *The First Letter of Clement*; and the application of Old Testament *testimonia* to Christ is found in many texts from the first Christian centuries, including some of the other texts translated in this volume.

The authors of the next group of texts are today classified as "Apologists" because they penned defenses of Christianity in response to the Roman persecution of Christians and to dispel widespread Roman misconceptions about their beliefs and practices. These defenses included accounts of God and Christ as well as critiques of traditional Roman culture. This volume contains selections from Justin Martyr's ***First* and *Second Apologies*** (dated to the early 150s) and from Tatian's ***Address to the Greeks*** (written a decade or more after Justin's *Apologies*). These texts identify Jesus Christ with the Word (*Logos*) of God, whom they understand to have been brought into existence by God to be the intermediary between the utterly transcendent God the Father and the material creation so that God could make and administer the world through him. It was the Word of God who thus became incarnate in Jesus Christ. This way of thinking about Jesus is now known as "Logos theology." While later Christians became dissatisfied with Logos

2 2 Cor 3:13–16.

theology because of a perception that it flirted with ditheism, conceptualizing Christ as the incarnate Word of God became standard. Furthermore, Justin contends that the events that occurred in connection with Jesus' life, death, and resurrection, as well as the history of the church after him, were foretold by the Jewish prophets. Thus, the match between ancient prophecy and recent events was proof for Justin that Jesus is the incarnate Son of God, the incarnate Logos.

The selections from the ***Odes of Solomon*** translated here illustrate reflection on Christ in early Christian poetry. These highly allusive poems identify Jesus, the Messiah, with the Son of God and explore the significance of his birth from a virgin, crucifixion, and resurrection.

The next two texts stem from the milieu of Valentinian Gnosticism. The ***Treatise on Resurrection*** is a didactic epistle that contains a brief exposition on the true meaning of resurrection. The treatise highlights Christ's salvific work, teaching that his defeat of death by resurrection enables those who believe in him to experience the true resurrection, namely, a spiritual transformation. The ***Ptolemaic Theology*** is a mid-second-century account of a Valentinian exegesis of the prologue of the Gospel of John. Here the prologue is interpreted as the revelation of the generation of the Ogdoad, the first eight Aeons, in a series of four conjugal couples: Father and Grace, Only-Begotten and Truth, Word and Life, and Human Being and Church.

Part I concludes with selections from Irenaeus of Lyons's ***Against Heresies*** from the late second century. Writing against opponents of various stripes, Irenaeus articulated a profoundly influential account of Christ, in which Jesus Christ is identified as the one and the same Word and Son of God now incarnate, as human as we are human (excepting sin) and as divine as the Father is divine. Irenaeus recapitulates and indeed advances upon the proto-orthodox traditions of Christological reflection that preceded him and became the harbinger of the dominant strands of Christological reflection that would follow.

PART II: DEVELOPING CHRISTOLOGICAL TRADITIONS

The texts in Part II illustrate the beginning stages of the gradual establishment of Christological standards. This part contains several third- and fourth-century texts that showcase the traditions of Christological reflection that were developing in the Latin, Greek, and Syriac milieux. This

period witnesses to the emergence of a widespread set of beliefs about Christ as well as the initial development of a technical theological vocabulary for speaking about Christ, though of course these were not shared by all. Most of the authors of the texts presented here had a formative influence on subsequent generations in their respective traditions.

The Latin tradition is represented by two figures. Excerpts from three writings of Tertullian written between ca. 197 and the early 210s are included. In his early ***Apology***, continuing the apologetic tradition found also in Justin and Tatian, he offers a range of proofs for his traditionalist Roman audience in support of the Christian belief that Christ was both human and divine, emphasizing the plausibility and reasonableness of such a belief. ***On the Flesh of Christ*** is a defense of the reality of Christ's human body, sufferings, and death against different strains of docetism taught by the followers of Marcion, Apelles (a disciple of Marcion), and Valentinus, all of whom were thought to deny the reality of Christ's flesh in some way. In ***Against Praxeas*** Tertullian takes on the monarchians, whose view of Christ, he claimed, resulted in "patripassianism." In other words, the monarchians identified God and Christ, and the result of this, according to Tertullian, was that the Father experienced the sufferings experienced by Christ – an implication rejected as a blasphemous impossibility by Tertullian. In this treatise he offers an account of the incarnation that attempts to uphold the divine immutability of Christ. In the course of his writings Tertullian developed a technical vocabulary for discourse about Christ that would prove to be enormously influential on the later Latin tradition. The second work of Latin theology that appears in this part is ***On the Trinity*** of Hilary of Poitiers, written around 360. In the selection in this volume Hilary refutes the "Arian" idea that the Son is by nature inferior to the Father simply because of the incarnation. He affirms that in the incarnation God lowers himself to the human condition without ceasing to be fully God, and that Christ's expressions of weakness or ignorance must be attributed to his human nature, not taken as proof of his lesser divinity.

The Greek tradition is represented by Origen of Alexandria and Paul of Samosata. In the selection from ***On First Principles*** translated here, likely written between 220 and 230, Origen investigates what he takes to be not yet clear in the ecclesiastical proclamation about Christ. This proclamation maintained an anti-monarchian distinction of the Father and Son, the preexistence of Christ, his becoming human while remaining divine, and an anti-docetic insistence upon the true humanity of Christ and the reality

of his human experiences, especially his suffering and death. In inquiring into these teachings further, Origen presents Christ as the "God-human being" and conceives the incarnation as the Word of God taking on flesh through the intermediary of the soul of Christ. The Antiochene bishop Paul of Samosata was condemned and deposed for heresy in the 260s. ***Selected Fragments*** of Paul are presented in this volume. Paul's views are difficult to reconstruct because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence. He appears to have viewed the incarnation as an instance of the Word's indwelling of a human being, an instance that was qualitatively akin to its presence in all righteous human beings, but with a permanence and completeness unlike all others. By the early fourth century Paul's teaching was routinely regarded as resulting in a Christ who was a "mere human being" who was "adopted" by God as his Son. Later Christians would pillory these positions as "psilanthropism" (a term based on the Greek for "mere human being," *psilos anthrōpos*) and "adoptionism." In the fifth century, Paul would be viewed as a precursor to Nestorius.

The Syriac tradition is represented in Part II by Aphrahat and Ephrem the Syrian. The early to mid-fourth-century Aphrahat's ***Demonstration 17: On the Son*** is a response to objections imagined to be raised by Jews about Christian beliefs about Jesus, that they call someone who is only a human being "God." In the selections from the ***Hymns on Faith*** that appear in this volume, which were probably written in the 360s, Ephrem addresses the issue of the limits of human knowledge when it comes to divine topics such as Christ's divinity and his incarnation. Ephrem also deals with the "Arian" argument that Christ's knowledge, which the gospels present as inferior to the Father's, suggests his ontological subordination to the Father. He counters that this inferior knowledge is explained by the Son having assumed human nature.

PART III: TRADITIONS OF PRO-NICENE CHRISTOLOGY

Part III presents several texts from pro-Nicene writers of the late fourth and early fifth centuries. The pro-Nicene alliance started to emerge in the 350s, through the efforts of Athanasius of Alexandria and then of Basil of Caesarea and others, when the Nicene Creed, promulgated in 325 and interpreted according to a Trinitarian logic and doctrine articulated by its chief proponents, gradually became the basis for consensus in the

Trinitarian debates of the era. These pro-Nicene efforts reached an apogee at the Council of Constantinople in 381, when a revised version of the Creed was issued and imperial legislation subsequently enforced the pro-Nicene doctrine of the Trinity. In late antiquity the original version of the Nicene Creed was known as the creed of 318 fathers and the revised version as that of 150 fathers, referring to the purported number of bishops who assembled at the first and second ecumenical councils in 325 and 381. Today they are called the Nicene Creed and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

Both versions of the Creed, however, are quite laconic on the subject of the incarnate Christ, simply affirming that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, "became incarnate" (*sarkōthenta*) and "became human" (*enanthrōpēsanta*) to save humanity. Accordingly, most pro-Nicene accounts of Christ in the late fourth and early fifth centuries attempt to explain *inter alia* precisely what "becoming flesh" and "becoming human" meant. At the same time, most of these pro-Nicene authors were refuting various strains of "Arian" Christology, such as that of the Heteroousians (or Eunomians) or the Homoians, or other currents of thought whose sources are hard to determine. But since pro-Nicenes themselves espoused a range of Christological positions, with some opting for a more unified approach to Christ (stressing the single subjectivity of Christ) whereas others maintained a more dualistic perspective, they also engaged in polemics with each other. All the pro-Nicene theologians represented in this part laid the foundations for centuries of further Christological debate and development, whether later deemed touchstones of orthodoxy or fountainheads of heresy – even though the later Christological traditions that developed did not agree as to who should be placed in which category.

The selection of the ***Tome to the Antiochenes*** penned by Athanasius of Alexandria and others in connection with the Council of Alexandria in 362 offers a precious snapshot of the Christological issues under debate at the time. Several of the affirmations made in the *Tome* reappear or are debated in other writings from this period: that the Word did not indwell Christ in the same manner that he dwelt in the prophets, but he really became a human being, taking flesh from Mary, for the redemption and salvation of humanity; and that the incarnate Word is one and his divinity and humanity should not be divided into separately acting and experiencing agents. Athanasius's three ***Christological Letters to Epictetus, Adelphius, and Maximus***, written between 360 and 374, confront a wide range of

Christological aberrations that had been reported to him. As some of these positions are inconsistent with others, it seems likely that Athanasius is dealing with a hodgepodge of Christological views rather than a cohesive Christological system, though he describes some as "Arian." In response, Athanasius affirms that the divine Word became incarnate without any change to his divine properties. He repeatedly emphasizes the single subjectivity of the incarnate Word, insisting that the humanity, its properties, and its experiences *belong to* the Word, making them his own. The Word acts and experiences in a twofold manner, divinely and humanly, and yet he remains a single individual. The *Letter to Epictetus* in particular was later esteemed as a monument of Christological orthodoxy at the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon as well as by Cyril of Alexandria.

Several writings of Apollinarius of Laodicea are included in this volume: ***Recapitulation***, ***Selected Letters***, ***On the Faith and the Incarnation***, ***On the Body's Union with the Divinity in Christ***, ***Fragments of Other Writings***, and the ***Fragmentary Writings against Diodore and Flavian***. Apollinarius exemplifies the unitive approach, stressing the absolute unity of divinity and humanity in Christ, whom he called one person (*prosōpon*), one hypostasis, and "one incarnate nature of God the Word." Intending to avoid any dualistic subjectivity in Christ, he conceptualized the incarnation as the Word assuming human flesh or a human body through an integrative union and thus eliminated the humanity's rational soul from the Christological compound, with the Word of God effectively taking the place of Christ's human power of self-determination. His opponents seized on this precise point as the chief defect of his teaching, inasmuch as they claimed he attributed a defective humanity to Christ. Because Apollinarius so emphasized the identity of the Word and Jesus, it permitted him, for example, to speak of Christ's flesh as "heavenly" and same-in-substance with God precisely on account of the union. The technical term for such an understanding is *communicatio idiomatum*, "a sharing of properties." But this led his opponents to accuse Apollinarius of teaching that the flesh of Jesus had descended from heaven, even though Apollinarius himself denied it. The numerous translations presented in this volume allow the reader to hear Apollinarius speaking in his own voice, his views for the most part set within their own argumentative context and not subjected to the polemical conjectures and distortions of his opponents. One of Apollinarius's interlocutors was Diodore of Tarsus, whose approach to Christ was more dualistic than his. The ***Selected Fragments*** of his translated in this volume

illustrate how he could speak of Christ as if he were two separate entities, "the seed of David" or "the one from Mary," and "God the Word."

In ***Letters* 261 and 262**, from the 370s, Basil of Caesarea confronts several Christological opinions he takes to be deviant, including one that held that Christ's body was "heavenly." In the course of refuting the deviant opinions, he provides a sketch of his own Christological views. His ***Homily on the Holy Birth of Christ***, also from the 370s, is a commentary on selected verses of the infancy narrative in Matthew 1:18–2:11, which includes reflection on the incarnation. Here Basil conceives of the incarnation as God's presence in human flesh, in a human body that is just like ours, but in a unique way unlike his intermittent presence in the prophets. Basil affirms divine immutability even in the incarnation, explaining that the Word was not diminished or changed when he came to dwell among us.

In the 380s the tide turned definitively against Apollinarius when Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa began to write against him. The former's ***Letter* 101 *to Cledonius*** and ***Poems* 1.1.10–11** demonstrate Gregory's anti-Apollinarian polemics in two different genres: letter and verse. Against Apollinarius Gregory affirms that Christ was fully divine and fully human with body, soul, and mind as he lays out a Christological vision that was to have profound influence on subsequent generations of Christians. *Letter* 101 later became another monument of Christological orthodoxy, and in it Gregory's famous (and often misquoted) dictum appears: "For what is not assumed is not healed, but what is united to God is saved." Though Gregory of Nyssa wrote works specifically against Apollinarius, the Laodicean bishop is not in his sights in his ***Oration on the Savior's Nativity***. In the course of commenting on the Matthean infancy narrative (much as Basil had done) Gregory addresses various objections to the doctrine of the incarnation: If this intervention was providentially necessary, why was it delayed in human history? If evil and death were conquered by Christ, why are they still so powerful? Isn't the incarnation out of character for God, who is perfect and incorruptible?

Diodore's protégé Theodore of Mopsuestia's ***On the Incarnation***, from the late 380s or early 390s, is directed against both Eunomians and Apollinarians. This work survives only in fragments, which have been arranged in their original order as far as can be determined. In this work Theodore expounds a Christology that is very much a work in progress. He attempts to work out the categories, concepts, and contours with which to articulate his dualistic understanding of Christ, which he expresses in dyophysite

("two natures") terms: in Christ there is a union of two distinct, intact, and complete natures (humanity and divinity) in a single person. Theodore speaks of God indwelling in Christ "by good pleasure" and goes to great lengths to elucidate what he means by that. He teaches that Christ can be called "Son of God" (by grace) because of his conjunction with the Word (who is Son of God by nature).

The pro-Nicene Christological dynamics found in the Greek East were also found in the Latin West, which is represented here by selected writings of Augustine of Hippo and a dossier of texts connected with Leporius. In ***On Eighty-Three Different Questions. Number 80: Against the Apollinarians*** from 396 Augustine engages in anti-Apollinarian polemics. In ***Letter* 137** from 412 he defends the incarnation as the Word's assumption of a human being and answers pagan objections to this belief, namely, that it posits that the ruler of heaven was confined in the tiny body of an infant and underwent the ordinary experiences of a human being. In ***Letter* 219** from about 420 – the first document in the Leporius Dossier – Augustine reports how he persuaded the monk Leporius to abandon his Christological dualism in favor of a more unitive pro-Nicene Christology and provides a succinct summary of his Christology. There are two more documents in the Leporius Dossier. The first is Leporius's ***Statement of Amendment***, in which he demonstrates his abandonment of his earlier Christological opinions and outlines his corrected Christological views, articulating his reasons for holding them. He admits that his former views had the unintended consequence of positing two Christs and adding a fourth person to the Trinity. He now views the incarnation as a mixture of divinity and humanity without confusion or detriment to either nature, a mixture in which the properties of each nature are shared by the one Christ, the incarnate Word, who is the subject of all the human experiences of Jesus in respect of his humanity. The third document in the Leporius Dossier is the first book of John Cassian's ***On the Incarnation of the Lord against Nestorius***, from late 429 or early 430. Here Cassian depicts Leporius as a kind of Nestorius before Nestorius, attributing his Christological errors to his adherence to the teaching of Pelagius.

The final selection in Part III is Theodoret of Cyrrhus's ***Exposition of the Orthodox Faith***, probably from the 420s. The first section of this work summarizes the doctrine of the Trinity, against unnamed opponents, most likely "Arians" of his era, perhaps some sort such as Heteroousians, and here Theodoret recapitulates the central pro-Nicene teachings about the

Trinity articulated in the fourth century and in particular by the Cappadocian Fathers. The second part of the work is devoted to Christology. The focus of this section is the mode of union between the humanity and divinity in Christ, teaching that in the incarnation two different substances have been united in a conjunction to create a single new entity, which he calls a person. He also deals with the problem of reconciling the omnipresence of the Word with the constraints of the human body assumed in the incarnation and rejects Christologies which conceive the incarnation as a blending or confusion of the divine and human natures, or which speak of the Word changing into the body or the body becoming divine. As this work illustrates the concerns of pro-Nicene Christology on the eve of the controversy over Nestorius, it is a fitting conclusion to Part III.

PART IV: CONTROVERSY OVER NESTORIUS

Of the six parts of CEECW 3 and 4, this one is the most compressed in time. The texts translated here were written over a period of less than twenty years, from about 428 to around 447. All of them are connected in some way with the controversy over Nestorius and have been chosen to illuminate the Christological positions and political machinations of the two main factions.[3] One was headed by Cyril of Alexandria, who had allied himself with Celestine of Rome against Nestorius of Constantinople. Their opponents were the "Easterners" (so called because they came from the Roman diocese of Oriens or "East") led by John of Antioch; their chief theological authority was Theodoret of Cyrrhus. While the Easterners eventually repudiated Nestorius, their Christological differences with the party of Cyril endured.

Soon after Nestorius became bishop of Constantinople in 428, a dispute erupted between two groups in the imperial capital over the propriety of the titles Theotokos ("bearer of God") and Anthropotokos ("bearer of the human being") for the Virgin Mary. Neither term was novel, the former having entered Christian usage in the early fourth century and the latter in the late fourth century. In an attempt to resolve the issue, Nestorius rejected both terms and advocated instead Christotokos ("bearer of Christ"). In several of his documents contained in this part he rehearses

3 The introductions to the individual texts narrate the progression of this controversy in greater detail.

his reasons for preferring this title. But this did not quieten the dispute as he had hoped. At some point, a layman named Eusebius, later the bishop of Dorylaeum, harangued Nestorius in defense of the title Theotokos while the Constantinopolitan bishop was preaching in church. Shortly after this, he issued a formal ***Protest*** against Nestorius, a public denunciation of his views. In this document he accused Nestorius of reviving the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, mentioned above, whose teaching by the 420s was universally considered indisputably heretical. Because of his interventions Nestorius now found himself at the center of the dispute he had tried to resolve.

News of the controversy in Constantinople soon spread throughout the East. It made its way to Egypt, over whose church Cyril of Alexandria presided. In two letters intended for Egyptian audiences written in early 429, he touched upon the Christological issues roiling Constantinople, rejecting Nestorius's position though without naming him. One of these letters, his *Letter to the Monks of Egypt*, reached Constantinople and upset Nestorius, whom everybody knew was the object of Cyril's rebuke. Reports of Nestorius's annoyance reached Cyril, and in the face of the unabated controversy in Constantinople, he wrote directly to Nestorius for the first time, justifying his *Letter to the Monks of Egypt* and announcing that his concern for Nestorius's orthodoxy was shared by Celestine the bishop of Rome (with whom Cyril was in regular contact).

In early 430 Cyril wrote his ***Second Letter to Nestorius***, in which he for the first time engages directly with the Christological issues raised by Nestorius's teaching. Here he explicates the Christological statements of the Nicene Creed of 325 and introduces his conception of the "hypostatic union" of the divine and human natures in Christ, which, he teaches, results in a single subject to whom can be attributed all the actions, experiences, and sayings of Jesus Christ, both those human and those divine – the doctrine of *communicatio idiomatum*. The Council of Ephesus in 431 and the Council of Chalcedon in 451 would give formal approval to the *Second Letter to Nestorius*, securing its status as a monument of Christological orthodoxy. In response to this letter Nestorius wrote his ***Second Letter to Cyril***, in which he summarizes his Christological teaching in a way that highlights his differences from Cyril. Toward the end of the same year, 430, bishop Proclus of Cyzicus (he became bishop of Constantinople in 434) preached a ***Homily on the Holy Virgin Theotokos*** in defiance of his archbishop Nestorius, who was present in the audience. In the homily he unequivocally defends using

the title Theotokos for the Virgin Mary, as it safeguarded the union of the divine and human natures in Christ the incarnate God.

Cyril's attempts to form an alliance with Celestine prompted Nestorius to write ***Three Letters to Celestine of Rome*** over the course of about a year, from late 429 to late 430, to try to win the bishop of Rome to his cause. These letters not only provide a clearer picture of the theological issues at stake at this early stage in the controversy, but also illuminate the political aspects of the dispute. Celestine never responded to these letters, but he was in communication with Cyril, who wrote to the bishop of Rome seeking a judgment on the question of whether it was necessary to sever communion with Nestorius. Cyril also provided Celestine with a dossier of Nestorius's writings. By mid-430 at the latest Celestine had tasked his archdeacon Leo (the future bishop of Rome) with evaluating them. Leo in turn requested John Cassian to examine the texts of Nestorius and produce a document to advise Celestine and the Roman church about the matter. In his ***On the Incarnation of the Lord against Nestorius*** Cassian firmly rejected Nestorius's position. As the first Latin text to assess Nestorius's theology, this treatise had a profound influence on subsequent perceptions of Nestorius in the Latin West. In August 430 a synod met in Rome under Celestine that formally condemned Nestorius. Celestine then wrote to Nestorius for the first time, informing him of the Roman synod's decision against him and ordering him to recant his views or be deposed. Celestine also wrote to Cyril about the synodal decision against Nestorius, prompting Cyril to hold a synod in Alexandria that also condemned Nestorius. Cyril then wrote his ***Third Letter to Nestorius***. Unlike his *Second Letter to Nestorius*, this letter was not a personal communication but intended to reflect the consensus that had formed against Nestorius's views, and to spell out in greater detail the Christological dogmas to which the bishop of Constantinople must adhere. In the *Third Letter* Cyril explains the Christology of his *Second Letter* in more detail, also touching upon its implications. To the letter Cyril appended Twelve Anathemas (or Twelve Chapters) which summarized his position as forthrightly as possible and deliberately excluded Nestorius's teachings as viable. Both this letter and Celestine's were delivered to Nestorius on November 30, 430.

In early December 430 Nestorius wrote his ***Letter to John of Antioch*** in an attempt to garner his support against the alliance of Cyril and Celestine. He expressed his willingness to confess the Theotokos so long as its possible heretical meaning was rejected. He also forwarded Cyril's *Third*

Letter to Nestorius along with its Twelve Anathemas. This turned out to be a shrewd move. For John and the Easterners were appalled by the Twelve Anathemas, which they viewed as smacking of the heresies of Apollinarius, Arius, and Eunomius. In response, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, the preeminent theologian among the Easterners, wrote his ***Refutation of the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria***. (Andrew of Samosata wrote another refutation of the same.) In the months before the Council of Ephesus in 431, then, Cyril's views as expressed in the Twelve Anathemas were under as much suspicion by the Easterners as Nestorius's were by Cyril and his allies. The upcoming council was intended to be an examination of both bishops.

But the Council of Ephesus was a debacle from its opening session on June 22 until its dissolution in October – see the introduction to ***Acts of the Council of Ephesus*** for details. The selections from this council translated in this volume begin with proceedings of the ***First Session*** on June 22 chaired by Cyril, at which Nestorius was deposed. The acts include a florilegium of twenty-five excerpts from the writings of Nestorius, compiled to highlight his most distinctive and, to his opponents, his most damning teachings. The proceedings of the ***Session of the Counter-Council of the Easterners*** on June 26 chaired by John of Antioch is also translated, which provides insight into the political dimensions of the council. At this session Cyril and his ally Memnon of Ephesus were deposed. At the ***Sixth Session*** on July 22 a "Nestorian" creed attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia was presented because some Lydian Christians hoping to return to orthodoxy from heresy had been "tricked" into signing it. This creed teaches that the human nature of Christ, conceptualized as a distinct subject conjoined to God the Word, shares in the titles of Son and Lord, as well as the honor and worship properly belonging to them, in virtue of his conjunction with God the Word. As such, it is a succinct statement of "Nestorian" Christology. In July Nestorius wrote his ***Letter to Scholasticus the Eunuch of Emperor Theodosius*** in response to slander about him being circulated in the imperial capital. Here he reiterates his acceptance of the term Theotokos, as long as it is paired with Anthropotokos, and rails against Cyril's Christology because it attributes change, suffering, and even death to God the Word. This letter provides the best insight into Nestorius's own thinking in the midst of the council. In early August the Eastern delegation wrote a letter to Emperor Theodosius in response to his sacra (imperial letter) accepting the depositions

of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon. This ***Report of the Easterners Written in Response to the Sacra Delivered by Count John*** offers a rare glimpse into the Christology of those opposed to Cyril: though they were willing to make Christological affirmations that amounted to a repudiation of Nestorius, they were unwilling to drop the charge that Cyril's Twelve Chapters were tainted with Apollinarianism. This *Report* includes one of the earliest statements – if not the earliest statement – of the so-called double consubstantiality of Christ, the idea that Christ is both same-in-substance (*homoousios*) with the Father and same-in-substance with all humanity. The ***Letter of John of Antioch and Others to Rufus of Thessalonica*** from October is another letter of the Easterners in which they justify their deposition of Cyril and Memnon and provide insight into their understanding of their opponents' Christology. The selections from the acts of Ephesus conclude with the ***Homily of John of Antioch***, also from October. Here John bids farewell to his supporters and urges them to remain steadfast in the authentic Christological faith they hold, which John concisely summarizes and contrasts with his opponents' views. In the end, the Council of Ephesus did nothing to resolve the Christological issues that had pitted Cyril and his allies against Nestorius and his supporters, apart from securing agreement that Nestorius should be deposed. Rather, the council only exacerbated the divisions between the Cyrilline party and the Easterners led by John of Antioch.

It took nearly two years for a compromise to be reached, in 433, when both factions agreed to a statement of faith known as the Formula of Reunion. The Formula was actually a slightly modified version of the statement of faith contained in the *Report of the Easterners Written in Response to the Sacra Delivered by Count John*, from August 431, with its double consubstantiality clause. Cyril quotes the Formula of Reunion in his ***Letter of Reunion to John of Antioch***. Along with Cyril's *Second Letter*, this letter would be endorsed as a Christological standard at the Council of Chalcedon (and at subsequent ecumenical councils), associated with the work of the Council of Ephesus even though it was written two years afterward. In the *Letter of Reunion* Cyril also clarifies his Christological positions against critics accusing him of heresy. One of these critics was Ibas of Edessa, who in his ***Letter to Mari the Persian*** gives an account of the Council of Ephesus and the reconciliation between Cyril and John in 433 in a way that disparages the Alexandrian bishop quite harshly. The *Letter* of Ibas later became quite infamous as one of the so-called Three Chapters.

Cyril's reunion with John led some of his supporters to wonder whether it amounted to a departure from his earlier views or even a capitulation to the "Nestorian" Easterners. One such partisan was Succensus of Diocaesarea, who voiced such concerns to Cyril. In response Cyril wrote his ***First and Second Letters to Succensus*** between 434 and 438. In the first letter Cyril identifies Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia as the sources of Nestorius's teachings, initiating a long trajectory of condemning these two pro-Nicene theologians of an earlier generation who died in the peace of the church. In the same letter Cyril addresses how one ought to speak of the "two natures" of Christ, the incorruptibility of Christ's flesh, and the proper interpretation of his own writings – all subjects that would continue to be debated for centuries. This letter contains one of Cyril's usages of the famous phrase "one incarnate nature of the Word" (*mia physis tou logou sesarkōmenē*), which later became the hallmark of the miaphysite movement. The second letter responds to a series of questions posed by an unnamed Easterner on the issue of what the words "flesh" or "become incarnate" mean and what they imply about how one should use the language of "nature" with respect to Christ. This letter could almost be regarded as the charter of the miaphysite movement that would crystalize after the Council of Chalcedon.

Part IV concludes with the epilogue of the ***Eranistes*** of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, which sums up the three dialogues of the treatise on, respectively, the immutability of the Word, the manner of union between the Word and the human nature in Christ, and the impassibility of the Word qua God in the union of the two natures in the incarnation. Written around 447, it is a fitting résumé of the dyophysite Christology of the Easterners before controversy was renewed soon thereafter, this time over Eutyches.

A feature in the texts surveyed in this part must also be noted. It is a feature also found in the texts in CEECW 4. The Nestorian controversy marks the beginning of a new method of theological argumentation in the Christological debates (though there were precedents before this time). It is the so-called argument from authority. Participants in the Christological debates, no matter what side they were on, were concerned with fidelity to the authoritative figures of earlier generations. To be considered as departing from these authorities and engaging in the development of doctrine, which was routinely called "novelty" or "innovation," was tantamount to being charged with heresy. Accordingly, theologians in this period strove above all to be traditional, to affirm what the "fathers" had previously taught.

Such arguments took two interrelated forms. The first was recourse to certain statements of faith, and especially creeds, as irreformable touchstones of orthodoxy. By the early fifth century everyone agreed that the Nicene Creed (whether the original creed of 325 or the version issued in 381) was the authoritative document par excellence (apart from scripture). Christological developments were therefore often presented as nothing more than clarifications of the Nicene Creed. Over time certain documents were identified as particularly helpful explanations of the pro-Nicene faith encapsulated in the Nicene Creed: Athanasius's *Letter to Epictetus*, Gregory of Nazianzus's *Letter* 101 *to Cledonius*, Cyril of Alexandria's *Second Letter to Nestorius* and *Letter of Reunion to John of Antioch*, the Tome of Leo, the Chalcedonian Definition, and other synodal definitions and documents.

The argument from authority took another form: direct quotations from the works of the authoritative men of the past ("church fathers"), often collected into florilegia. Many theologians and councils from the fifth century onward included such florilegia in their texts to prove that whatever they were teaching had the approbation of tradition, that what they were teaching was nothing more than what approved church fathers had taught. Sometimes the patristic quotations are presented as self-evident justifications for the position endorsed by the theologian; on other occasions some exposition is provided to demonstrate how the excerpt confirms the position of the theologian. Florilegia of counter-testimonia were also produced: a theologian might compile excerpts from notorious heretics to prove that his opponent's views were nothing more than the recrudescence of some already-condemned heresy. Regrettably, most of these florilegia have been excluded from the translations in the interests of space, but several have been included to demonstrate this method of argumentation.

A CATALOGUE OF HERETICS

In all the parts of this volume the authors of the texts frequently make reference to those whose views they disagree with or are writing against. Such opponents are typically labeled "heretics" and their Christological views are deemed aberrant or erroneous or even dangerous. Of course, this was all a matter of perspective. For example, dyophysites of the Church of the East revered Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Interpreter, as they called him, as the champion of orthodoxy, whereas Chalcedonians reviled him as one of the Three Chapters and the inspiration of Nestorius's heresy. In

this section, to avoid repetition in the footnotes, a brief catalogue of the pre-fifth-century "heretics" is provided, listing those most frequently mentioned in the texts in this volume. The focus here is on how these figures were viewed by early and late antique Christians, not necessarily what they may or may not have actually taught, insofar as their teaching is recoverable by modern scholarship.

The encounter between **Simon Magus** and the apostles Philip and Peter is recorded in Acts 8. In early Christianity many apocryphal traditions developed around Simon, who was depicted as a sorcerer, a rival Christ, the cause of the first persecutions of Christians in Rome, and the archetypal heretic. The term "simony" is derived from Simon's actions in Acts 8:18–25.

Several Jewish Christian groups were identified as "Ebionites" in early Christianity, purportedly founded by one **Ebion**. These sects were reported to have lived according to the Jewish law, rejected the writings of the apostle Paul, and regarded Jesus as an ordinary human being (psilanthropism). The name Ebionite was actually derived from the Hebrew word for "poor" and referred to the poverty of the group, rather than a founding figure named Ebion, who is a heresiological invention.

Valentinus was a Christian philosopher from Alexandria who moved to Rome between 136 and 140, where he taught until his death around 165. Later generations of Christians considered him the fountainhead of an influential variety of Gnosticism and credited him with docetic views about Christ. Texts from the Valentinian school included in this volume are the *Treatise on Resurrection* and *A Ptolemaic Theology*.

Marcion came from Pontus to Rome in 140, but only four years later was expelled from the church for his dualistic views. He taught that Jesus had revealed a new and unknown God, his Father, the good God who sought to destroy the evil God of the Old Testament, who was seen as the imperfect and flawed Creator, the God of the Jews, the Lawgiver, and the Judge. Later generations of Christians routinely accused Marcionites of espousing a docetic Christology.

The early third-century **Sabellius** was a proponent of monarchianism or modalism (also called Sabellianism) which stressed the "monarchy" ("single rule") or the oneness of God to avoid any hint of ditheism or tritheism. Monarchians saw the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three manifestations of the single God or three modes in which the one God appeared or was revealed to humanity in salvation history. Opposition to monarchianism

became a feature of orthodox thinking from the middle of the second century onward.

Paul of Samosata, a bishop deposed for Christological heresy in the 260s, became widely regarded as teaching adoptionism or psilanthropism. Selected fragments of Paul of Samosata are translated in this volume.

Mani (also known as **Manichaeus**) was from southern Mesopotamia and died a martyr in 276. He was the founder of a Christian sect that espoused a radical dualism of light and darkness. Later generations of Christians frequently accused Manichaeans (also called Manichees) of teaching a docetic Christology.

Arius was an early fourth-century presbyter in Alexandria whom later generations of Christians depicted as teaching that the Son was inferior to the Father and in fact a creature made by God. His dispute with his bishop, Alexander, over the relationship of the Father and Son sparked the decades-long "Arian" controversy. It was Arius who was the impetus for the Council of Nicaea in 325, and thereafter opposition to Arianism became a key feature of any theology that claimed allegiance to Nicaea. Later generations considered "Arian" Christology defective because of its unwillingness to distinguish between Christ's human and divine attributes and its implication that the Son could not unite humanity to God.

Marcellus of Ancyra was deposed for heresy in 336, though he lived into the 370s. His theology was driven by a concern to preserve the unity of God at any cost, understanding God as a unitary divine monad that mysteriously expanded into a triad (namely, the Word and Spirit) without losing its essential oneness and indivisibility. For Marcellus, the Word could only be called "Son" in the proper sense at the incarnation. Marcellus was viewed as a reviver of a form of Sabellianism, and opposition to him became a hallmark of pro-Nicene theology. A disciple of Marcellus, **Photinus of Sirmium**, was deposed for heresy in 351. In his own day and long afterwards he was considered by some as an adoptionist and by others as a monarchian.

In the second half of the fourth century **Eunomius**, the quondam bishop of Cyzicus, was the leader of the Heteroousians (also called Eunomians) who taught that the Father and Son were "different-in-substance" (*heteroousios*). Opposition to Heteroousian theology became a touchstone of the pro-Nicene movement from the 360s onward. Pro-Nicenes rejected Eunomius's Christology on two grounds. First, since they interpreted Eunomius as affirming that the Son was created, they took him to be implying

that the Son was inherently mutable and thus naturally suited to life in the body but incapable of effecting salvation. Second, noting that Eunomius did not distinguish between Christ's human and divine attributes, they accused Eunomius of denying that Christ had a human soul, which they understood to result in a confusion of the distinct properties of his humanity and divinity.

Macedonius was bishop of Constantinople until 360. An anti-Arian Homoiousian during his lifetime, he came to be considered by later generations of Christians as the founder of the Macedonians, whose denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit provoked the First Council of Constantinople in 381.

The pro-Nicene **Apollinarius of Laodicea** (d. ca. 392) was condemned during his lifetime for Christological heterodoxy. Later generations of Christians typically accused him of teaching the elimination of the rational soul from Christ's humanity to avoid any dualistic subjectivity in Christ and the descent of the flesh of Jesus from heaven. Several writings of Apollinarius are translated in this volume.

A CHRISTOLOGICAL VOCABULARY

In the course of the first eight centuries of Christianity, a number of conceptual models were put forward at various stages to explain how Christ was the incarnate Son of God. Old models which later Christians judged to be deficient were replaced by new ones aiming to resolve the issues once and for all. Each of these conceptual models had a technical vocabulary associated with it, frequently overlapping with the technical vocabulary of other conceptual models, without the terms always being used in precisely the same sense. Accordingly, theologians in the various Christological traditions gradually developed Christological lexicons to express their understanding of the incarnation. Each tradition had a preference for certain conceptual models and terms, and they attempted to refine the meaning of these terms and hone precision in their usage over time through debate. By the end of the period covered in these volumes a rich technical vocabulary for speaking about Christ was firmly in place for the various Christological traditions.

One benefit of including texts spanning over 600 years in CEECW volumes 3 and 4 is that the development of this technical vocabulary can be traced. For this reason considerable effort has been made in these volumes

to translate key technical terms consistently across texts, at least when the terms are used in a technical sense. Consistency in translation, however, has not been elevated to an unbending rule. So if the usage of a particular author has warranted a different translation, the term has been translated accordingly. The following paragraphs survey the key terms for which an attempt has been made to offer a consistent translation in these volumes.

Terms for the incarnation that use the root "flesh" (e.g. *sarx* in Greek, *caro* in Latin, *basrā* in Syriac) have been translated in a way that preserves this root, or at least signifies it with the Latinate *-carn-* root. Examples include "incarnation," "incarnate," "enfleshment," "enfleshed," "became incarnate," "become flesh," "made flesh," and so forth. Terms that fall into this category are the Greek *sarkōsis*, *ensarkōsis*, and *sarkōthenta*; the Latin *incarnatio* and *incarnatus*; and the Syriac *besrānuṯā*, *mḇasrānuṯā*, and *meṯḇasrānuṯā*. Other terms for the incarnation use the root "human" (e.g. *anthrōpo-* in Greek, *homo/humanus* in Latin, *bar[ʾ]nāšā* in Syriac, *rōme* in Coptic). These terms are likewise translated in a way that preserves their root, such as "became human," "made human," and so forth. Terms that fall into this category are the Greek *enanthrōpeō*; the Latin *homo factus*; and the Syriac *eṯḇarnaš*. Abstract nouns with this root, such as the Greek *enanthrōpēsis* and the Syriac *meṯḇarnšānuṯā*, have been rendered with "humanification."

The Nicene *homoousios* is translated with "same-in-substance." The Latin equivalents *eiusdem substantiae* and *consubstantialis* and the Syriac equivalent *bar kyānā* are translated in the same way. When the Greek term *hypostasis* is used in a technical Christological sense it is simply transliterated. Its Syriac equivalent *qnoma* is rendered by the same transliteration (when the text is a Syriac translation of a Greek original). The phrase *kathʾ hypostasin*, which literally means "according to hypostasis," is frequently rendered with "hypostatically" or "hypostatic," depending on the context. The standard translation of the Greek *prosōpon*, the Latin *persona*, and the Syriac *parṣōpā*, when used in a technical Christological sense, is "person." The Greek term *synapheia* is translated "conjunction," and its verbal cognates based on *synaptō*, "conjoin."

The three Greek terms *theotokos*, *christotokos*, and *anthrōpotokos* are also simply transliterated. These titles, which respectively mean "bearer or birthgiver of God, of Christ, or the human being," refer to Mary, the mother of Jesus, but each encapsulates a particular view of the incarnation. The Latin equivalents are rendered with the Greek transliterations: *theotocos*, *dei genetrix*, and *partrix dei* for Theotokos; and *genetrix hominis* and *genetrix*

Christi for the other two terms. The Syriac equivalent for Theotokos, *yāldaṯ alāhā*, is also rendered with the Greek transliteration.

The four Chalcedonian adverbs are translated, when possible, as adverbs: "unconfusedly" (*asugchutōs*), "unchangeably" (*atreptōs*), "undividedly" (*adiairetōs*), and "inseparably" (*achōristōs*). The adjectival forms of these are also rendered similarly when possible.

The Greek term *oikonomia*, whose Latin equivalent is *oeconomia*, is translated by "economy" or "divine plan" when the term is used to refer to God's plan for salvation. A related term with a similar meaning is the Latin *dispensatio*, "dispensation."

Two circumlocutions were used in Greek in reference to Christ. The phrase *allo kai allo*, which consists of two neuter singular pronouns joined by the conjunction "and," was used to describe the position that Christ consists of two different "things" (substances or natures). This phrase is typically rendered by "one thing and another" or something similar. The expression *allos kai allos*, which contains two masculine singular pronouns, was used to describe the position that Christ consisted of two distinct persons or subjects. This expression is typically rendered by "one and another" or something similar.

A FINAL WORD: THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST

Many of the texts in this volume contain some sort of acknowledgment that the incarnation is ultimately a mystery whose full comprehension is beyond the capacities of the human intellect. Such a viewpoint was not the exclusive preserve of any single Christological tradition – it is found in all of them. One might think that this shared belief in the ultimate incomprehensibility of the incarnation would have made early Christians engaged in Christological debate more tolerant of differences in approach and opinion. Sadly that was not the case. Rather, respect for this mystery and recognition of what could and could not be known and said about the incarnation was deemed an essential feature of any theological account of Christ. As Theodoret of Cyrrhus memorably remarked, "We confess that we do not have a clear understanding of the truth – indeed, that is a significant part of the victory" (*Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* 17). Indeed, the errors of "heretics" were often attributed to a failure to respect this mystery. Attempting to explain the unexplainable, it was thought, inevitably led to heresy.

And so, in the many pages of this volume containing early Christian texts that in one way or another attempt to explain Christ as God incarnate there is an underlying current of apophaticism or unknowing, along with an assumption that the subject of inquiry would prove ever elusive, ever beyond the grasp of the human mind. For most of the theologians in this volume the divine–human Christ was in the final analysis not a problem to be solved, however much ink they spilled on that endeavor, but a person to be contemplated, to be experienced, and to be loved in the midst of a community of believers on the quest for salvation. It was in the service of this quest that so much reflection on Christ, so much inquiry into his identity and constitution, was set down for posterity.