the cambridge edition of
EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS
VOLUME 4
CHRIST:
Chalcedon and Beyond

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 fourth volume focuses on early Christian reflection on Christ as God incarnate from ca. 450 CE to the eighth century. 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

SERIES EDITORS

Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, *University of Notre Dame*
Mark DelCogliano, *University of St. Thomas*
Ellen Muehlberger, *University of Michigan*
Bradley K. Storin, *Louisiana State University*

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 4

CHRIST:
Chalcedon and Beyond

EDITED BY

Mark DelCogliano

University of St. Thomas, Minnesota

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

<div align="center">CONTENTS</div>

Notes on Contributors

Scott Ables is Instructor in the School of History, Philosophy and Religion at the Oregon State University. He translated John of Damascus's *On Composite Nature against the Leaderless*, his *On the Faith against the Nestorians*, and the selection from his *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*.

Sebastian Brock is Emeritus Reader in Syriac Studies at Oxford University. He translated Jacob of Serugh's *Metrical Homily on the Council of Chalcedon*.

E. W. Brooks (1863–1955) was an independent scholar based in London who edited and translated many Syriac texts. His previously published translation of Timothy Aelurus's *Petition to Emperor Leo* with F. J. Hamilton, excerpted from their translation of *The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*, appears in this volume.

Aaron Michael Butts is Associate Professor in the Department of Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures at the Catholic University of America. He translated Jacob of Serugh's *Letter 14* and Simeon of Beth Arsham's *Letter on Bar Ṣawmā and the Heresy of the Nestorians*.

Mark DelCogliano is Associate Professor of Theology at the University of St. Thomas. He translated the selections from *Acts of the Home Synod at Constantinople*; Eutyches's *Letter to Leo of Rome*; the selections from *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*; Leo of Rome's *Second Tome (Letter to Emperor Leo)*; the selection from Emperor Justinian's *Edict on the Orthodox Faith* with Bradley K. Storin; the selections from *Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople*, from Gregory the Great's *Homilies* and *Epistles*, from *Acts of the Lateran Synod*, and from *Acts of the Third Council of Constantinople*; and Maximus the Confessor's *Opusculum 3* with Jonathan L. Zecher.

ix

R. Y. Ebied is Emeritus Professor of Semitic Studies at the University of Sydney. His previously published translations of the second and fourth parts of Timothy Aelurus's *Against the Council of Chalcedon* and Timothy's *Letter to Claudianus* with L. R. Wickham appear in this volume.

Philip Michael Forness is Research Fellow in the Historical Seminar at the Goethe-University Frankfurt. He translated the first part of Timothy Aelurus's *Against the Council of Chalcedon*.

F. J. Hamilton's previously published translation of Timothy Aelurus's *Petition to Emperor Leo* with E. W. Brooks, excerpted from their translation of *The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*, appears in this volume.

Ellen Muehlberger is Professor of History at the University of Michigan. She translated the selections from Philoxenos of Mabbug's *Letter to the Monks of Senoun* and from Narsai's *Metrical Homilies on the Nativity and on the Epiphany*.

Andrew Radde-Gallwitz is Associate Professor of Liberal Studies at the University of Notre Dame. He translated pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite's *Fourth Letter*; the selections of Sophronius of Jerusalem's *Synodical Letter*; the *Ekthesis of Emperor Heraclius*; and the *Typos of 647/8*.

Jeanne-Nicole Mellon Saint-Laurent is Associate Professor of Historical Theology and Syriac Patristics at Marquette University. She translated Jacob of Serugh's *Metrical Homilies on the Name "Emmanuel" and on How the Lord is Known in Scripture as Food and Drink*.

Bradley K. Storin is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at Louisiana State University. He translated Leo of Rome's *Tome to Flavian of Constantinople*; Emperor Zeno's *Henotikon*; the selection from Emperor Justinian's *Edict on the Orthodox Faith* with Mark DelCogliano; and Emperor Justin II's *Second Henotikon*.

Erin Galgay Walsh is Assistant Professor of New Testament and Early Christian Literature at the University of Chicago Divinity School. She

Notes on Contributors

translated Narsai's *Metrical Homily on "the Word became Flesh" (John 1:14)* and the *Anonymous Apology for Narsai*.

L. R. Wickham (1932–2017) was University Lecturer in the Faculty of Divinity at the University of Cambridge. His previously published translations of the second and fourth parts of Timothy Aelurus's *Against the Council of Chalcedon* and Timothy's *Letter to Claudianus* with R. Y. Ebied appear in this volume.

John Zaleski is a Lecturer in Theology at Loyola University Maryland. He translated the selections from Babai the Great's *On the Union*.

Jonathan L. Zecher is Research Fellow in the Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry at the Australian Catholic University. He translated Maximus the Confessor's *Ambigua* 5 and 31, and his *Opuscula* 6 and 7. He also translated Maximus the Confessor's *Opusculum* 3 with Mark DelCogliano.

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: Scott Ables, Sebastian Brock, Aaron Michael Butts, Philip Michael Forness, Jeanne-Nicole Mellon Saint-Laurent, Erin Galgay Walsh, John Zaleski, and Jonathan L. Zecher. 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,

Acknowledgments

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 book 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

Notes on the Texts and Translations

        *
      * *   Transition from one document or major section to another

    * * *   Intentional omission of material from the translation

Abbreviations

ABAW.PH	Abhandlungen Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse
ABAW.PPH	Abhandlungen Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologisch und historische Klasse
ACC	*Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*
ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum
ACO²	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, Series secunda
BHG	Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca
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
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller
GCS n.F.	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Neue Folge
GNO	Gregorii Nysseni Opera
PG	Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca
PL	Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
SChr	Sources chrétiennes
Apollinaris	Hans Lietzmann (ed. and trans.), *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1904).
Nestoriana	Friedrich Loofs (ed.), *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905).
LXX	Septuagint
Ep.	*Epistula, Epistle*

xvi

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.

<div style="text-align: right">

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

</div>

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 3: *Christ: Through the Nestorian Controversy*. 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.

---

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.

introduction

These volumes include only non-biblical texts, though of course the Bible itself is profusely cited in the early Christian texts selected for them. 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 first volume (CEECW 3) 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 the context of preceding

Introduction

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 this volume. 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 to 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 more 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 COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON AND ITS RECEPTION

In the wake of the controversy over Nestorius, a new controversy arose over Eutyches, when this venerable priest and archimandrite of Constantinople was accused of and deposed for heresy in 448. A series of synods met after this, culminating in the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which proved to be divisive in the extreme. The texts translated in Part I have been chosen to illustrate not only the lead-up to Chalcedon but also its aftermath and troubled reception. The Christological landscape became irrevocably fractured in this period, as Chalcedonian dyophysites and anti-Chalcedonian

Introduction

miaphysites attempted to claim the mantle of Cyril and other "approved" fathers, and as both groups continued to struggle with dyophysite "Nestorians" who looked to Theodore of Mopsuestia as their inspiration. This part of the volume covers the initial period of the reception of Chalcedon up to the second Council of Constantinople in 553.

But first a feature in the texts surveyed in this part and the next must be noted. The Nestorian controversy marked 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.

Part I opens with texts that illustrate the origins of the controversy over Eutyches. At the Home Synod at Constantinople in November 448, presided over by Archbishop Flavian, Eusebius of Dorylaeum – the same Eusebius who had harangued Nestorius twenty years earlier – indicted Eutyches on charges of heresy. The selections from *Acts of the Home Synod at Constantinople* chart the course of the seven sessions of this synod, at the last of which Eutyches was put on trial, condemned, and deposed. The views of Eutyches are difficult to reconstruct, but the proceedings from the Home Synod translated here provide some of the best evidence for understanding his position. What led to his deposition was his rejection of the double consubstantiality endorsed in the Formula of Reunion of 433 (though he indicates his willingness to affirm this if required to do so) and his blunt refusal to acknowledge two natures in Christ after the incarnation. Immediately after his deposition, Eutyches wrote his *Letter to Leo of Rome* to appeal the verdict. This letter, as well as the *Profession of Faith* and *Protest* that he appended to it, provides further insight into Eutyches's Christology. At the same time Flavian of Constantinople reported the Eutychian affair to Leo, and in response in May and June 449, Leo wrote his *Tome to Flavian*, a refutation of Eutyches in which he expounded that in the incarnation the inviolable divine nature and the passible human nature are united in a single person without diminishment of either nature or limitation of their respective capacities. The Chalcedonian Definition would later praise Leo's Tome as "a universal pillar for the confirmation of right doctrines against those with wicked opinions," but this endorsement was a major factor in Chalcedon's chilly reception.

Certain irregularities in the trial of Eutyches led to an inquiry in April 449, and he was allowed to appeal the verdict against him at the second Council of Ephesus (Ephesus II) in August 449. Presided over by Dioscorus of Alexandria, Ephesus II exonerated Eutyches, convicted Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum of impropriety at the Home Synod, and deposed them along with a number of other dyophysite bishops including Ibas of Edessa and Theodoret of Cyrrhus. But when Marcian became emperor in 450, he convened the Council of Chalcedon in October

451, in the hope of settling the various Christological disputes once and for all. How unfounded that hope turned out to be!

The selections from *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* translated in this volume highlight the main work of the council over its first six sessions. Dioscorus was condemned (Eutyches had been condemned again shortly before the council), Flavian was exonerated posthumously, Leo's *Tome to Flavian* was accepted (Dioscorus had refused to let it be read at Ephesus II), and a new Definition of Faith was issued. At the **First Session** the acts of Ephesus II were read out, which in turn included the reading of the acts of the Home Synod in November 448, and those of the two inquiries in April 449. The selections translated in this volume include the plaint Eutyches made at Ephesus II, which is another key resource for reconstructing his Christology. At the **Second Session**, translated in its entirety, the synod was ordered by the imperial officials to produce a new Definition of Faith, which was resisted by the bishops. When Leo's Tome was read out as a standard of orthodoxy, two blocs of bishops, from Illyria and from Palestine, voiced concerns with three passages from the Tome, which other bishops tried to allay by quotations from the writings of Cyril. At the third session, which is not translated here, Dioscorus was tried, condemned, and deposed. The next document translated from the acts is the so-called **Address to Marcian**, which argues that the Tome of Leo contains no innovations with respect to the Creed of Nicaea but rather commendably responds, following a hallowed tradition, to new theological controversies unforeseen by the Nicene fathers. The selections translated from the **Fourth Session**, at which the Tome of Leo was affirmed, include the corporate statements by the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops who had previously objected to the Tome. At the **Fifth Session**, which is translated in its entirety, the new Definition of Faith was presented and acclaimed. The remaining sessions, which are not translated here, dealt with jurisdictional, episcopal, and canonical disputes, and restored some of the bishops deposed at Ephesus II to their sees, including Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa.

The Chalcedonian Definition that the council produced with vociferous reluctance and under compulsion from the emperor immediately became a bone of contention, with some claiming that it was unfaithful to Cyril's Christological legacy and ceded too much to the Nestorian position. This perspective was supported by Chalcedon's endorsement of the strongly dyophysite Tome of Leo and the rehabilitation of Theodoret and Ibas. Stung

also by the deposition of Dioscorus, the Egyptian church in particular was galvanized against Chalcedon. Here the miaphysite movement was born, defined by uncompromising opposition to Chalcedon and a fidelity to Cyril of Alexandria that emphasized his *Third Letter to Nestorius* (with its Twelve Anathemas) over his *Letter of Reunion to John of Antioch*.

In 457 the miaphysite Timothy Aelurus became the uncontested bishop of Alexandria and spearheaded the efforts to overturn Chalcedon when in that same year Marcian died and Leo I became the emperor. In October 457 Leo I consulted over sixty Eastern bishops as well as Leo of Rome to see whether they thought Chalcedon should be upheld and Timothy recognized as the legitimate patriarch of Alexandria. Not one bishop supported Timothy. Leo of Rome wrote two letters to the emperor in response. In the first he expressed his full support for Chalcedon and rejected Timothy, and in the second, from August 458, he offered a defense of the Chalcedonian position. This second **Letter to Emperor Leo** has become known as the *Second Tome*. As a corrective to the *Tome to Flavian*, the *Second Tome* strives to articulate a balanced Christology that is explicitly both anti-Eutychian and anti-Nestorian and affirms the two natures of Christ in a single person. Here Leo clarifies that both natures are necessary for any action of Christ, though they are not two principles of action. In Christ the natures are united and remain unconfused, and the one person performs both human and divine actions.

Emperor Leo forwarded both letters to Timothy, who in response wrote his **Petition** to the emperor. In this *Petition* he elucidates his own Christology and explains his rejection of Leo's Tome as tacit Nestorianism. Two additional writings from Timothy are translated in this volume to demonstrate early miaphysite perspectives. The first is three of the four parts of **Against the Council of Chalcedon**, which offers section-by-section refutations of both the Tome of Leo and the Chalcedonian Definition, and a eulogy for Dioscorus. Particularly noteworthy in this treatise is Timothy's use of excerpts and florilegia as a method of corroborating his own position or refuting Chalcedon. The other is his **Letter to Claudianus**, which is anti-Eutychian in focus.

Emperor Zeno succeeded Leo I when he died in 474, and Timothy Aelurus died in 477. Zeno sought to reconcile the imperial Chalcedonian church and the Egyptian anti-Chalcedonian church. In 482, with the support of patriarch Acacius of Constantinople, Zeno issued the **Henotikon**, a minimalist document aimed at identifying points of

Introduction

common agreement. It gave approval to both aspects of Cyril's theology (represented by the strongly miaphysite Twelve Chapters and the dyophysite-leaning *Letter of Reunion to John of Antioch*), and reduced the council's work to the condemnation of Nestorius and Eutyches. Timothy's successor, Peter III Mongus, approved the document. Eastern Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians were thus reconciled – at least officially. In actuality the minimalism of the *Henotikon* allowed Eastern Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians to use the document as a cover for continuing to promote their own positions. Western bishops, however, rejected the *Henotikon* outright, leading the bishop of Rome to break off communion with Acacius, resulting in the so-called Acacian Schism. The *Henotikon* remained official imperial policy until 518, when Emperor Justin embraced Chalcedon as the standard of Christological orthodoxy. This eventuated in the reestablishment of communion between Rome and Eastern Chalcedonians (thus ending the Acacian schism) but anti-Chalcedonian miaphysite bishops such as Severus of Antioch and Philoxenos of Mabbug were deposed from their sees. The selections from the latter's **Letter to the Monks of Senoun** translated in this volume provide a detailed account of second-generation miaphysite Christology outside of Egypt. In addition to communicating the details of his own Christology, Philoxenos criticizes Chalcedonian Christology by examining passages from the Tome of Leo, the Chalcedonian Definition, Leo's *Second Tome*, and even from a letter of Nestorius written shortly before the Council of Chalcedon.

To further illuminate miaphysite reflection on Christ, several works of the poet-theologian Jacob of Serugh (ca. 451–521) are translated in this volume. Anti-Chalcedonian Christological themes are muted in his **Metrical Homilies on the Name "Emmanuel"** and **on How the Lord is Known in Scripture as Food and Drink**, allowing other features of his Christology to emerge, such as how the prophet Isaiah's reference to an "Emmanuel" is a declaration of the reality of the incarnation and Christ is known in the Eucharist. In his **Metrical Homily on the Council of Chalcedon** and particularly in **Letter 14**, however, anti-Chalcedonian polemics are front and center, and he even signals his support of Zeno's *Henotikon*. Another miaphysite writer of the early sixth century, Simeon of Beth Arsham, provides a genealogy of the heresy of the "Nestorians" and explains how it spread into the land of the Persians in his **Letter on Bar Ṣawmā and the Heresy of the Nestorians**.

The dyophysite "Nestorian" opponents of both the Chalcedonians and the anti-Chalcedonians alike are also represented in Part I through works of Narsai (died ca. 500). His ***Metrical Homily on "the Word became Flesh"*** is a meditation on the opening verses of the Gospel of John, particularly on how to properly understand the Word's "becoming" flesh (John 1:14). In the selections from his ***Metrical Homilies on the Nativity and on the Epiphany*** Narsai examines several events from the life of Christ and affirms the immutability of the Word even in the incarnation and stresses that it was the human being who was the subject of these biblical events, not the immutable Word of God. Narsai holds that the immutable Word did not literally become flesh in the incarnation (since that would be impossible for the Word), but rather indwelt the human being for the purpose of revealing knowledge of God.

Included in Part I is a text that is difficult to date and classify, and was later interpreted in support of various Christological positions: the ***Fourth Letter*** of pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Composed in the late fifth or early sixth century by an unknown author using the pseudonym of Dionysius the Areopagite, who according to Acts 17:34 converted to the faith after hearing the apostle Paul's preaching in Athens, the writings of the "Corpus Dionysiacum" exercised an enormous influence on Christian thought in late antiquity because of their purported apostolic connections. The *Fourth Letter* speaks of the Word "becoming substantial" instead of "becoming flesh" or "becoming human," meaning that the one who is "beyond substance" takes on substance in the incarnation, a position that differs equally from Chalcedonian and miaphysite teachings. The letter also speaks of Christ engaging in "a new god-manly activity" (*kainēn tina theandrikēn energeian*), an expression that would become the subject of much debate in the monoenergist debates of the seventh century.

Upon his accession to the imperial throne in 527, Justinian continued the pro-Chalcedonian policies of his predecessor, Justin. Seeing "Nestorian" dyophysitism as irredeemable, Justinian attempted to bring about a rapprochement between pro-Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians by clarifying that Chalcedon was in no way susceptible to the charge of "Nestorianism." This new approach to the reception of Chalcedon, which is sometimes called "Neo-Chalcedonianism" or "Cyrilline Chalcedonianism," follows the path of other theologians of the era such as Leontius of Byzantium and Leontius of Jerusalem. It attempts to clarify the meaning of the Definition by extracting and highlighting what its proponents took

to be the latent Cyrillianism already present in the Definition, by demonstrating the fundamental agreement between Chalcedon and the whole of Cyril's Christology, in particular that found in the Twelve Chapters. The endeavor to clarify Chalcedon in this manner, however, was at the same time a constructive project which resulted in real Christological innovation and development. Thus, Neo-Chalcedonianism used the resources of the ecclesiastical tradition, above all Cyril, to articulate a more refined Christology that was less liable to misinterpretation than the Definition had been.

To this end, Justinian launched a campaign against the so-called Three Chapters – the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, certain writings of Theodoret of Cyrrhus against Cyril, and the *Letter to Mari the Persian* attributed to Ibas of Edessa. These three were of course the bishops of the previous century who were most reviled by anti-Chalcedonians as "Nestorians" – except for Nestorius himself. By condemning the Three Chapters, then, Justinian hoped to show anti-Chalcedonians the true meaning of Chalcedon's dyophysite Definition, that it provided no foothold for "Nestorianism." The emperor issued an edict against the Three Chapters in 544 or 545, but it was poorly received in the East and West. After some years of fruitless attempts to build support for the condemnation of the Three Chapters, Justinian realized that the only way to achieve this would be to hold an ecumenical council. Before the council convened, however, Justinian issued his ***Edict on the Orthodox Faith*** in 551. The edict provides an important clarification of the meaning of the Chalcedonian Definition in the light of the full scope of Cyril's Christology. Accordingly, the Neo-Chalcedonian Christological exposition in the edict supplies the theological reasoning that informed the work of the upcoming council. Indeed, the anathemas included in this edict were recycled as the canons issued by the council.

The council planned by Justinian took place in Constantinople in June 553 (Constantinople II). Selections from the ***Sixth Session*** and ***Eighth Session*** of the ***Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople*** are included in this volume. At the former the case against Ibas of Edessa was presented. The latter was the concluding session of the council, at which a long speech summarizing the work of the council was read out, the Three Chapters were formally condemned, and fourteen canons were issued. The first ten canons are Christological, indicating the boundaries of acceptable Christological expression and understanding and condemning the heresies

that transgress those boundaries, whereas the last three canons are directed against each of the Three Chapters. The long speech that summarizes the council provides great insight into what those in control of the council thought it had achieved, whereas the fourteen canons provide a résumé of the Christological issues at stake for the Neo-Chalcedonians.

While Constantinople II would soon become recognized as the fifth ecumenical council among Chalcedonians, it failed to achieve any rapprochement between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. Indeed, the council only accelerated the establishment of independent non-Chalcedonian churches. The miaphysite movements in Syria and Egypt were well on their way to becoming the Syriac Orthodox Church and the Coptic Orthodox Church (the Armenian Apostolic Church, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, and the Malankara Orthodox Church also have their origins in the miaphysite movement), just as the "Nestorian" dyophysite movement outside the Roman Empire was becoming the Church of the East. The significance of Constantinople II, for Chalcedonians, then, lies not only in its definitive establishment of Chalcedon – the council and its Definition – at the heart of Christological orthodoxy (a position which it had certainly not held in the decades after the council under the *Henotikon*), but also in its particular reception of Chalcedon. The council canonized an interpretation of the Chalcedonian Definition that demonstrated that it was not a compromise with Nestorians but a real Christological achievement that had not been properly understood. Thus Constantinople II inaugurated an "official" interpretation of Chalcedon whose influence was acutely felt by subsequent generations of Christians and indeed continues to the present day.

PART II: CHRISTOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES AFTER CONSTANTINOPLE II

The second part of the volume begins with a selection of texts that illustrate the coalescing of distinct Christological traditions in the aftermath of Constantinople II. The first is Emperor Justin II's **Second Henotikon** from 571, a renewed attempt to reconcile pro-Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians, coming nearly a century after Zeno's *Henotikon*. For the most part Justin's edict is little more than a tissue of quotations from Justinian's *Edict on the Orthodox Faith*, at times modified to reflect his own position. A Neo-Chalcedonian perspective is found in the selections from the **Homilies** and **Letters** of Gregory the Great, written between 590 and

Introduction

601. Gregory was not a speculative theologian involved in the theological debates over Christ. In his homilies, while affirming Neo-Chalcedonian Christology, he highlights the soteriological importance, meaning, and ramifications of the incarnation. His letters, however, contain more technical discussions, against Egyptian miaphysites (called Agnoetae) who maintained that Christ was subject to ignorance just like all human beings, and against Nestorians. The dyophysite perspective of the Church of the East is also represented by two texts. The first is the ***Anonymous Apology for Narsai***, whose precise date is uncertain. Rather than offering a systematic argument in defense of Narsai's Christology, it begins by presenting a florilegium of scriptural verses referring to Christ at various stages of the economy of salvation, and then juxtaposes eight statements of Narsai and the apostle Paul to show their doctrinal harmony. The apology concludes with a passage from Narsai that is otherwise unattested. The second is Babai the Great's ***On the Union*** from the first quarter of the seventh century. In the selections translated in this volume Babai characterizes miaphysitism as entailing theopaschism and then, through a series of definitions, arguments, and colorful analogies, he explains how Christ is two natures and two hypostases united in one person.

The next set of texts illustrates the monoenergist and monothelite controversies of the seventh century. Both pro- and anti-Chalcedonians had occasionally spoken of Christ having a single activity (*energeia*), language which had some precedent in authors regarded as authoritative by both factions. But there was no consensus in either pro- or anti-Chalcedonian circles in regard to this so-called monoenergist doctrine. In the 610s, however, Sergius of Constantinople (patriarch 610–638) began to promote monoenergism in the name of Emperor Heraclius (r. 610–641) not only as a possible basis for reconciliation between the imperial church and miaphysite anti-Chalcedonians, but also as a legitimate clarification of Neo-Chalcedonian Christology. In time, however, monoenergism became controversial and so in 633 or 634 Sergius issued a decree in the emperor's name called the *Psēphos*, which forbade the enumeration of the activities in Christ. Shortly after this Sophronius of Jerusalem offered a formidable critique of monoenergism in his ***Synodical Letter***. In response to Sophronius in 636 Sergius issued the ***Ekthesis*** in the emperor's name which repeated the *Psēphos*'s prohibition of discussion of the number of activities in Christ and instead promoted the idea that Christ had one will (*thelēma*). Previously there had hardly been any discussion of Christ's will(s), and the assertion

xxxiii

of this so-called monothelite doctrine was perhaps an attempt to quieten controversy over monoenergism. Soon, however, intra-Chalcedonian controversy over monothelitism eclipsed that over monoenergism, due in no small part to Maximus the Confessor's public defiance of monothelitism and embrace of the dyothelite position, that Christ has two wills, one human and one divine. This volume contains five texts of Maximus, written from the mid-630s to the early 640s, which illustrate his evolving response to monothelitism. In *Ambiguum 31* (written before the outbreak of the monoenergist controversy) Maximus expounds the dynamics of the incarnation by exploring three possible meanings of Gregory of Nazianzus's claim in *Oration* 38 that the "laws of nature are dissolved" and the "world above" will be populated. Written at the beginning of the monoenergist controversy, *Ambiguum 5* provides an anti-monoenergist interpretation of ps.-Dionysius's *Fourth Letter to Gaius*, particularly the key phrase, "a new god-manly activity." In *Opusculum 3* from the early 640s Maximus teaches, in an anti-miaphysite vein, that the duality of natures in Christ necessitates a duality of activities and wills, without, however, entailing their opposition or separation. Here Maximus distinguishes between "natural" (*physikon*) and "deliberative" (*gnōmikon*) wills, affirming two natural wills in Christ as necessary consequences of each nature having its own appropriate activity, while denying two deliberative wills in Christ. *Opusculum 6* also stems from the early 640s and here Maximus provides a dyothelite interpretation of a key biblical passage in the monothelite controversy, the prayer uttered by Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane: "Father, if possible, let this cup pass from me, but not what I will, but rather let your will be done" (Matt 26:39). In *Opusculum 7* from 641 Maximus holds that Chalcedonian Christology implies two activities and two wills in Christ, at once interwoven and distinct. Here he articulates his dyoenergist and dyothelite position by reclaiming passages from Cyril and pseudo-Dionysius to which monoenergists and monothelites had appealed.

In 647 or 648 Paul of Constantinople issued the *Typos* in the name of Emperor Constans II to replace the *Ekthesis* as imperial policy, forbidding discussion of both the number of activities and the number of wills in Christ. The Roman preference for dyothelitism was longstanding, and even before the *Typos* was issued there were plans to hold a synod to affirm it. In October 649 the Lateran Synod, convened by Pope Martin with Maximus in attendance, did precisely this. The selections from *Acts of the Lateran Synod* translated below include three speeches in favor of

Introduction

dyothelitism and against monothelitism, providing insight into the state of Roman dyothelite thinking in the late 640s. Also translated is the synodal definition with twenty chapters that issue various condemnations.

Tensions between Rome and Constantinople in the aftermath of the Lateran Synod's rebuke of imperially backed monothelitism thawed only in 678 when Emperor Constantine IV initiated plans with Rome to resolve the issue of the number of wills in Christ. When a Roman delegation was sent to Constantinople in 680, the emperor convened the third Council of Constantinople, which came to be recognized as the sixth ecumenical council. For the most part this council examined whether monoenergism/ monothelitism or dyoenergism/dyothelitism had the weight of tradition behind it. The selections from *Acts of the Third Council of Constantinople* translated in this volume include the *First and Second Sessions*, at which there was an examination of the acts of Ephesus I and of Chalcedon; excerpts from Pope Agatho's letter to Constantine, which was read out at the *Fourth Session*; the examination of patristic florilegia at the *Sixth Session*; the examination of the monothelite Macarius of Antioch at the *Eighth Session*; and the *Synodal Definition* that was read out at the *Eighteenth Session*. Constantinople III marks the formal end of the monoenergist and monothelite controversies, though of course these positions survived thereafter.

The sixth part concludes with three selections from John of Damascus, who wrote in the early eighth century. John's *On Composite Nature against the Leaderless* and *On the Faith against the Nestorians* are translated in their entirety. The first attempts to debunk the miaphysite concept of the composite nature, while the second is directed against the East Syrian dyophysites of the Church of the East. The final selection is an excerpt from John's masterpiece, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, in which he articulates his support for dyothelitism against the position's detractors in his day and witnesses to his favorable reception of Maximus.

*
* *

In the past John of Damascus has been viewed as a great (or, more negatively, as a "mere") synthesizer and systematizer of the prior tradition, and in the Roman Catholic tradition this viewpoint is evident in the custom of sometimes calling him "the last of the church fathers." But concluding this volume with John – and thus our anthology in CEECW 3 and 4 – is

not meant as an endorsement of such ideas. Recent revisionist scholarship on John has proposed that he was far more constructive and innovative as a theologian than the traditional view would have us believe. Accordingly, John does not represent the sunset of one era and the dawn of another, and he is not the "fitting" or "obvious" endpoint of a volume illustrating early Christian reflection on Christ, in spite of his being where the volume does end.

The choice to end with John was rather more a matter of convenience and practicality. One has to stop somewhere. But the story of reflection on Christ continued and so this volume could have easily been continued – or a third volume on Christ added to the CEECW series. The original plan was to include coverage of the iconoclast controversy, which raised important Christological questions and had significant Christological implications. The various iterations of the debates between iconoclasts and iconodules would have been tracked, providing excerpts from the Council of Hiereia in 754, the second Council of Nicaea in 787 (the last of the first seven ecumenical councils accepted as legitimate by Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox alike – another seemingly "fitting" or "obvious" place to end) or even the Triumph of Orthodoxy in 843, along with pertinent texts from John of Damascus, Emperor Constantine V, Nicephorus of Constantinople, Theodore the Studite, and others. This material would have highlighted an aspect of reflection on Christ that had received scant attention in previous centuries, the validity of the veneration of images, including those of Christ. Moreover, in planning this volume a section on ninth-century "Christology in Arabic" was toyed with, featuring selections from the writings of Theodore Abū Qurrah (a Chalcedonian or "Melkite"), Abū Ra'ita of Tikrit (a miaphysite *malphono* ["teacher"] of the Syrian Orthodox Church), Ammar al-Basri (an East Syrian dyophysite of the Church of the East), and perhaps others. In the end including these figures was not feasible, but they would have demonstrated not only that the debates between Chalcedonians and the various groups of non-Chalcedonians continued unabated in Arabic outside of the Greek and Latin worlds under Islamic hegemony in the East, but also that these debates took on a new anti-Islamic dimension, as Christians in these regions confronted Muslim views about Christ. And so, the various streams of Christological reflection in the early centuries of Christianity continued to be received and refined and developed far beyond the stopping-point of this volume, shaping the reception of the writings of the seminal period covered here up to the present day.

Introduction

A CATALOGUE OF HERETICS

In 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 (a view known as 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. Two texts from the Valentinian school, *Treatise on Resurrection* and *A Ptolemaic Theology*, are included in CEECW 3.

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 CEECW 3.

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,

Introduction

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 CEECW 3.

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, *besrā* 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 *meṯbasrānuṯā*. 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 *eṯbarnaš*. Abstract nouns with this root, such as the Greek *enanthrōpēsis* and the Syriac *meṯbarnšānuṯā*, 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 *kath' 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 *parṣoḇā*,

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.