

Chalcedonian Council Revisited: Fr. Gregory Bishay

CHURCH SCHISM

Why do the study

- To understand the Schism that happened in the church after the Chalcedonian Council.
- To clarify the events that led to that, before and during the Council
- Divisions happened in the church that did not last more than hundreds of years, but in the 5th Century two divisions happened: One after the Council of Ephesus in 431AD, and the second after the Council of Chalcedon in 451AD

Nestorinous

- He was raised by the Antiochian theology, and took it further into a heretical dogma: Can God be born?
- His priest Anastasius gave a sermon criticizing the term "Theotokos"
- People of Constantinople were out-raged and expected their Bishop Nestorinous to do something.

Nestorius

- Nestorius supported Anastasius
- The People of Constantinople sent to Pope Cyril of Alexandria, so he wrote letters to Nestorius
- Nestorius was excommunicated due to his insistence on the heresy

After Council of Ephesus

- The excommunication of Nestorius
- The difference in the definitions of the Alexandrian and the Antiochian Theology
- Why the Antiochian and The Alexandrian?
- Some of Antiochian were against the excommunication of Nestorius; headed by Theodoret the Bishop of Korash.
- The Alexandrian side was headed by St. Cyril who wrote the 12 anathemas against Nestorius

Orthodoxy – St. Athanasius

- St. Athanasius "when explaining his doctrinal terms after the Synod of Alexandria in 362, had set out for his listeners that, 'hypostasis means ousia (essence), nothing more'.

Trinitarian Terms development

- "In the Trinitarian debates of the late fourth century a great deal of theological effort, on
- the part of the Cappadocian Fathers among others, had succeeded in Forging new technical senses for the word hypostasis.
- The Trinity doctrine had thus defined that God was one **ousia** expressed in three **hypostases**.

Trinitarian terms – East and West

- In the Trinitarian theological application, the West used *substantia* (substance) where the Greeks applied *ousia* (essence), and the reeks applied *hypostasis* where the Latins used *persona*. Thus, the Trinity doctrine as defined by the Latins is that God is one **substantia** (substance) expressed in three **personae** (Persons), while the Greeks defined it as one **ousia** expressed in three **hypostases**.

Ousia - Hypostasis

- "We say that essence and hypostasis are concepts which indicate the existence of existing things. 'Essence' (**ousia**) discloses that the subject (is and) exists and **hypostasis** says that it subsists' (St. Severus of Antioch Hom 125: PO 29, 235).

Ousia - Hypostasis

- "We say that essence and hypostasis are concepts which indicate the existence of existing things. 'Essence' (**ousia**) discloses that the subject (is and) exists and **hypostasis** says that it subsists' (St. Severus of Antioch Hom 125: PO 29, 235).

Ousia - Hypostasis

- With regard to the Trinity, the **essence** is the godhead: Father, Son and Spirit are God without diminution or gradation.
- With regard to the **hypostases**, in each case a particularity is expressed of the godness of the Father, Son and Spirit. Thus for the Father the non-begotten applies (agenetos in the twofold meaning of 'unbecome' and 'unbegotten');

- (cont'd) at the same time, however, the begetting is in reference to the Son; for the Son the being *begotten* of the Father, independently of time, and for the Spirit the *proceeding* from the Father.
- 'The *particularities* remain fixed and unalterable; they characterize without mingling each of the *hypostases* and do not divide the common *essence*.'

St. Cyril of Alexandria

- Our Lord Jesus Christ is "One incarnate nature of God the Logos", St. Cyril's own contribution, "it seems, lay in his definition of the union of the Logos with flesh as a 'hypostatic' and 'natural' union, and it is abundantly clear that he introduced it to enforce the truth,.....that Jesus Christ is one Person, the Logos in his incarnate state, and that any 'dividing' of this One Person is altogether Impossible"

The Alexandrian and the Antiochian Terms

- Alexandria: "Word-Flesh Christology"
- Relied mainly on John 1:14
- Antioch: "Word-Man Christology"
- Feared that the Alexandrian were close to the Appolonarian heresy.
- Appolonarios denied the presence of the rational soul and mind in Christ claiming the Divine Nature played that role.
- So Antioch refused the Word-Flesh term and used the Word-Man term

More Explanation

- Alexandria Theological Terms
 - 1 – Union from Two Natures
 - 2 – Hypostatic (in the Nature) Union
 - 3 – Since it is a Hypostatic Union then Christ is One Hypostasis “One Nature of the Incarnate God the Logos”
 - One Compound One, not a simple one
 - 4 – Christ is full God, full Man

- Wrong terms: **Two** Natures after the Union - Exists in Two Natures
- The Antiochian side adopted the term “Two Natures after the Union”
- So Alexandria says *Hypostatic* Union – Antioch says *Prosopic* Union (Union of the Prosopon = person. Prosopon is the same term used for the “mask” that actors wear to act as in a theatrical play)

Reunion of the Camps in 433

- 1- Getting rid of Nestorius did not solve the problem
- 2 - The Emperor (Theodosius the second) pressured for a union between Alexandria and Antioch to happen
- This led to John of Antioch to send Paul Bishop of Homs to Alexandria with the message:
 - "Our Lord Jesus Christ is a complete God, complete Man
 - Begotten of the Father before all ages in regards to the Divinity
 - Himself in the last days was incarnate of Virgin Mary.
 - He is of the same essence of the Father, He has the same essence of us"

The Result

- St. Cyril accepted this statement and there was an "Apparent" union between Alexandria and Antioch

Change of Leadership

- In **Antioch**: John of Antioch departed, was followed by Domnus his nephew
- In **Alexandria**: St. Cyril departed, was followed by St. Dioscorus

Result of Change of Leadership

- Bishop Domnus was of weak personality, so he was completely under the control of Theodoret of Korash.
- In 447 AD **Theodoret** of Korash published a book called *Eranistes (of different forms)* which disfigures the Alexandrian Fathers.
- Because of this the Emperor issued an edict in Antioch confining **Theodoret** to His See in Korash, and not come to Antioch (Where Domnus is the Bishop). Coupled with Theodoret was another Bishop called Ibas Bishop of Raha

Eutyches

- He was the head of Job Monastery in Constantinople, which had 300 monks
- Was a friend of Pope Cyril and claimed that he received copies of the Ephesus Council (431 AD) decision from Pope Cyril and kept it with him.
- He was the God father of his nephew *Chrysaphius* the chief of the Emperor palace staff. He, hence, had direct access to the palace staff.

Eutyches

- His zeal to the Alexandrian side, in a time of tension between Alexandria and Antioch, was met with great opposition of the Antiochians. In fact, this increased the tension.

His opposers and Their faith

- Flavian (Bishop of Constantinople)
- It seems he was pulled into the problem by Eusebius B. of Durellem, if we assume that the statement of faith that he gave to the emperor after this Council reflects his true faith, then there is no Alexandrian Theologian that will have a problem with him.

Flavian (cont'd)

- He used the following terms:
- 1 – **Of two Natures**
- 2 – One Hypostasis (which stipulates the Hypostatic Union)
- 3 – and, the Alexandrian golden statement: “One Nature in the Flesh of God the Logos”

His opposers and Their faith

- Eusabius (Bishop of Durrelleem) :
- Did not leave behind any written statement of his faith.
- Durrelleem was within the borders of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, so he visited often the city for church matters, where he met with Eutyches and had theological debates with him.

The Spark that started the Fire

- A theological discussion between Eutyches and Eusebius (B. of Dorylaeum) led to a sharp contention
- Eusebius went to Flavius (B. of Constantinople) accusing Eutyches of heresy against the faith of Councils of Nicea and Ephesus
- Flavius advised Eusebius that the latter meet again together with Eutyches to eliminate the contention, but Eusebius insisted on holding a Council to judge Eutyches. Council started Nov. 12, 448AD

The Local Council in Constantinople (448 AD)

- They sent a priest called John with a deacon called Andrew to the monastery to question Eutyches.
- The priest John after meeting with Eutyches that his faith is as follows: (P. 52)
- A – He denies being a heretic opposing to Nicea and Ephesus
- B – After the Incarnation of the Logos, i.e. after the birth of Christ, He is worshiped as One Hypostasis, which is the Nature of God in the Flesh who became Man.

The Local Council in Constantinople (448 AD)

- C – That Eutyches dismissed being accused that he believes that Christ's Body descended from Heaven.
- D – He believes that Christ is a Full God, Full Man, but says that the Body he took was not consubstantial with ours.
- E - Because Eutyches was leaning to the Alexandrian side he stipulated that "Christ was the One Nature of God the Logos Incarnate in the Flesh" (St. Cyril)

The Reports after visiting Eutyches

- The Reports of the Council accused him of:
- 1 – Denial of Two Natures united (not true at all, because he believed in the union of Two Natures)
- 2 – That he refused the belief that Christ is of the same nature as ours (this may have some truth, but he will retreat from it in the Council)


More visits to Eutyches

- Nov. 15 Two priests; Mamas and Theophilus went, came back reporting that Eutyches was sick
- Third time by priests Memnon, Epiphanius, and deacon Germanos
- Nov 16: Archimandrite Abraham reported that Eutyches was sick, Eutyches offered to write his faith but the Council did **not** agree.

- Nov 20: Council reconvened, priest Theophilus mentioned a remark (that may have been based on his meeting with Eutyches), he said Eutyches is asking "In which bible book it says that "Two Natures"?, But Theophilus acknowledged that Eutyches believes that He is a Full God, Full Man, but refused discussing the Two Natures issue, or the Nature of God.

The Trial of Eutyches

- Eutyches presented a *written* statement of his faith, but it was not read by the Council.
- Eutyches presented a profession of faith and an appeal to the Synod. Flavian answered that there was no need for a written statement of faith.

- 
- After his condemnation Eutyches mentioned to Leo of Rome that he presented a profession of Faith, and an appeal, and complained that it was not read from him.
 - Leo wrote to Flavian but mentioned nothing of the profession of faith, he just mentioned the appeal. In his reply to Leo, Flavian denied that Eutyches presented any appeal

Why was the confession of faith ignored?

- 1 – Admission of a document would require a decision of the Synod whether it was Orthodox or not.
- In the historical context of the Synod, they wanted to avoid finding it to be Orthodox, and in the meantime judging it to be not Orthodox would have deadly consequences.
- 2 - May be it may force the Council to discuss Eutyches stand on the Alexandrian and the Antiochian views of the Unity between Antioch and Alexandria enforced in year 433 AD

Eutyches presented an Oral Confession

- *Thus I believe, I worship the Father with the Son, and the Son with the Father, and the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son. Concerning his coming in the flesh, I confess that it happened from the flesh of the Virgin, and that he became man perfectly for our salvation. Thus I confess in the presence of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and of your holiness.*

Eusebius pressed..two points

- 1 – Two natures after the Union.
- 2 – Christ Body is consubstantial with us.
- Regarding the **First** one: Eutyches said (his famous statement): *“I confess that our Lord was from two natures before the union, but after the union I confess one nature.”*

- Regarding the **Second** one: Eutyches was reluctant to use the phrase "*consubstantial with us*" (not because he denied the reality and perfection of Christ's manhood, nor because he refused to admit his real birth from Mary, but) because Christ for him was God incarnate.
- The manhood which God the Son assumed in the incarnation was not the manhood of a *man*, but of God the Son who accepted on Himself an incarnate state. (He wanted to avoid, in his mind, the doctrine of two Sons.)

Confrontation

- **Florentius** (The Emperor representative) insisted that Eutyches would accept “from two natures”. And to condemn all those who oppose it.
- **Eutyches** said that he read St. Cyril and St. Ath. And they speak of “from two natures” as referring to the two *before* the union. As for *after* the union and the incarnation, they no longer affirm two natures but one.

Condemnation of Eutyches

- Conclusion: The statement “consubstantial with us” reflects more the Antiochene view of the reunion of 433. It was written in the Formulary of the reunion, so when Eutyches was reserved in confessing it, meant that he is not endorsing the document.
- This led to Eutyches Condemnation.



Part III

Apologetics 3055
Seminary ACTS

Reaction to the Condemnation of Eutyches

- The Second Council of Ephesus on August 8, 449

Apologetics 3055 ACTS
Seminary

The Second Council of Ephesus in 449

- Emperor Theodosius II asked Dioscorus (Alexandria) to exercise supreme authority, with Juvenal (Jerusalem) and Thalassius (Caesarea in Cappadocia). The Order in the Council was Dioscorus (as chief presiding officer), then Julius of Puteoli (Rome), Juvenal (Jerusalem), Domnus (Antioch), Flavian (Constantinople)

The Second Council of Ephesus in 449

- Double Role of Dioscorus: *first*, investigate the condemnation of Eutychus
- *Second*, his theological conviction was obviously on the Alexandrine side (as opposed to the Antiochene side) with reference to the reunion of 433. The Emperor was in agreement on this with Dioscorus.

Another Force: Pope Leo of Rome

- Another force: 7 weeks before, Pope Leo of Rome had sent his *Tome* to Constantinople. Well-received by Flavian, and the party opposed to Eutychus.
- *Tome* was intended by Pope Leo to offer the final and infallible teaching of the Church on the *person of Christ* (as if the explanation coming from none than Apostle Peter himself).

The Council (EphII, 449) events:

- Elpidius (one of the two imperial commissioners, the other being Eulogius) gave direction that the faith should be confirmed first, then discuss minutes of the synod of Constantinople to assess the justification for Eutyches' condemnation.
- Dioscorus argued that the faith has been established by the fathers already, and just examine the matching what had risen to the faith of the fathers. The Council shouted to anathemize anyone who objects to the faith of the fathers.

- Eutyches was invited to present his appeal. His appeal here has been extracted from reading the *minutes* of this Council in the Council of Chalcedon.
- This appeal does *not* contain **TWO** sentences of crucial importance included by Eutyches in his confession, but Eutyches had these TWO sentences in the appeal he sent to Pope Leo after the local Constantinople synod.

Why 2 sentences were removed from Chalcedon


- Because the Council of Chalcedon was moving from the beginning in the direction to accuse Eutyches to be a heretic. So removed the two sentences.

What are they?

- The TWO sentences: “For He who is the Word of God came down from heaven without flesh and was made flesh from the very flesh of the Virgin unchangeably and inconvertibly, in a way He Himself knew and willed. And He who is always perfect God before the ages was also made perfect man in the end of days for us and for our salvation.”

The Council events...

- Flavian (Constantinople) asked the Synod to let Eusebius (Dorylaeum) speak.
- Elpidius (emperial commissioner) expressed that Eusebius already mentioned his view, and that the focus should go to reading the minutes of the local council (the council of Constantinople 448)

- 
- Dioscorus asked the council if they support Elpidius. 18 bishops (what is the total number of bishops) agreed on that course of action. They all exclaimed, “We all want the minutes to be read”

- Dioscorus asked the *roman* bishops specially for their opinion. Their opinion matched the council provided that the letters of Leo were read first.
- Eutyches complained that the Roman delegates were on the side of Flavian in opposition to him, and that he did not get to get justice from them. Based on this Dioscorus ruled to read the minutes of the home synod, then the letter of Leo.

Condemnation of Flavian and Eusebius, and others

- Their case was opened in the context of reading the minutes of Ephesus 431 (and the condemnation of Nestorius)
- Dioscorus asked the council regarding Flavian and Eusebius, 89 bishops declared *individually* that they have transgressed the faith.

Condemnation of Flavian and Eusebius, and others

- So Eutyches was rehabilitated and condemned Flavian and Eusebius.
- This way, the council of 449 asserted the Alexandrine view of the reunion of 433, as against the Antiochene interpretation which the synod of Constantinople in 448 had owned.

A Comment

- Eutyches had not understood the idea behind the phrase “from two natures”. He took the ‘from’ of the phrase in a chronological sense of a ‘before’ and an ‘after’. This appears from his statements in the synod affirming ‘two natures before’ and ‘one nature after’ the union.

A Comment

- Leo found Eutyches statements to be 'absurd and perverse'. Neither the local synod (Constantinople 448) nor this council (Ephesus 449) saw in it the idea which the pope Leo saw in it.
- This council saw only the Alexandrine emphasis in these words to be on 'of two natures' for Christ is 'One incarnate nature of God the Word'.

A Comment

- It is safe to say that pope Leo's evaluation of Eutyches was colored by his lack of understanding of the Alexandrine tradition.
- Note: Following the Antiochene side, the home synod accepts the council of 431 (Ephesus Ecumenical) in a way that matches the reunion of 433 (Local Constantinople), but in conformity with the Alexandrine tradition the council of 449 insisted on an acceptance of the council of 431

The Omission of the Tome of Leo

- This is the main accusation against Dioscorus. The Roman delegates asked 3 times for it to be read but there was no one in the council to support their request. In fact, the records of Ephesus show that Dioscorus *alone* suggested the *reading* of the letter.
- Why did it get ignored? (by the whole council, not Dioscorus)

Why was it Omitted?

- 1 – the Tome was widely circulated in the east from about the middle of June 449, so its contents was well-known.
- 2 – They had learned that it was an able defence of the 'two natures after the union'.

- 3 – The council gave its extreme opposition to this statement on several occasions, here is one: Seleucus of Amasia said “We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ in two natures”, the whole council shouted at him “No one says of the Lord that He is two natures after the union. He is not Bishop of Amasia. Do NOT divide the undivisible”


- 4 – Because the Tome contained ‘two nature’, We can venture the conjecture that the council did not read the *Tome* then out of respect for the see of Rome. So in all probability, Dioscorus and the rest of the council not to declare the one who sits on the See of Rome, Leo, (in light of this council) as a heretic.
- 5 – Leo declared this council as *latrocinium* – a meeting of robbers.

Some remarks on Eutyches

- Flavian (in the local Synod of Constantinople of 448), and Leo of Rome and the council of Chalcedon, made the the following points against Eutyches:
 - 1 – Reviving Apollinarius
 - 2 – According to Eutyches: “The Lord’s body derived from St. Mary was not of our substance, nor of human matter.”
- Though he calls it human, he claims it is not consubstantial with us.

Some remarks on Eutyches


- 3 – He is reproached for saying “two natures before” and “one nature after” the union.
- 4 – It is asserted that he refused to affirm the reality of Christ’s manhood.
- The basis of all these lies in Eutyches’ hesitation to affirm Christ’s consubstantiality with us.
- And on using the terms “two natures before” and “one nature after” the union.

- 
- Those who acquitted him in Ephesus 449 council took his oral and written statements to validate his faith, but did not stand to look deeply into the positions that created difficulty for his critics.


After the Council of Ephesus

449

- Council was a triumph to the Alexandrine understanding of the Nicene faith, without adopting the Formulary of Reunion of 433.
- The Emperor, upon receipt of the council's report, took provisions that require all Bishops to sign on the council, in this connection he asked pope Leo to accept the decisions.

- 
- Julius and Hilary (the delegation of Rome) left to Rome shortly after the council started. A synod convened in Rome from which Leo ensured support to his measures against the Ephesus council.
 - Death of Flavian, which was shortly after his condemnation, elicited sympathy to the cause of Leo.

- Leo wrote two letters to Emperor Theodosius: one denouncing the council, second asking for another council in Italy. Emperor ignored both.
- On the feast of *Cathedra Petri* the Western Emperor Valentinian III, his mother, and his wife Eudoxia, came to Rome. Leo complained to them that the See of St. Peter was humiliated. They sent letters to Theodosius who responded that Leo's story was not the truth concerning the council.

- 
- Leo wrote to the monks and clergy of Constantinople who oppose Eutyches, urging them to stay loyal to Flavian.
 - Anatolius, an Egyptian priest, was notified in 450 that he will be the patriarch of Constantinople in place of Flavian. Leo refused to acknowledge him.

Death of Theodosius II, then...

- A year later, in 450, Theodosius fell off his horse, and died. His sister **Pulcheria** gained control (instead of the son), and her consort **Marcian** became the Emperor.
- Pulcheria was extremely influential person, she determined to:
 - Support Rome over Alexandria, she worked to establish the Tome as a document of authority. Anatolius, the Egyptian patriarch of Constantinople (who resisted the document) signed the Tome in the presence of two bishops and two presbyters sent by Leo.

Death of Theodosius II, then...

- Elevate Constantinople against Rome, so the Emperor wrote to Leo to convene a council under the Pope's authority 'in order to do away with all impious error'
- Leo was demanding the remove names of Dioscorus and others from the diptychs, and was trying to take control, and work out a theory that Dioscorus and few ignorant men had been solely responsible for the decisions of 449.
- On 17 May 451, orders were issued to convene the Council of Chalcedon.




Part 4

The Council of Chalcedon

Some preliminary remarks

- By September 1st, delegates arrived at Nicea, but were asked to proceed to Chalcedon.
- About 500 delegates gathered in the church of St. Euphemia. First session was held on Oct. 8, 451.
- Highly interested in the Council, Marcian and Pulcheria nominated 18 high-ranking officials to preside on the Council.
- Seating: Facing the Altar; at the center is placed the Holy Gospel

- 
- Decisions of the Council which will be studied are:
 - Deposition of Dioscorus
 - The acceptance of the Tome of Leo
 - Adoption of the definition of faith
 - Exoneration of Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa


Deposition of Dioscorus

(A) Set apart and accused

- As soon as they were seated the Roman legate Paschasinus demanded that Dioscorus be excluded from the council (by the order of the Bishop of Rome)
- The Charge: stated by Lucentius (another Roman) "Dared to conduct a council without the authorization of the apostolic see"
- Required that Dioscorus seat be placed in the middle (the place of heretics)

- Eusebius: Dioscorus ill-treated him, damaged the faith, and Flavian had been killed
- Marcian and his colleague Valentinian accused him of 2 ecclesiastical crimes:
 - 1 -Establishing heresy of Eutyches as orthodoxy
 - 2 -Deposed Eusebius and Flavian, neither of whom had trespassed against the faith

- Pope Dioscorus: This is a charge against the whole council of 449 which had been convened by the emperor
- (Pope Leo had eastern supporters and they had planned together to single out Dioscorus.)
- Commissioners of the Council told Dioscorus, that since there are personal charges against him, they have to be discussed before discussing the faith issue that was discussed in the council of 449.


- 
- **The reading of the minutes**
 - Minutes of 449, which contained also minutes of 448 were read.
 - Dioscorus raised the question: Juvenal and Thalassius of Caesarea were presidents also, why is he alone set apart on trial?


The Story of The Blank Papers

- Based on Dioscorus question, the oriental party shouted that nobody agreed to the decisions of 449, but they had been forced to sign “blank papers”
- Stephen of Ephesus: 300 men who are followers of Dioscorus did not allow him to leave the church until he took down the decrees made by Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, other bishops.

The Story of The Blank Papers


- Dioscorus and his part conducted several meetings of their own, made their decisions and they were not recorded, but extended to the rest “blank papers”

- 
- Dioscorus: “they claim they had not agreed to things decided, and simply signed blank papers presented to them”,
 - so here is the challenge of Dioscorus:
 - 1 – “ why did they sign if they were not in agreement”
 - 2 – “Everyone wrote with the help of a notary” (Juvenal confirmed the words of Dioscorus)

- 
- 3 – “Take the report of Juvenal, of Thalassius, or of the bishop of Corinth, and see whether theirs is a copy of my minutes”
 - NO ATTENTION WAS PAID TO Dioscorus!!

Continuing on the blank papers

- Stephen of Ephesus: While his secretaries were recording the minutes, the secretaries of Dioscorus came and took away from them the writing tablets. Then they tore off the previous reports.
- “The next day when the inspection took place, we had the papers inscribed. The bishops who had not taken down wrote from the pledged copy”

- 
- Note: This contradicts that Dioscorus filled blank papers!
 - Dioscorus: “Let the account in the possession of Stephen himself be read” but NO ATTENTION AGAIN WAS PAID TO Dioscorus!!

THREE COMMENTS ON THE STORY OF BLANK PAPERS

- COMMENT 1
- Stephen admitted that writing the minutes happened by secretaries of the bishops themselves, so if what is written is different from what the bishops witnessed, then these bishops did not have the freedom to write down the minutes of the various incidents as they witnessed them.

THREE COMMENTS ON THE STORY OF BLANK PAPERS

- This allegation is answered by Dioscorus to simply compare all the recordings of the minutes and see if there is any difference between them.

- COMMENT 2
- Even for the sake of argument the story of blank papers is true, it would then should accuse not only Dioscorus but also Juvenal, Thalassias, and 'other bishops', and also Eusebius himself who attended the council of 449

- COMMENT 3
- Eusebius was present at the council, and presented a petition which was read in this council of 451, which most probably is the same appeal he presented to Emp Theodosius II after 449, and in both there was no mention of "blank papers"
- Is it then that the man who should be an eyewitness to the alleged story had to wait for two years to hear it for the first time on 8 Oct 451, from the men who had signed the Tome of Leo and agreed to support it?

Eutyches condemned and Flavian and Eusebius acquitted

- The appeal of Eutyches was being read to the council from the minutes of Ephesus. When it came to where the monk affirmed the Nicene creed, his accuser said that Eutyches was lying.


Eutyches condemned and Flavian and Eusebius acquitted

- The crucial point: when in reading the minutes it came to “the flesh of our Lord and God Jesus Christ had come down from heaven”, Eusebius commented that Eutyches avoided the “from heaven”, but had not specified where it was from.
- Basil of Seleucia observed that Eutyches affirmation of God the Word became man by assuming flesh was enough to confess the incarnation.

- Immediately Dioscorus stated that words of Basil were his own, without any recorded evidence in the minutes of 448.
- Dioscorus added "If Eutyches holds notions disallowed by the doctrines of the Church, he deserves not only punishment but even fire. But my concern is for the catholic and the apostolic faith, not for any man whomsoever."
- AGAIN, NO ONE ANSWERED THE POINT MADE BY HIM!!

Consecutive Incidents:

- Basil of Seleucia stated his conviction: 'I worship our one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only Son of God, God the Word, as made known in two natures after he became incarnate and was made man'
- The commissioners asked how then Flavian (who had passed away already) who believes in the same thing could be excommunicated.

- 
- Commissioners asked: “did you not complain that you had been forced to sign on blank papers the excommunication of Flavian?”
 - In answer they just repeated: “we all have sinned; we ask for pardon”
- Apologetics Seminar 3055 ACTS*

Core Issue

- “Two natures after the Union” is not stated in the Formulation of the Union of 433, nor in the statement of the faith of Flavian. This made Flavian’s faith seem correct and hence should not be excommunicated.

Core Issue

- Dioscorus asked for the minutes to be read to see that Flavian and insisted on “Two natures after the Union”.
- And that he had passages of writing of the holy fathers Athanasius, Gregory, and Cyril, forbidding the ‘two natures’ formula, but sanctioning only ‘one incarnate nature of God the Word’
- BUT THERE WAS NO RESPONSE!!
- Note: He was open to: ‘*from* two natures after the union’


- Confusion: Flavian's faith as written by him was not wrong, the Formula of faith of 433 (by John of Antioch and sent to Cyril) had no mention of the natures.
- Then there was a great confusion and Dioscorus biggest supporter Juvenal of Jerusalem wavered.
- THIS LED TO THE CONDEMNATION OF DIOSCORUS


- 
- THIS LED TO THE CONDEMNATION OF DIOSCORUS!!


Apologetics 3055 ACTS
Seminary

The Tome of Leo

- Eutyches relied on his imperfect understanding of the faith. Had he only paused to examine carefully the creedal statement, 'I believe in one God the Father omnipotent, and in Jesus Christ his only son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary', He would not have fallen into the folly of heresy.

- 
- The document, then, furnishes evidences from the scriptures to show that the 'Self-same who was the only begotten and the Everlasting One of the Everlasting Parent was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary'. In this way God the son took our nature for healing.

- 
- As against this clear teaching Eutyches uses 'deceptive words', saying that 'having been conceived in the Virgin's womb', Christ 'possessed the form of a man without a real body taken from his mother'. The truth is that 'the Holy Spirit made the Virgin bring forth, but it was a real body taken from her body' that she brought forth.

- 
- The Eternal God the Son assumed the manhood in such a way that 'the properties of both natures and substances were preserved and coexisted in one Person'. The Son of God, 'descending from his heavenly seat' and at the same time 'without retiring from the Father's Glory', entered this world being born in a new way.

- By this birth Godhead was not changed into manhood, neither was manhood absorbed in Godhead. But they were so united that 'each nature what is proper to its self in communion with the other; the Word, for instance, performing what is proper to the Word, and the Flesh carrying out what is proper to the Flesh'. As man, he was able to feel hunger and thirst, to be weary and to sleep; but as God, he satisfied thousands of people with five loaves and worked other miracles.

- . It is true that ' in the Lord Jesus Christ there is one person of God and Man, yet that whence suffering in common to both is another; for from us he has the humanity inferior to the Father, and from the Father He has the divinity equal to the father'. Thus the unity of person is ' to be understood as existing in two natures', so that it is possible to say that the Son of Man came down from heaven and that the Son of God took flesh and was born from the Virgin.

Observations on The Tome of Leo

- The Tome had been compiled by Pope Leo in the light of an assumption that Eutyches had failed to affirm the reality of Christ's human birth and his manhood.
- So, with a definite purpose of excluding the danger implied in the position ascribed to the monk, Leo makes three points;

- 1 - Christ's manhood was real.
 - As Man, He was Born of the Virgin Mother,
 - He had all the essential human properties
 - He Died and rose again from the dead.
- 2 - Through the Birth, life and dispensation of Jesus Christ, God the Word, the second person of the holy trinity, Himself entered the mundane plane of existence and worked out the salvation of the human race.
- 3 - The Godhead of the Word and the manhood which he assumed continued in him without change in his one person.

The Tome of Leo

- The letter of Leo speaks of '**one person**'. What did the pope mean by it?
- 5th Century terms of Theology: employing the words **Prosopon** and **Hypostasis** to correspond to the **persona** of the Latin Language.

Alexandrian and Antiochene

- **Alexandrian**
- the union of the natures was according to **hypostasis**
- and that Christ was one hypostasis and one prosopon
- The two natures of Godhead and manhood were so united that Christ was not 'two natures after the union'
- **Antiochene**
- a union of the natures in the realm of **prosopon**
- On this ground they taught that Christ was two natures united in one prosopon

Alexandrian (and Leo)

- He was always 'from two natures' and therefore 'one incarnate nature of God the Word'
- In fact, the theological basis on which the council of 431 had condemned Nestorius as a heretic was this Alexandrine emphasis.
- **So the question, which Leo meant by the words 'one person', is indeed most relevant. Did he, for instance, take the 'one person' to be 'one hypostasis' or simply 'one prosopon'?**

Weakness in Leo's tome

- So, while affirming the unity of Christ's person, he insists also that '*each nature performs what is proper to itself in communion with the other:*
 - the Word, for instance, performing what is proper to the Word,
 - and the flesh carrying out what is proper to the flesh" and that the unity of person is 'to be understood as existing in both the natures'.

- Men trained in the Alexandrine theological tradition would see in the one person existing in two natures only one prosopon, and in each nature performing what is proper to itself in communion with the other a hypostasis.
- is precisely what Antiochene theologians had all along been teaching

Alexandrene would object

- Alexandrines would thus take Leo to maintain that the two hypostases, namely God the Son and the man Jesus, were united in one prosopon.
- There is a real discrepancy between the teaching of the Alexandrine theologian and the emphasis of pope Leo.
- Cyril, for instance, had made it clear that the words and deeds had been expressed by the one hypostasis, but for the Tome the words and deeds had been expressed by the natures

The Correct Terms

- One Nature of the Incarnate God the Logos
- Ephesus
- *From Two Natures*

Wrong Terms

- Two Natures (after the Union)
- *Of* Two Natures

Apologetics 3055
Seminary ACTS