

On the Way to Ephesus 431

By Monsignor Cantley

In the first lecture I introduced the central doctrinal problem we have been examining as Christological. The careful reader has seen that the first two Councils Nicea in 325 and First Constantinople in 381 have concentrated their concerns on the mystery of the Trinity. In terms of priority of order, this is certainly correct; but in terms of the experience of faith, given that we would have no knowledge of the Trinity apart from Jesus' revelations about His father and sending of the Spirit, Christology has a central place. From this point on, with Ephesus and the declaration of Mary as the *Theotokos* (God-bearer, Mother of God), the Christological element is more clearly centralized. "The dogma of the Trinity was developed as the Church's response to a question about the identity of Jesus Christ. Was he, or was he not, equal in his divine existence with the Creator and Lord of heaven and earth? The answer of orthodox Christian doctrine was the confession that he is 'from the *ousia* of the Father' and '*homoousios* with the Father'...a few decades after Nicea...the theme is not the preexistent Son of God, but the incarnate one. Not the relation of God to God...but the relation of God to man in the person of the earthly Christ."ⁱ

Again it is necessary to situate the half century from First Constantinople to Ephesus in terms of civil and ecclesial politics and personalities. The Alexandrian – Antiochene rivalry in theology and politics continue to play a central role; and the central figures will be Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius (of Antiochene training and sympathy) bishop of Constantinople (chosen by the Emperor Theodosius II in 428, the same who will call for the Council of Ephesus in 431 to condemn and depose Nestorius).

The fifty years intervening between the second and third Ecumenical Councils were tumultuous. Theodosius I (the 'Great') died in 395. He was the last of the sole Emperors. His sons Arcadius in the East and Honorius in the West were orthodox Christians, but ineffectual. They ruled in a time of crisis when the "Barbarian" hords were crossing the borders and conquering much of the Empire. The Vandals, along with the Alans and Sueves crossed the Rhine near Mainz and pushed across the continent toward Gaul; the Visigoths, led by Alaric, sacked Rome in 410 and drove south into northern Africa. Augustine began his *City of God* in 413, the first ten books of which were dedicated to refuting the pagan's taunt that their gods were the more powerful (fortunately, from book 11 on, he turned to the real theme of his work, a theology of the "two Cities" and the intervention of God in human history).ⁱⁱ The Burgundians, Alamanni and Franks followed quickly and more and more of the former Empire was conquered, divided and formed into smaller kingdoms by these Germanic groups. Honorius (dubbed "pale flower of the women's quarter")ⁱⁱⁱ cowered before them. Not to put too fine a point on it, these German invasions completely reshaped the political face of Europe, and after accepting Christianity with an Arian doctrine threatened its authentic faith for some time into the future. The Roman aristocracy remained isolated in fortified

cities, carrying on their lives as though nothing were happening, thinking that these unwelcome neighbors would soon go away and all would return to status quo. They took no action, simply letting the invasion take place only to wake up surprised that it became a permanent situation. One of the factors that would control history for a long time was that in the abdication of ruling class, responsibilities that once belonged to the nobility was now transferred to the bishops who took on civil responsibilities as well as ecclesiastical administration. They became the ‘Prince-Bishops’ that had rather dubious value for the Church’s immediate and long-range future.

The Eastern Empire was being ruled from impregnable Constantinople and was relatively safe for the moment. In 408 Arcadius died and his seven-year old son, Theodosius II became Emperor with his older sister Pulcheria as regent and later, when he married, was highly influenced by his philosopher wife Eudoxia.^{iv}

The numerous and scandalous inter-Church rivalries also create an important back-drop to the events leading to the Council of Ephesus. Bishop Nectarius of Constantinople replaced Gregory Nazianzus as president of the first Council of Constantinople and as bishop of that city. He died in 397 and was replaced, at the insistence of the Emperor Theodosius I by John of Antioch (known from the 7th Century as Chrysostom meaning ‘golden tongued’). The new bishop was undoubtedly saintly, but not politically sagacious. His ‘golden tongue’ offended the Empress on two occasions when he likened her to Jezebel and to Herodius. He got in trouble with the court and with a powerful fellow bishop, Theophilus of Alexandria by giving sanctuary to Egyptian monks disciplined by Theophilus for their Origenist sympathies. John was exiled in 404 and died in prison in 407. The bishops sympathetic to Theophilus removed John’s name from the *diptychs* (the list of those to be mentioned at the Liturgy), but over the next ten years replaced them, all but **Cyril of Alexandria** who succeeded his uncle Theophilus in 412. Cyril held out longer and finally added John’s name to the diptychs did at the urging of his confessor. Cyril is a saint and doctor of the Church with a feast day on January 18th. His early actions at Alexandria were oppressive and set him at odds with many powerful people in the Empire: Orestes, the Prefect of Egypt, and formidable opponent, and one jealous of the Bishop-Patriarch’s power is an example. This and other struggles led to the tensions that resulted in bloodshed, one of which both unfortunately and notoriously took the life of a neo-Platonist, the woman philosopher Hypathia. There is a sermon of Cyril that attests to the riotous propensities of the Alexandrians. There is no evidence that Cyril was ever implicated in such actions, but is a witness to the tenor of the times.

The other major protagonist in the theological debate that would lead to the Council of Ephesus was **Nestorius** 381-451. He was a priest and monk at Antioch when Theodosius II chose him, in 428, to be consecrated bishop and made Patriarch of Constantinople. He had the same forceful temperament as Cyril and moved actively and violently against heretics. It is one of the ironies of history that this man, who earned the sobriquet “hammer of heretics”, would be branded a

heretic himself at the Council of Ephesus and deposed in 431. It was with Nestorius that the Christological problem, the union of the two natures, human and divine, in the one Person of the Son of God came into debate.

We recall that in the Arian controversy, which had obvious Christological implications, basic Arian theology could be designated a *Logos-Sarx* (or Word-Flesh) Christology since Arius denied Christ a soul and declared that it was replaced by the Logos (Word). The Word, then, was united to human flesh, but for Arians the result was not a man. This Arian Christology was essentially monophysitic (one-nature, and that divine). Nicea resolved the issue of the Son having the same nature as the Father; but never touched the Logos-Sarx Christology and probably was not even aware of it. Some theologians were aware. In the West, Hilary of Poitiers (315-368) fought it vigorously, and to counter it advanced a *Logos-Anthrōpos* (Word-Man) Christology, the Word became Man, took on himself a full and complete human nature, body and soul. In the East, even Athanasius did not see the Christological implications of Arius' heresy. The Nicene Creed also seemed oblivious, it affirmed "For us human beings and for our salvation he came down, and became flesh (σαρκθέντα).^v On that basis, saying that the Word became flesh is not wrong, but has to be properly and accurately understood (It is useful to remind ourselves that we use the expression in the 13th Century prayer of the Angelus: 'And the Word was made flesh'; and John 1: 14 reads: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us"). The proper understanding of the problem is what Nestorius attempted, unsuccessfully, to address. He already knew that the route through the denial of a human soul to Jesus that Arius and Apollinaris of Laodicea had traveled was impassible. Nestorius, schooled in the literalism of the Antiochenes addressed the problem through a phrase describing Mary's role as *Theotokos* (God bearer, often rendered as Mother of God, though that would more precisely be rendered *Μητηρ Θεου*). It was an unfortunate choice on Nestorius' part to attack this title of Our Lady. His intention seems not to have been to lessen Mary's dignity or status. But he never adverted to the fact that the title 'Theotokos' had already been in use since the third century. We find it in Origen around 230 and in Dionysius of Alexandria in 250. By Nestorius' time it was a familiar term in theology and in popular piety. When Nestorius preached against it, preferring the term *Christotokos*^{vi} (or Christ bearer) he meant to restrict the role of Mary to being the Mother of the human nature only. In this he offended the people, even causing interruptions of his sermons as they called out "Mary is the Mother of God." Obviously Nestorius was understood to be diminishing Mary and her role in redemption. "A placard was stuck on the wall of the cathedral accusing Nestorius of following Paul of Samosata by denying that Jesus is God. The accusation was leveled against Nestorius especially by a firebrand layman [named] Eusebius..."^{vii} The charge was unfair. Nestorius had no desire to deny the divinity of Jesus. He wanted to protect the doctrine of His divinity and could not grasp that his position was essentially flawed. He did not have the philosophical insight to distinguish *person* from *nature*. Person answers the question "Who?" Who is born of Mary? The eternal Son of God, who became incarnate. Nature answers the questions "What?" What is born into this world? A Man. A mother does not give

birth to a nature. She gives birth to a child, a person. Mary gave birth to the Son of God, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, Who took upon Himself a human nature. In the Incarnate Reality, there is only one Person, the Son of God Who, never losing His divinity is born in time as man entering into our history, our world, our time. There is only one divine Person Who is God and man. This is the heart of Cyril of Alexandria's answer to Nestorius. With his fellow Antiochenes, Nestorius was concerned not to jeopardize the impassibility of the divine Nature. In attempting this, did Nestorius deny the *homoousios* of the Creed? No, he misused it. He understood it to mean that the attributes of the Logos, as divine, rendered Him impassible and therefore incapable of suffering; It was the nature He took that suffered and died on the Cross. "It was permissible, according to Nestorius, to call the impassible Christ passable because he was 'impassible according to his divinity but passable according to the nature of his body'".^{viii}

Again the contrasting Alexandrian and Antiochene perspectives come into play. In Christology, the theologians of the time (and probably at least implicitly today as well) were "either Antiochene, beginning with the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels and attempting to explain how this man is also God, or Alexandrian, beginning with the Word of John's Prologue [in the Fourth Gospel] and attempting to understand the implications of the Logos taking flesh."^{ix} So much of the dispute centers on the fact that language would not be settled as to the precise meaning of words until a much later time. An example could be taken from a completely orthodox theologian, St. Cyril. Mistakenly thinking he was using an authentic writing of Athanasius, but in reality used an Apollinarianist apocrypha, Cyril used the formula *μία φύσις* by which he meant to indicate the perfect unity of being, the unity of natures in one person in Christ. However the word means "nature", and understood as such would be Monophysitic, something totally contrary to the whole theology of Cyril.^x Cyril did not allow for two φύσεις (really natures) because he took the word to imply a subsistent nature (i.e., personal and therefore the result would be two persons). This is what occurs in his unfortunate phrase (in transliteration) *mia phusis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene* (one nature incarnate of God the Word). His meaning was to emphasize against Nestorius the unity of Christ's Person; instead it reads just the opposite, the unity in one nature. While Nestorius thought he was protecting the full integrity of the human nature of Christ, he could see no way of doing this apart from affirming that the two natures were in the closest junction, but not a union in *hypostasis*. Cyril insisted on the union in person, a *hypostatic* union, the one Christ has two perfect and distinct natures: divine and human. It was problems like this that forced the establishment of technical language with a precise meaning to serve the authentic teaching of the Church. One has to wonder whether the dispute between Nestorius and Cyril could have led to a meeting of minds if they had discussed their differences and what each meant, rather than the acerbic dispute that actually arose. Yet their rivalry and personal animosity would not allow this to happen.

Cyril surely means to teach that the flesh of Christ is the flesh of God; that it is God who died on the Cross in His human nature (passable) and not His divine nature (impassable). That it is truly the flesh of God the Son we receive in the Eucharist. Here we have a good example of the need for precision in speaking about the mystery of God made man. It is called the *Communicatio Idiomata* (communication of idioms) where “idioms” refers to the natural properties and actions in Christ. “[It] concerns the mutual predication of properties and actions common to the two natures in Christ; it is a mode of speaking by which, acknowledging the unity of Person subsisting in the two natures what is attributed to Christ as man is of God, and what is attributed to Christ as God is also human.”^{xi} Hence, one can say: God is man; God was born of the Virgin Mary; God died on the cross; this man is God, eternal, omnipotent, etc. One may not say: divinity died on the cross, nor that this humanity is God, etc. Here we are exemplifying a simple general rule of language: since the communication of idioms is based on the unity of Person in Christ, *concrete terms* refer to person (they signify the nature as it exists in the person) and the properties of the nature as they inhere in the subject which is the person; *abstract terms* refer to the nature, signifying the nature and/or natural parts in separation from the person. Again we are reminded of the need for precision in speaking about God and the things of God.

The importance of the ‘communication of idioms’ can be seen clearly through its neglect in Nestorius’ thought. Listen to him: “Mary merely engendered the man in which the Word became incarnate...Jesus is God, however, because He contains God. I worship the vase because of its contents, and the vestment because of him whom it cloths.”^{xii} Nestorius separates the man-person and God-person in Christ. His philosophical principal is that an intellectual nature is, by definition, a person, therefore there are two persons as there are two natures in Christ. He concludes to two subjects of attribution, two egos and therefore refuses to attribute to God the properties and actions of the human nature-person he assumes. Again, the implications for redemption are opaque to Nestorius’ vision: since the divine is impassable, the Son of God did not die on the cross in the human Jesus. The act of redemption was not a *theandric* (God-man) action. Hence redemption was not effectively accomplished for the human race.

Both Cyril and Nestorius wrote to Pope Celestine I (another early indication of the recognition of the doctrinal authority of the Bishop of Rome). After months, the Pope wrote to Nestorius condemning his position. The delay was caused by the fact that no one in Rome could be found to translate the Greek of Nestorius’ letter. Cyril was wise enough to write in Latin. Nestorius would not take no for an answer and appealed to the Emperor, Theodosius II, for a Council. Here we have an incipient (and probably unconscious) Conciliarism that will raise its head more clearly in the 15th and 16th Centuries, i. e., appealing to a General Council over the authority of the Pope. But that is another issue in the long history of the Church in its Spirit guided development of doctrine. The Emperor called the Council and Pope Celestine sent legates to represent Rome. Impatient, perhaps, since there were delays in delegates getting to Ephesus, Cyril opened the first session on June 22, 431.

His second letter to Nestorius (January-February 430) was read and accepted by the assembly as an accurate statement of the Church's doctrine on the Incarnation. Here are excerpts from that letter that address the issues we have described above:

Confessing the Word to be made one with the flesh according to substance, we adore one Son and Lord Jesus Christ: we do not divide the God from the man, nor separate him into parts, as though the two natures were mutually united in him only through a sharing of dignity and authority (for that is a novelty and nothing else), neither do we give separately to the Word of God the name Christ and the same name separately to a different one born of a woman; but we know only one Christ, the Word from God the Father with his own Flesh. For as man he was anointed with us, although it is he himself who gives the Spirit to those who are worthy and not in measure, according to the saying of the blessed Evangelist John.....

But we do not say that the Word of God dwelt in him as in a common man born of the holy Virgin, lest Christ be thought of as a God-bearing man; for although the Word tabernacled among us, it is also said that in Christ "dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily"; but we understand that he became flesh, not just as he is said to dwell in the saints, but we define that that tabernacling in him was according to equality. But being made one, and not converted into flesh, he made his indwelling in such a way, as we may say that the soul of man does in his own body.....

One therefore is Christ both Son and Lord, not as if a man had attained only such a conjunction with God as consists in a unity of dignity alone or of authority. For it is not equality of honor which unites natures; for then Peter and John, who were of equal honor with each other, being both Apostles and holy disciples [would have been one, and], yet the two are not one. Neither do we understand the manner of conjunction to be apposition, for this does not suffice for natural oneness. Nor yet according to relative participation, as we are also joined to the Lord, as it is written "we are one Spirit in him." Rather we deprecate the term of "junction" as not having sufficiently signified the oneness. But we do not call the Word of God the Father, the God nor the Lord of Christ, lest we openly cut in two the one Christ, the Son and Lord, and fall under the charge of blasphemy, making him the God and Lord of himself. For the Word of God, as we have said already, was made hypostatically one in flesh, yet he is God of all and he rules all; but he is not the slave of himself, nor his own Lord. For it is foolish, or rather impious, to think or teach thus. For he said that God was his Father, although he was God by nature, and of his substance. Yet we are not ignorant that while he remained God, he also became man and subject to God, according to the law suitable to the nature of the manhood. But how could he become the God or Lord of himself? Consequently as man, and with regard to the measure of his humiliation, it is said that he is equally with us subject to God; thus he became under the Law, although as God he spoke the Law and was the Law-giver. We confess that he is the Son, begotten of God the Father, and Only-begotten God; and although according to his own nature he was not subject to suffering, yet he suffered for us in the flesh according to the Scriptures, and although impassible, yet in his Crucified Body he made his own the sufferings of his own flesh; and by the grace of God he tasted death for all: he gave his own Body thereto, although he was by nature himself the life and the resurrection, in order that, having trodden down death by his unspeakable power, first in his own flesh, he might become the first born from the dead, and the first-fruits of them that slept. And that he might make a way for the nature of man to attain incorruption, by the grace of God (as we just now said), he tasted death for every man, and after three days rose again, having despoiled hell. So although it is said that the resurrection of the dead was through man, yet we understand that man to have been the Word of God, and the power of death was loosed through him, and he shall come in the fullness of time as the One Son and Lord, in the glory of the Father, in order to judge the world in righteousness, as it is written.

And since the holy Virgin brought forth corporally God made one with flesh according to nature, for this reason we also call her Mother of God, not as if the nature of the Word had the beginning of its existence from the flesh.

This was followed by Anathemas or condemnations of Nestorian teaching.

The 12 Anathemas, Proposed by Cyril and accepted by the Council of Ephesus:

1. If anyone does not confess that Emmanuel is God in truth, and therefore that the holy virgin is the mother of God (for she bore in a fleshly way the Word of God become flesh) let him be *anathema*.
2. If anyone does not confess that the Word from God the Father has been united by hypostasis with the flesh and is one Christ with his own flesh, and is therefore God and man together, let him be *anathema*.
3. If in Christ who is one anyone divides the hypostases after the union, connecting them by mere association in dignity or authority or power, and not rather by a coming together into "physical" (*phusike*) union, let him be *anathema*.
4. If anyone distributes between the two persons or hypostases the expressions used either in the gospels or in the apostolic writings, whether they are used by the holy writers of Christ or by him about himself, and ascribes some to him as to a man, thought of separately from the Word from God, and others, as befitting God, to him as to the Word from God the Father, let him be *anathema*.
5. If anyone dares to say that Christ was a God-bearing man and not rather God in truth, being by nature one Son, even as "the Word became flesh", and is made partaker of blood and flesh precisely like us, let him be *anathema*.
6. If anyone says that the Word from God the Father was the God or master of Christ, and does not rather confess the same both God and man, the Word having become flesh, according to the scriptures, let him be *anathema*.
7. If anyone says that as man Jesus was activated by the Word of God and was clothed with the glory of the Only-begotten, as a being separate from him, let him be *anathema*.
8. If anyone dares to say that the man who was assumed ought to be worshipped and glorified together *with* the divine Word and be called God along *with* him, while being separate from him, (for the addition of "*with*" must always compel us to think in this way), and will not rather worship Emmanuel with one veneration and send up to him one doxology, even as "the Word became flesh", let him be *anathema*.
9. If anyone says that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit, as making use of an alien power that worked through him and as having received from him the power to master unclean spirits and to work divine wonders among people, and does not rather say that it was his own proper Spirit through whom he worked the divine wonders, let him be *anathema*.
10. The divine scripture says Christ became "the high priest and apostle of our confession"; he offered himself to God the Father in an odor of sweetness for our sake. If anyone, therefore, says that it was not the very Word from God who became our high priest and apostle, when he became flesh and a man like us, but as it were another who was separate from him, in particular a man from a woman, or if anyone says that he offered the sacrifice also for himself and not rather for us alone (for he who knew no sin needed no offering), let him be *anathema*.
11. If anyone does not confess that the flesh of the Lord is life-giving and belongs to the Word from God the Father, but maintains that it belongs to another besides him, united with him in dignity or as enjoying a mere divine indwelling, and is not rather life-giving, as we said, since

it became the flesh belonging to the Word who has power to bring all things to life, let him be *anathema*.

12. If anyone does not confess that the Word of God suffered in the flesh and was crucified in the flesh and tasted death in the flesh and became the first born of the dead, although as God he is life and life-giving, let him be *anathema*.^{xiii}

Cyril, as mentioned, did not wait for the Legates of the Pope and for some of the Eastern bishops delayed in arriving. Among them was John of Antioch, Cyril's arch-enemy and supporter of Nestorius, with forty-three of his bishops. Cyril began the Council with 160 bishops present. Nestorius was invited three times to attend, but refused. After the reading of the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius, the Council fathers voted to accept it as the orthodox Christian faith; then the anathemas attached to the third letter of Cyril to the same destined recipient were read. They were not voted on, but were attached to the final acts of the Council. The report of the proceedings was sent to Theodosius for approval. Meanwhile, on June 26th, the other bishops arrived. Patriarch John on learning of the first session of Cyril's assembly immediately attempted his own rival council in his quarters. The Papal Legates arrived in early July, and on the 10th and 11th Cyril's Council reassembled for two more sessions, approving in the presence of Celestine's representatives what had already been accomplished. There was also a 4th and 5th session that set aside the actions of the illegitimate assembly Patriarch John had called. At these sessions the Council issued six canons, all disciplinary.

There was difficulty in getting the Council approved by the Emperor and shameful lobbying by both Nestorius and his party and by Cyril and his supporters which cast a shadow over this story. In the end, neither Pope Celestine nor his successor Sixtus III approved the Council. It was finally approved at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 but without the approval of the twelve anathemas of Cyril's third letter to Nestorius. Nestorius was deposed and returned to monastic life; and Maximian became Patriarch of Constantinople in his place. Accord seemed possible. But the issue of Cyril's twelve anathemas remained a problem, and demands were made that he apologize for them. Cyril, instead, agreed to compromise if the supporters of Nestorius would accept Nestorius' deposition and condemn his teaching. This eventually was worked out and a "Formula of Union" was agreed to in 433. That document had its own ambiguities; and some of the Cyrilian party thought that Cyril had surrendered too much in not objecting to some of its phrases. John of Antioch, Nestorius' strongest ally, was criticized for giving in to Cyril. Surely the most ambiguous statement in the document was the final sentence of the formula of accord: *"Concerning the Evangelical and Apostolic expressions which have reference to Christ, we are aware that theologians apply some of them to the two natures, because they are addressed to one person only, whereas they distinguish the others, because they are addressed to one of the two natures. Expressions that are becoming to God are attributed to the divinity, whereas those which refer to the abasement, are addressed to the humanity."* If this were merely an

historical statement about what theologians had been saying, it could stand; but it is a formula of accord and betrays the truth with its Nestorian implications of a two-person act center, each acting in its own nature to accomplish either human or divine results. It seemed to be peace at any price, but the price is too high. The whole issue, fought over for so long had been: One act center, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity; two natures in which HE acts, divine and human. There can be no compromise on that.

ⁱ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, Vol. I, “The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)”, University of Chicago Press, 1971, pg. 226.

ⁱⁱ Augustine, *City of God*, translated by Marcus Dods with a fine introduction by Thomas Merton, Modern Library Giant, 1950.

ⁱⁱⁱ See Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*, A Michael Glazer Book, The Liturgical press, Collegeville, Min., 1990, pg. 135.

^{iv} Eudoxia (401-460) was the daughter of the sophist, Leontius who trained her in literature and rhetoric. Her accomplishments brought her to the attention of Pulcheria who made her one of her ladies-in-waiting, saw to her Christian baptism and groomed her to marry Theodosius (this happened in 421). Several of her writings, renditions of Scriptural books in hexameter, are extant. Another famous woman philosopher, mathematician, astronomer/astrologer and teacher at this time was Hypathia of Alexandria (cā 370-415). Though evidence is scanty, she is reputed to have invented the astrolabe and hydrometer. She was murdered by a Christian who was a lector at the Alexandrian cathedral. The given reason was her pagan sentiments and neo-Platonism. This cast aspersions on the Bishop, Cyril, though there is no hard evidence that he was at all involved. The incident, however, suggests strong pagan vs. Christian tensions at the time. There is a fine book by Maria Dzielska, *Hypathia of Alexandria*, 1995.

^v See the first lecture, pg. 10.

^{vi} Philip Hughes, *The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils 325-1870*, Hanover House, 1961, pg. 50 recalls Nestorius’ letter to Pope Celestine I (422-431) indicating Nestorius’ preference of the term Christotokos in regard to Mary.

^{vii} See Davis. Op. cit., pg. 140.

^{viii} See Pelikan. Op. cit., pg. 231.

^{ix} See Davis, Op.cit. pg. 142.

^x See Jean Daniélou, *The Christian Centuries: A New History of the Catholic Church*, Vol. I “The First Six Hundred Years”, McGraw-Hill, 1964, pg. 344.

^{xi} Translation from Canon J. M. Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae*, Paris, 1949 Vol. II, pg. 424 # 497.

^{xii} Quotation from Dom Charles Poulet & Rev, Sidney A. Raemers, *A History of the Catholic Church*, Vol. I, B. Herder Book Co., 1950, pg. 230.

^{xiii} Translation from *Weaton CCEL Library of the Early Church Fathers*, with minor changes and a new translation of anathema 3.

Addendum:

Monophysitism – a Christological position that arose after the Council of Chalcedon in 451. It attempted to emphasize the immutable and perfect nature of Jesus by postulating only one dominant nature in Him after the incarnation, and

that being the divine nature. It contradicts Chalcedon which defined two complete natures in one divine Person. Monophysitism was finally condemned in the sixth Ecumenical Council, Constantinople III in 681. The belief still exists in the Coptic, Jacobite and some Armenian Churches.

I spawned:

Monothelism – a Christological position proposed in the seventh Century that held that Jesus’ actions derived from one divine-human operation; that He had only one will. Constantinople III defined a *dyothelite* (two-will) teaching: two natural will and two natural operations (this latter against *monoenergism*) concurring in Christ for the salvation of the human race.

and

Monoenergism – proposed a single operation or action in Jesus, one divine energy.

Origenism – a school of thought inspired by Origen (cā185- cā254). Some of its teachings include: universal salvation (*apocatastasis*), pre-existence of souls (including Christ’s), an apparent subordination of the Son to the Father. It was condemned at Constantinople II in 553. It remains unclear whether these teachings were those of Origen or extrapolations by disciples. If his, were they explorations that later disciples took as his teaching?

Pelagianism – a heresy initiated by the British (Irish?) Monk, Pelagius, in the 400rds. He taught that human beings could attain salvation by their own sustained efforts; that Original Sin was Adam’s bad example that did no interior harm to his descendents and left the natural use of free will fully intact. It reduced grace to the good example given by Christ. It was a heresy strongly opposed by St. Augustine, and was condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 431.

Questions for discussion:

- 1) What is the importance of the title of our Lady, Theotokos?
- 2) Why was it troublesome to Nestorius?
- 3) What was the fundamental error of Nestorius? What Trinitarian truth was he trying to protect?
- 4) What were the implications of Nestorianism for salvation?
- 5) How did Cyril of Alexandria address the error, and what solution did he offer?
- 6) What was the response of the Council of Ephesus to Nestorianism?
- 7) How would you explain the union of two natures, divine and human, in the one divine Person, the Son of God?
- 8) Why is accuracy about this and all doctrine important, and how does the “Communication of Idioms” help in the articulation of doctrine?
- 9) Pelagianism was also condemned at Ephesus. How was it related to the saving action of Christ?
- 10) What did Origenism teach? How did it reflect Arianism and abet Nestorianism?