

2000

The Cyrillian Character of the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith»,

Martzelos, Georgios

<http://hdl.handle.net/11728/7711>

Downloaded from HEPHAESTUS Repository, Neapolis University institutional repository

GEORGIOS D. MARTZELOS

Prof. in the Theological Faculty of the Aristotle University/Thessaloniki

The cyrillian character of the chalcedonian Definition of Faith

Introduction

While modern theologians have dealt extensively with the problem of the sources of the Definition of Chalcedon¹, there hasn't been yet an absolutely sufficient solution to this problem, so that it could respond to the questions arising from the research of the historico-theological framework of its genesis in the Council of Chalcedon. For this reason most researchers, Roman-Catholics in their majority, speak of four or even more, mostly heterogeneous, sources of the Chalcedonian Definition, so that they essentially deny the inner cohesion and unity of its Christological elements and consider it a dogmatic text which synthesizes basically without any coherence the different or opposite Christological traditions of the 5th century in East and West². It's rather an exception that fifty years ago two Roman-Catholic theologians, Th. Šagi-Bunić and A. de Halleux, in their research of the sources of the Chalcedonian Definition discovered actually the inner cohesion and unity of its Christological elements, pointing out its inner relation to the Christology of St. Cyril³.

But despite the fact that recent research constantly discovers the homogeneity of the Christological elements of the Chalcedonian Definition and stresses increasingly its Cyrillian character, we have to emphasize that even until today the problem of its sources hasn't been investigated, so much as it should be, in the historical and theological framework of its generation, but more or less as a philological problem, namely as a problem we have to solve, searching for the sources of its phrases or words in different important dogmatic texts of the 5th century.

However, we do believe that in order to properly investigate the problem of the sources of the Chalcedonian Definition, we should not consider it like a simple literary

¹ On this point we have to give the following explanation: When we speak of the sources of the Definition of Chalcedon, we mean only the very Christological part of the Definition and not of course the whole text of it. We mean namely only this part that some older researchers have called the "symbol of Chalcedon" (See for example I. Ortiz de Urbina, "Das Symbol von Chalkedon. Sein Text, sein Werden, seine dogmatische Bedeutung", in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Grillmeier – H. Bacht, Bd. I, Würzburg 1973, pp. 389 ff.; H. M. Diepen, *Les trois Chapitres au Concile de Chalcedoine. Une étude de la Christologie de l'anatolie ancienne*, Oosterhout 1953, pp. 107 ff.).

² See M. Richard, «L'introduction du mot 'hypostase' dans la théologie de l'Incarnation», in: *Mélanges de Sciences Religieuses* 2(1945), pp. 267 ff.; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *op. cit.*, pp. 398, 400; P. Th. Camelot, «Théologies grecques et théologie latine à Chalcedoine», in: *Revue des Sciences Écumeniques*, 2) Paris 1962, pp. 139 ff.; H. M. Diepen, *op. cit.*, pp. 109 ff.; R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon. A historical and doctrinal survey*, London 1961, pp. 211 ff.; J. N. D. Kelly, *Philosophiques et Théologiques* 35(1951), pp. 402 ff.; *ibid.*, *Éphèse et Chalcedoine* (in the series *Histoire de Conciles Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1960, pp. 340 f.; F. Hebart, *Zur Struktur der altkirchlichen Christologie. Studien zur Vorgeschichte des Chalcedonense*, Bd. II, Heidelberg 1973, p. 636.

³ See Th. Šagi-Bunić, «'Duo perfecta' et 'duae naturae' in definitione dogmatica chalcedonensi », in: *Laurentianum* 5(1964), pp. 203 ff.; *ibid.*, «*Deus perfectus et homo perfectus*» a Concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451), Romae – Friburgi Brisg. – Barcinone 1965, pp. 205 ff.; A. de Halleux, "La définition christologique de Chalcedoine", in: *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 7(1976), pp. 156 ff.

problem, but primarily as a theological problem, functionally tied to the historical context of genesis of this dogmatic text.

This is the reason why in our study under the title *Genesis and sources of the Definition of Chalcedon. Contribution to the historico-dogmatic research of the Definition of the 4th Ecumenical Council*, Thessaloniki 1986 (in Greek) we've tried to show the Cyrillian character of the Chalcedonian Definition by examining the problem of its sources in immediate and close relation with the historical framework of its generation, and this because, as it is testified in the Minutes of the Council, this framework is what mainly determined the need so that the Definition has a Cyrillian dogmatic content.

a) The historical and theological framework

From the first sessions of the Synod the imperial representatives, following the ecclesiastical policy of the Imperial Court, suggested to the Fathers that they compose an Exposition of Faith that would clearly express the Christological doctrine⁴. But by this tactic they came into conflict both with the ecclesiastical policy of Leo of Rome, who believed that his *Tome* alone had a unique value for the settling of the Christological problem, as well as with the ecclesiastical policy of Dioscorus of Alexandria, which was exclusively based on the acceptance of the Creed of Nicaea and the «definition» (7th Canon) of Ephesus⁵. Thus, the problem of composing the Exposition of Faith was unavoidably created at the Synod.

During the confrontation of this problem by the Fathers, three factions were created within the Synod. The first, which consisted chiefly of Westerners and Antiochians maintained that Leo's *Tome* was sufficient for confronting the Christological problem, which arose with the heresy of Eutyches⁶, while the second faction, largely composed of extreme Alexandrians, followers of Dioscorus, rejected the *Tome* and maintained an exclusive insistence on the Creed of Nicaea and the «definition» of Ephesus, concealing behind this stance their monophysite mentality⁷. The third faction was composed chiefly of the bishops of Eastern Illyricum and Palestine, who had openly expressed three times their doubts on the Orthodoxy of the *Tome* and its concordance with Cyril. The most important on this point is that every time the *Tome* was disputed by these bishops, its Orthodoxy was defended by the usage of parallel Christological passages from St Cyril⁸. This means that the Christology of Cyril in comparison with Leo's *Tome* was for the majority of the Fathers

⁴ See Mansi (= J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Graz² 1969-1961) VI, 936 f.; 952 ; ACO (= E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Berolini et Lipsiae 1927-1940) II,1,1,195 ; II,1,2,78[274].

⁵ For the ecclesiastical policy of Leo of Rome and Dioscorus of Alexandria on this point see G. D. Martzelos, *Genesis and sources of the Definition of Chalcedon. Contribution to the historico-dogmatic research of the Definition of the 4th Ecumenical Council*, ed. by P. Pournaras, Thessaloniki 1986 (in Greek), pp. 24 ff.

⁶ See Mansi VI, 953; ACO II,1,2,78[274]. See also G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 39 ff.

⁷ See Mansi VII, 49 ff.; ACO II,1,2,109[305] f. See also G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 57 ff.

⁸ See Mansi VI, 972 f.; ACO II,1,2,81[277] f. See also J. S. Romanides, "St Cyril's 'One physis or Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate' and Chalcedon", in: *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10,2(1965), p. 88; P. Galtier, "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et Saint Léon le Grand à Chalcédoine", in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Grillmeier – H. Bacht, Bd. I, Würzburg⁴1973, p. 354.

in Chalcedon indisputable. While at the outset the Fathers of this faction were not distinguished from the wider faction of the Alexandrians, suddenly on the initiative of Attikos of Nikopolis, and most probably for fear that Leo's *Tome* might be the final exposition of the Chalcedonian Faith, although the doubts on its Orthodoxy were retreated, differentiated themselves and accepted the proposal of the imperial representatives that the Exposition of Faith be drafted⁹. But also most of the remaining Fathers were obliged to overcome their original objections and accept the above proposal of the imperial representatives, because they were made conscious that the exclusive insistence on the Creed of Nicea and the «definition» of Ephesus would be a triumph for Monophysitism¹⁰.

Thus, the committee, which was established under the supervision of Anatolius of Constantinople for this purpose, took into account the objections, which existed as regards the composition of an Exposition of Faith. For this reason the committee regarded it as its purpose and aim not to compose a new dogmatic text, but to repeat important passages and phrases, which had been sanctioned by the indisputable authority of Cyril and represented the two phases of his Christology, both before and after the reconciliation of 433. This text, although it was read in the fifth session of the Council, is not preserved in the Minutes, but, as we can conclude from the insistence of the majority of the Fathers who were not willing to change its dogmatic content, as well as from some of its elements preserved in the Minutes of the Council¹¹, it mustn't have been very different from that it was finally accepted. For this reason we have tried to find it out on the basis of the elements preserved¹². As it seems from the discussions of the Fathers about the content of the text of

⁹ See Mansi VI, 973; ACO II,1,2,82[278]. See also G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 47 ff.

¹⁰ See also G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

¹¹ See Mansi VII, 101 ff.; ACO II,1,2,123[319] ff.

¹² See *op. cit.*, pp. 115 ff. The text of this original Definition has according to our research in its verses as follows:

1. «Ἐπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν
2. ἕνα καὶ τὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱόν
3. τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν
4. συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν,
5. θεόν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον τὸν αὐτόν
6. ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος,
7. ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα
8. καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτόν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
9. κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας,
10. πρὸ αἰῶνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα,
11. ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτόν
12. δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
13. ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
14. ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν Χριστόν υἱόν κύριον μονογενῆ,
15. ἐκ δύο φύσεων νοούμενον,
16. οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν,
17. ἀποτελεσασῶν δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν ἕνα κύριον καὶ Χριστόν καὶ υἱόν
18. θεότητός τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος,
19. διὰ τῆς ἀφράστου καὶ ἀπορρήτου πρὸς ἐνότητα συνδρομῆς,
20. οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον,
21. ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν υἱόν μονογενῆ
22. θεόν λόγον κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
23. καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφητῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ
24. καὶ αὐτός ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐξεπαίδευσεν
25. καὶ τῷ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον».

the original Definition, it did not include the term «θεοτόκος» for the Virgin Mary¹³, it contained the Cyrillian phrase «ἐκ δύο φύσεων» (“of two natures”) for the person of Jesus Christ¹⁴ and it did not include any dyophysite passage from Leo’s *Tome*¹⁵. Instead of the Leonine passage of the *Tome* which was finally added in text of the final Definition¹⁶, we hold the opinion that in the original Definition there existed the passage «ἀποτελεσασῶν δέ μᾶλλον τόν ἕνα κύριον καί Χριστόν καί υἰόν θεότητός τε καί ἀνθρωπότητος διά τῆς ἀφράστου καί ἀπορρήτου πρὸς ἐνότητα συνδρομῆς» from Cyril’s *2nd Letter to Nestorius*¹⁷ which continues the passage «οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διά τὴν ἔνωσιν» from the same letter of Cyril that remained already in the final Definition¹⁸.

Thus, with the exclusively Cyrillian character which it gave to the text of the original Definition aimed to restore the unity of the two phases of Cyril’s Christology which had been principally attacked by the teaching of Eutyches and Dioscorus, especially during the so-called Robber Synod¹⁹. Only in this way the committee did believe that Monophysitism and Nestorianism would be fought effectively and that unity would be restored to the bosom of the Church. More precisely, according to the text of the original Definition we have tried to restore, we believe that the Christological portion of this original Definition in its first part tried to present a descriptive development of the Christological doctrine on the basis of the Formulary of Reunion of 433 from Cyril’s *Letter to John of Antioch*²⁰. In the second part the first portion might be summarized on the basis of the dyophysite formula «ἕνα καί τόν αὐτόν υἰόν... ἐκ δύο φύσεων νοούμενον» (“one and the same son... considered of two natures”) which must be existed in the original Definition and come also from the same letter of Cyril²¹. In the third and last part there would be in our opinion a clarifying explanation of the second part on the basis of Cyril’s *2nd and 3rd Letters to Nestorius*, so that both Monophysitism and Nestorianism are explicitly excluded²².

However, when the original Definition was read during the fifth session of the Synod, objections were made by the papal legates and certain followers of the Antiochian Christological tradition, because they regarded the dyophysite formula of the original Definition as unclear and double-meaning²³. Receiving support from the imperial representatives they sought to have this dyophysite formula modified on the basis of the clear dyophysitism of Leo’s *Tome*. But the great majority of the Fathers was unyielding in opposition to any proposal for modification of the original Definition on the basis of the

¹³ See Mansi VII, 101f.; ACO II,1,2,123[319] f.

¹⁴ See Mansi VII, 104; ACO II,1,2,124[320].

¹⁵ See Mansi VII, 101, 104 f.; ACO II,1,2,123[319]; 124[320] f.

¹⁶ See footnote 25 below, verses 19-20.

¹⁷ See PG 77, 45C; Mansi VI, 661; ACO II,1,1,105.

¹⁸ See footnote 25 below, verse 18.

¹⁹ See *op. cit.*, pp. 127 ff.

²⁰ See PG 77, 176C -177B; Mansi VI 668 f.; ACO II,1,1,108 f.

²¹ See PG 77, 180AB; Mansi VI 672; ACO II,1,1,110: «...ὡς εἶς ἤδη νοούμενος μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός... καί ὡς ἐν ἐνὶ προσώπῳ νοούμενος· εἷς γάρ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, κᾶν ἢ τῶν φύσεων μὴ ἀγνοῖται διαφορά, ἐξ ὧν τὴν ἀπόρρητον ἔνωσιν πεπράχθαι φαμέν».

²² See G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 136 f.

²³ See Mansi VII 104; ACO II,1,2,124[320].

Tome. Finally, after continual pressures and the threat of the Emperor to bring the Synod to the West, the Fathers retreated. They formed a revision committee, which made, however, only the few modifications required by the Fathers²⁴. It modified namely the «ambiguous» formula of the original Definition and the verse about the «two perfect», which was connected with it. It also added the term «θεοτόκος» for the Virgin Mary as well as only one passage from Leo's *Tome* to replace, as we believe, a parallel passage of Cyril. The final Definition which resulted from these modifications and additions²⁵ was characterized as an «interpretation» of the original one²⁶ and was accepted by the Fathers with enthusiasm²⁷.

b) The sources of the Chalcedonian Definition

The above-mentioned historical and theological framework of the origin of the Chalcedonian Definition is the basic area in which we have to examine the problem of its sources and to identify its theological character.

The first part of the Definition (verses 1-15), in which there is a descriptive development of the Christological doctrine, contains at points according to the majority of the researchers the text of the Formulary of Reunion of 433 which is contained in the Letter of Cyril to John of Antioch and this almost word for word²⁸. If we except verse 11 which

²⁴ See Mansi VII 101 ff.; ACO II,1,2,123[319] ff. See also G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, p. 67 ff.

²⁵ The final Definition of Chalcedon, the so-called "Symbol of Chalcedon", has in its verses as follows:

1. «Ἐπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν
2. ἕνα καὶ τὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱόν
3. τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν
4. συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν,
5. τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι
6. καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι,
7. θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτόν
8. ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος,
9. ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα
10. καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτόν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
11. κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας,
12. πρὸ αἰῶνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα,
13. ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτόν
14. δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
15. ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
16. ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν Χριστόν υἱόν κύριον μονογενῆ,
17. ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον,
18. οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν,
19. σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως
20. καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης,
21. οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον,
22. ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν υἱόν μονογενῆ
23. θεόν λόγον κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
24. καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφητῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ
25. καὶ αὐτός ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐξεπαίδευσεν
26. καὶ τῷ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον» (Mansi [= J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et*

Amplissima Collectio, Graz 1969-1961] VII, 116; ACO [= E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Berolini et Lipsiae 1927-1940] II,1,2,129[325] f.).

²⁶ See Mansi VII 108; ACO II,1,2,126[322].

²⁷ See Mansi VII 117; ACO II,1,2,130[326].

²⁸ See M. Richard, *op. cit.*, p. 268; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *op. cit.*, pp. 398 f.; Th. Šagi-Bunić, «'Duo perfecta' et 'duae naturae' in definitione dogmatica chalcedonensi », *op. cit.*, p. 218; *ibid.*, «*Deus perfectus et homo perfectus*» a Concilio Ephesino (a. 431)

has *Hebr.* 4, 15 as its source, all the other verses have as their basic source the Formulary of Reunion (433), which was modified at several points not only on the basis of Cyril's *Letter to John of Antioch*, as Th. Šagi-Bunić maintained²⁹, but also, as we have shown in our above-mentioned study, on the basis of Cyril's *2nd* and *3rd Letters to Nestorius*³⁰.

The second part of the Definition (verses 16- 17), which is a synoptic formulation of the first part, portrays in this form the modification suggested by the imperial representatives at the fifth session, that the Fathers namely ought to remove the phrase «of two natures» («ἐκ δύο φύσεων») from the original Definition and replace it adding in the text that “there are two natures united immutably and undividedly and unconfusedly in Christ” according to Leo's *Tome*³¹. The sources of the second part are a) for the verse 16 not only the *2nd Letter* of Cyril to *Nestorius*, as some roman-catholic theologians maintain³², but, as we have proved in the above-mentioned study, also his *3rd Letter to Nestorius*³³, b) for the phrase «ἐν δύο φύσει γνωριζόμενον» (“known in two natures”) of the verse 17 the Confession of Faith of Basil of Seleucia at the Endemousa Synod of 448 which we'll examine analytically below, and c) for the first three of the four adverbs of the verse 17 («ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαρέτως ἀχωρίστως» [“unconfusedly, immutably, undivisibly, inseparably”]) the Statement of the Illyrian bishops on the Orthodoxy of Leo's *Tome* and its agreement with Cyril³⁴.

The third portion of the Definition (verses 18-26), which is a clarifying explanation of the second part, draws its content not only from the *2nd Letter* of Cyril to *Nestorius* (verse 18)³⁵, as well as from Leo's *Tome* (verses 19-20)³⁶, as the majority of researchers accept³⁷, but also from the *3rd Letter* of Cyril to *Nestorius*, so far as the phrase «καί μία ὑπόστασις» (“and one hypostasis”) of the verse 20 is concerned, as well as the verses 21-26 which are parallel with passages of this letter³⁸. Thus, in its greater extent, the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith consists of verses which came immediately from the *2nd* and *3rd Letters* of Cyril to *Nestorius* and his *Letter to John of Antioch*, from which the entire text of the original Definition also came. There are of course verses, as we have seen, which did not come directly from Cyril, but during the revision of the original Definition they came from Basil's Confession of Faith at the Endemousa Synod of 448, from Leo's

ad Chalcedonense (a. 451), Romae – Friburgi Brisg. – Barcinone 1965, pp. 211; A. de Halleux, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

²⁹ See Th. Šagi-Bunić, «‘Duo perfecta’ et ‘duae naturae’ in definitione dogmatica chalcedonensi », *op. cit.*, pp. 216 ff.

³⁰ See G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 149 ff.

³¹ See Mansi VII, 105; ACO II,1,2,125[321]: «Οἱ μεγαλοπρεπέστατοι καὶ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες εἶπον· Πρόσθετε οὖν τῷ ὄρω κατὰ τὴν ψῆφον τοῦ ἁγιοτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Λέοντος δύο φύσεις εἶναι ἠνωμένας ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀσυγχύτως ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ».

³² See M. Richard, *op. cit.*, p. 268; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *op. cit.*, p. 399.

³³ See G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 171 ff.

³⁴ See Mansi VII 29; ACO II,1,2,102[298].

³⁵ See PG 77, 45C; Mansi VI 661; ACO II,1,1,105.

³⁶ See ACO II,1,1,13. See also the Latin text in: C. Silva-Tarouca, *S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum episc. Constantinopolitanum (Epistola XXVIII) additis Testimoniis Patrum et eiusdem S. Leonis M. Epistola ad Leonem I. Imp. (Epistola CLXV)*, Textus et Documenta in usum exercitationum et praelectionum academicarum, Series Theologica 9, Romae 1959, p. 24.

³⁷ See M. Richard, *op. cit.*, p. 268; I. Ortiz de Urbina, *op. cit.*, p. 399; H. M. Diepen, *op. cit.*, p. 112; Th. Šagi-Bunić, *op. cit.*, p. 67; F. Hebart, *op. cit.*, pp. 636 f.; A. de Halleux, *op. cit.*, pp. 162 f.

³⁸ See PG 77, 113A -116C, 120BCD; Mansi IV, 1076 f.; 1081 f.; ACO I,1,1,37 f.; 40 f. See also D. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 186 ff.

Tome and the Statement of the Illyrian bishops on its Orthodoxy, and this finding poses rightfully the question: is it likely that the verses which came from these three sources misquoted the Cyrillian character and the main purpose of the original Definition? And if not, which is their position among the other verses of the final Definition with a so obvious and plethoric Cyrillian character? Therefore, the question which is to be answered is whether the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith constitutes as good as a mosaic of Christological elements of eastern and western origin, as some researchers maintain³⁹, or in spite of the above-mentioned modifications and additions made in original text it has an homogenous and uniform and, moreover a Cyrillian theological character.

c) The Cyrillian character of the “non-Cyrillian” verses

At first we have to notice that, as it comes up from the comparison of the texts of the original and the final Definition, modifications must have been made in all three parts of the original one: If we take into account that the phrase “τῆς θεοτόκου” was added in the text of the original Definition, it seems that all the other modifications are not independent from each other. As we shall see widely below, the basic modification of the second part of the Definition of Chalcedon (verses 16-17) was decisive for the modifications made in its first part (verses 1-15) and in its third part (verses 18-26) as well.

More precisely, in the first part of the original Definition (verses 1-13) the Formulary of Reunion (433) is quoted, as we have said, from the *Letter of Cyril to John of Antioch*, but almost in its original antiochian form. Only the verses 2 and 9 are excepted. And this because the verse 2, as we believe, interprets the passage «τόν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν» (“our Lord Jesus Christ”) of the Formulary of Reunion (433) on the basis of the *2nd* and *3rd Letter of Cyril to Nestorius*, obviously in order to exclude the danger that the names «κύριον», «Ἰησοῦν» and «Χριστόν» of the Definition of Chalcedon (verse 3) can be conceived in a Nestorian way. As far as the verse 9 is concerned, it was also added, in order to interpret and safeguard on the basis of the passage *Hebr. 4,15* the verse 8 of the original Definition, excluding in this way the Eutychian fear, that the human nature of the incarnate Word could be conceived as sinful, if it is considered as consubstantial with our human nature⁴⁰. All the other verses of the first part of the original Definition depend word for word from the Formulary of Reunion (433), as it is quoted in the *Letter of Cyril to John of Antioch*. This literal dependence was indeed so great that the word “θεοτόκος” which is the key and the core of the Cyrillian Christology was not involved in the text of the original Definition.

In the text of the final Definition we see, however, that the Formulary of Reunion (433) is not quoted in an almost antiochian form as it happens in the text of the original Definition; it is interpreted even more not only on the basis of Cyril’s *Letter to John of*

³⁹ See I. Ortiz de Urbina, *op. cit.*, pp. 398, 400; P. T. Camelot, *op. cit.*, p. 142; J. N. D. Kelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 340 f.; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian tradition. From the apostolic age to Chalcedon (451)*, transl. J. S. Bowden, London 1965, pp. 481 f.

⁴⁰ See G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 168 ff.

Antioch, as Th. Šagi-Bunić maintained, but also, as we have said, on the basis of Cyril's *2nd* and *3rd Letters to Nestorius*. For example the passage «θεόν τέλειον καί ἄνθρωπον τέλειον» (“perfect God and perfect man”) from the Formulary of Reunion on the one hand was interpreted on the basis of the passage «τέλειος ὢν ἐν θεότητι καί τέλειος ὁ αὐτός ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι» (“being perfect in divinity and the same perfect in humanity”) from Cyril's *Letter to John of Antioch*, so that it produced the verses 5-6, and on the other hand it was interpreted, as we'll see analytically below, on the basis of Cyril's *3rd Letter to Nestorius*⁴¹, so that it produced the verse 7 of the final Definition.

Nevertheless, this ascertainment poses rightfully the question: Why did the revision committee of the original Definition come to the necessity of a further Cyrillian interpretation of the Formulary of Reunion in the final Definition?

The answer on this question is tightly connected with the modification of the second part of the original Definition (verses 14-15). As we have seen above, despite the suggestion of the imperial representatives, that the Fathers ought to add in the text of the Definition that “there are two natures united immutably and undividedly and unconfusedly in Christ” according to Leo's *Tome* in replacement of the phrase “ἐκ δύο φύσεων”, the revision committee preferred to replace the phrase “ἐκ δύο φύσεων” with the dyophysite expression «ἐν δύο φύσεσι γνωριζόμενον» (“known in two natures”) from Basil's of Seleucia Confession of Faith at the Endemousa Synod of 448⁴². The main reason for this choice of the revision committee was according to our opinion its purpose to give the new dyophysite formula in the Definition an obvious Cyrillian character, similar with the formula “ἐκ δύο φύσεων”, so that it may be indisputable from the side of the Monophysite bishops of the Council who wanted the Definition to be in an absolute agreement with Cyril. And, we have to point out that there was not a more suitable dyophysite formula in the Minutes of Chalcedon, so that it may correspond to this intention of the revision

⁴¹ See PG 77, 180B; Mansi VI, 672; ACO II,1,1,110.

⁴² Basil's of Seleucia Confession of Faith at the Endemousa Synod of 448 has in verses as follows:

1. «Τίς δύναται ταῖς τοῦ μακαρίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κυρίλλου μέμψασθαι φωναῖς;
2. ὃς τὴν ἀσεβειαν Νεστορίου μέλλουσαν ἐπικλύζειν τὴν οἰκουμένην
3. ἐπέσχεν διὰ οἰκειᾶς συνέσεως
4. κάκεινου διαιροῦντος εἰς δύο πρόσωπα καὶ δύο υἱούς
5. τὸν ἕνα κύριον ἡμῶν καὶ θεόν καὶ σωτῆρα Χριστόν
6. αὐτός ἔδειξεν ἐπὶ ἐνός προσώπου καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότης τῆς κτίσεως
7. θεότητά τε γνωριζομένην τελείαν καὶ ἀνθρωπότητα τελείαν.
8. ἀποδεχόμεθα τοίνυν πάντα τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα καὶ ἐπεσταλμένα
9. ὡς ἀληθῆ καὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐχόμενα
10. καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν τὸν ἕνα κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν
11. ἐν δύο φύσεσι γνωριζόμενον.
12. τὴν μὲν γὰρ εἶχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ προαιώνιον
13. ὡς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς δόξης,
14. τὴν δὲ ὡς ἐκ μητρὸς δι' ἡμᾶς γεννηθεῖς
15. λαβὼν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἤνωσεν ἑαυτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν
16. καὶ κεχημάτικεν ὁ τέλειος θεὸς καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
17. καὶ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος καὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου,
18. πάντας ἡμᾶς σῶσαι βουλευθεῖς
19. ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι κατὰ πάντα ἡμῖν παραπλήσιος πλὴν ἁμαρτίας.
20. τοὺς δὲ ἐναντιουμένους τοῖς τοιούτοις δόγμασιν
21. ἐχθροὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἶναι φημέν» (Mansi VI, 828; ACO II,1,1,179).

committee, than that of Basil of Seleucia who formulated it in the context of his Confession of Faith at the Endemousa Synod of 448 based exclusively on St Cyril.

Indeed, not only in the Endemousa Synod of 448 but also in the so-called Robber-Synod (449) and in Chalcedon (451) Basil is shown as a warm defender and a good expert of Cyril's Christology. Of course, he expresses his Christological thought using either the Antiochian or alternatively the Alexandrian terminology, but always in the framework of the Cyrillian Christology. It is very characteristic that, although he formulates the Christological doctrine in an orthodox way on the basis of his dyophysite formula, he does not hesitate to express himself orthodoxly on the basis of the Cyrillian miaphysite expression "one nature of God the incarnate Word"⁴³. This fact shows not only how correctly he understood the Christology of Cyril, but also in which sense he himself conceived his dyophysite formula. The suppleness that characterizes on this point his Christological thought is due mainly to the fact that he knows well and follows faithfully both folds of Cyril's Christology, namely before and after the Formulary of Reunion (433). He underlines in his Confession of Faith explicitly that he accepts as true and orthodox all the works and letters of St. Cyril, namely both before and after the Reconciliation of 433. Exactly for this reason he presents in a contrived way in his Confession of Faith the unity of both folds of Cyril's Christology. Elements of the Cyrillian Christology after the Reconciliation of 433 are harmoniously and functionally connected in his Confession with Cyrillian elements before the Reconciliation of 433⁴⁴. His Confession of Faith shows how easily he moves in these two folds of Cyril's Christology.

Of course, at first glance it seems, however, that this formula does not have any connection to Cyril of Alexandria; moreover, it strikingly resembles some particular dyophysite expressions used by Nestorius. At least two of Nestorius' sermons show that he must have been the architect of dyophysite expressions such as "one Son... known... in two natures" in the Antiochian Christological tradition⁴⁵. Not only the expression "one Christ or Son in two natures," but also the connection with this expression of the verb "know" is commonplace in the dyophysite expressions of Nestorius and in the dyophysite formula of Basil. Perhaps this explains why, when Basil expressed his dyophysite formula for the first time in Chalcedon, the Egyptian and other Monophysite bishops cried: "this is what Nestorius believed; this is what Nestorius said"⁴⁶.

This certainly does not exclude Basil, who knew well, as we have shown in one of

⁴³ See Mansi VI, 636 f.; 745 f; ACO II,1,1,93; 144 f.

⁴⁴ See for example the verses 8-10 of Basil's Confession (footnote 42) where the emphasis on the union «καθ' ὑπόστασιν», which is a basic characteristic element of Cyril's Christology in his 2nd and 3rd Letters to Nestorius (see PG 77, 45B, 48B, 48D, 112C, 117D, 120C; Mansi VI, 661; 664; ACO II,1,1,105; 106), is excellently combined with the emphasis on the "two perfect" of the Formulary of Reunion in Cyril's Letter to John of Antioch (see PG 77, 176D, 180B; Mansi VI, 669; 672; ACO II,1,1, 108; 110).

⁴⁵ See Fr. Loofs, *Nestoriana. Die Fragmente des Nestorius*, Halle 1905, p. 328: «Γνωρίζομεν τοίνυν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τοῦ βρέφους καὶ τὴν θεότητα, [ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν τῶν φύσεων διαφορὰν...], τὸ τῆς υἰότητος τηροῦμεν μοναδικὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ θεότητος φύσει»; p. 330: «[...ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν θεωροῦμενον ἐν ἀκτίστῳ καὶ κτιστῇ φύσει... Γνωρίζεται οὖν ὡς εἷς Χριστὸς ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, θεία τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη, ὁρατῇ καὶ ἀοράτῳ... εἷς υἰὸς ἐν δύο φύσεσιν]». The passages in brackets are only saved in the Syriac translation, from which Loofs included them translated into German in the survived Greek fragments. In Greek we attach them in the archaic style, trying to give the approximate original form.

⁴⁶ See Mansi VI, 636; ACO II,1,1,93 : «ταῦτα Νεστόριος ἐφρόνει ταῦτα Νεστόριος ἐβόα».

our studies, the sermons and the teaching of Nestorius⁴⁷, to take the dyophysite formula “one Christ or Son known... in two natures” from Nestorius, or, even if that did not occur, he took the formula via the Antiochian Christological tradition, where it would have been widely known. However, he had already undertaken by his Confession in the Endemousa Synod of 448 – and here exactly appears his fruitful and creative contribution in bridging the chasm between the Antiochian and Alexandrian Christologies – not merely to use this dyophysite formula in an orthodox way and even against the teaching of Nestorius, characterizing him as “lunatic”⁴⁸, but also to genetically link it, concerning its content, with Cyril, considering his Christological teaching as its source.

Basil does not belong to those who ruminate mechanically and in an unassimilated way the dogmatic teaching of the Church Fathers. Based exclusively on St. Cyril he formulates his dyophysite formula and in this way he elongates fertile and creatively Cyril’s Christology, so that it may correspond also to the new theological challenges of Monophysitism. So even though his dyophysite formula has not a Cyrillian form, it has, however, out and out Cyrillian content. That’s why he considers it absolutely consistent with the teaching of St. Cyril and the Third Ecumenical Council⁴⁹. It’s actually characteristic that the relationship of Basil’s dyophysite formula with the Christological teaching of Cyril was made tangible already in the Endemousa Synod of 448, and exactly to this fact is due the wide sensation of this formula among the Fathers of this Synod.

Indeed, already from the beginning of his Confession, he not only explicitly turns against the heresy of Nestorius, but argues with fervor and enthusiasm the undisputed character of Cyril’s Christological teaching⁵⁰. While, as noted, Nestorius with his impious teaching divided “our one Lord and God and Saviour Christ” to “two persons and two sons” (v. 4-5), Cyril showed that “perfect divinity and perfect humanity is known in one person and Son and Lord and Master of creation” (v. 6-7). Especially at this point, Basil paraphrases, in an original and creative way, the interpretation that Cyril makes in the “double perfection” (“perfect God and perfect man”)⁵¹ of the Formulary of Reunion (433), as expressed in his *Letter to John of Antioch* (“perfect... in divinity and the same perfect in humanity” – «τέλειος... ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειος ὁ αὐτός ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι»)⁵² and in this way he essentially summarizes the quintessence of the Christology of Cyril, so as to clearly exclude Nestorianism.

Precisely for this reason, regarding the under discussion dyophysite formula, there exists a radical difference between Nestorius and Basil. For Nestorius the “one Christ and Son”, for whom he speaks about, is not the Son and Word of God, as is for Basil, but the moral person which resulted from the union of the two natures. For Nestorius the terms

⁴⁷ See G. D. Martzelos, *H Χριστολογία του Βασιλείου Σελουκείας και η οικουμενική σημασία της*, P. Pournaras Pub., Thessaloniki 1990, pp. 44 ff.

⁴⁸ See Mansi VI, 636; ACO II,1,1,92.

⁴⁹ See Mansi VI, 636; ACO II,1,1,92 f. See also Mansi VI, 685; ACO II,1,1,117.

⁵⁰ See footnote 42, v. 1-7.

⁵¹ See Mansi, VI, 668; ACO II,1,1,108.

⁵² See PG 77, 180B; Mansi VI, 672; ACO II,1,1,110.

“Christ” and “Son” do not exclusively declare the Son and Word of God, but both of his natures; they are “messages” of the two natures⁵³. Contrarily for Basil, the “one Christ” who “is known in two natures”, as already shown in his Confession and as he explicitly underlined in Chalcedon, is solely “the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word”⁵⁴, something which Nestorius would not be able to accept on the basis of his teaching.

However, beyond that, Basil clearly points out that his dyophysite formula is not only anti-Nestorian, but also originates from the Christological teaching of Cyril and is inextricably tied to it⁵⁵. Indeed, already in his Confession, his dyophysite formula (v. 10-11) not only conclusively summarizes the paraphrase that he himself makes regarding Cyril's interpretation of the “two perfect [natures]” of the Formulary of Reunion, but also it is considered in a way to be dogmatically equivalent to that, since it produces the same dogmatic truth in a slightly different way. In his dyophysite formula “our one Lord Jesus Christ” is known “in two natures” (v. 10-11), while in the paraphrase that is made in Cyrillian interpretation of “two perfect [natures]” of the Formulary of Reunion, the perfect divinity and perfect humanity is known as “over one person and Son and Lord and Master of creation” (v. 6-7). Common points between these two Christological formulas are not only the emphasis on “one Lord” or “one person”, but also the use of the participle of the verb “to know”. The close relationship between these two Christological formulas becomes even more evident for Basil's dyophysite formula with his clarifications which he affirms in Chalcedon: “What I said: known in two natures after the union, in perfect divinity and perfect humanity”⁵⁶. This clarification clearly shows that the two natures in the dyophysite formula of Basil's Confession are just the perfect divinity and the perfect humanity, for which he speaks in the paraphrase that he makes in Cyril's interpretation of the “two perfect [natures]” in the Formulary of Reunion (v. 6-7)⁵⁷.

These facts inevitably lead us to the source from which Basil produces his dyophysite formula and, as it seems not only from his Confession of Faith but also from what he said about it in the Council of Chalcedon, this source cannot be other than the above-mentioned passage from Cyril's *Letter to John of Antioch*, in which Cyril interprets, with his own manner, the “two perfect [natures]” of the Formulary of Reunion. Indeed, in this passage, Cyril does not refer only to the double perfection of one and the same person “in divinity and...humanity”, but also explicitly calls his “divinity” and “humanity” “natures (φύσεις)” (“even if the difference of natures...” – «κἄν ἡ τῶν φύσεων...διαφορά») ⁵⁸, and that, as it appears, did not go unnoticed by Basil. Already in

⁵³ See Fr. Loofs, op. cit., pp. 171, 175, 176, 182, 192, 196, 211, 254, 269, 271, 273, 274, 295, 307, 317, 318, 336, 358, 361. See also F. Nau, *Nestorius. Le livre d' Héraclide de Damas* (traduit en français), Paris 1910, pp. 146, 184, 185; G. L. Driver – L. Hodgson, *Nestorius. The Bazaar of Heracleides* (newly translated from the Syriac), Oxford 1925, pp. 166, 207, 209.

⁵⁴ See Mansi, op. cit.; ACO II,1,1,92 f.

⁵⁵ See footnote 42, v. 1-11.

⁵⁶ See Mansi, VI, 636; ACO II,1,1,93: «Ὁ ἔλεγον ἐν δύο φύσεσιν γνωριζόμενον μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, θεότητι τελεία καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι τελεία».

⁵⁷ See also Th. Šagi-Bunić, «*Deus perfectus et homo perfectus*» a *Concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451)*, Romae-Friburgi Brig.-Barcinone 1965, p. 192.

⁵⁸ See PG 77, 180B; Mansi VI, 672; ACO II,1,1,110: «τέλειος ὢν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειος ὁ αὐτός ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, καὶ ὡς ἐν ἐνί

the Endemousa Synod of 448 he has a clear and crystallized opinion on this subject. It is very enlightening for the meaning, of which Basil observes in the phrase “two natures”, the question he asks Eutyches at the Endemousa Synod: “do you say that two natures are known in the Lord, divinity and humanity?”⁵⁹.

Certainly the characterization of the “divinity” and the “humanity” of Christ as “natures,” and of course different from each other, not only responds to the above-mentioned passage from Cyril’s *Letter to John of Antioch*, but also to his *Second Letter to Nestorius*⁶⁰. However, the advantage of the above-mentioned Cyrillian passage is that the characterization of the “divinity” and the “humanity” of Christ as “natures” is combined with the double perfection of the one and the same person of Christ and this is exactly what Basil exploits theologically. Thus from the phrase “one Lord Jesus Christ...perfect...in divinity and perfect...in humanity” of the above-mentioned Cyrillian passage very easily produces the phrase “one Lord...Jesus Christ in two natures” of his dyophysite formula. With this phrase Basil essentially summarizes, in a conclusive way, the double perfection “in divinity and...humanity” of the one person of Christ, according to the above-mentioned passage of the Cyril’s *Letter to John of Antioch*⁶¹.

As far as the participle «γνωρίζομενον» (“known”) is concerned, with which Basil puts down his dyophysite formula (v. 11), we can reasonably argue that, like the participle «γνωρίζομένην» (“known”) of his dyophysite Confession (v. 7), he produces it in all likelihood from the phrase «μὴ ἀγνοῖται» (= “not to be ignored” = “to be known”), which also exists in the same Cyrillian passage⁶². With this participle Basil essentially renders with one word the basic teaching of Cyril, which survives in this passage, that the unity of the person of Christ does not negate the difference of His two natures which came together in this “secret union” («ἀπόρρητον ἔνωσιν») ⁶³, as well as his widespread teaching, after the Reconciliation of 433, that the knowledge of the difference of natures after the union does not mean division or separation or a breakdown of a person of the incarnate Word in two natures and two persons, because his natures are distinguished by themselves “only in a theoretical manner” («κατὰ μόνην τὴν θεωρίαν») ⁶⁴.

Characteristics for the notion, in which Basil understands the participle “known” (v.

προσώπῳ νοούμενος· εἷς γὰρ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, κἄν ἢ τῶν φύσεων μὴ ἀγνοῖται διαφορά, ἐξ ὧν τὴν ἀπόρρητον ἔνωσιν πεπεραχθαι φαμέν».

⁵⁹ See Mansi VI, 813; ACO II,1,1,173: «λέγεις γνωρίζεσθαι δύο φύσεις ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, θεότητα καὶ ἀνθρωπότητα;».

⁶⁰ See PG 77, 45C; Mansi VI, 661; ACO II,1,1,105: «οὐχ ὡς τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, ἀποτελεσασῶν δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν ἕνα κύριον καὶ Χριστόν καὶ υἱόν θεότητος τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος διὰ τῆς ἀφράστου καὶ ἀπορρήτου πρὸς ἐνότητα συνδρομῆς».

⁶¹ See Th. Šagi-Bunić, «‘Duo perfecta’ et ‘duae naturae’ in definitionem dogmatica chalcedonensi», *op. cit.*, p. 325; see also *ibid.*, «*Deus perfectus et homo perfectus*» a Concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451), Romae-Friburgi Brigs.-Barcinone 1965, p. 209; G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

⁶² See footnote 58.

⁶³ See also footnote 58.

⁶⁴ See Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle 46, Πρὸς Σούκκενσον ἐπίσκοπον Διοκαισαρείας ἐπιστολή Β΄*, PG 77, 245A; ACO I,1,6,162. See also *Epistle 44, Πρὸς Εὐλόγιον πρεσβύτερον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, PG 77, 225 B; ACO I,1,4, 35; *Epistle 45, Πρὸς Σούκκενσον ἐπίσκοπον Διοκαισαρείας ἐπιστολή Α΄*, PG 77, 232 D – 233 A; ACO I,1,6, 153 f.; *Epistle 40, Πρὸς Ἀκάκιον ἐπίσκοπον Μελιτηνῆς*, PG 77, 192D; 193A; 193C; ACO I,1,4, 26; 27. See also R. V. Sellers, *Two ancient Christologies. A study in the Christological thought of the schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the early history of Christian doctrine*, London 1954, p. 93 and *ibid.*, *The Council of Chalcedon. A historical and doctrinal survey*, London ²1961, p. 144.

7 and 11) in his dyophysite Confession, are his two following clarifying interventions at the Council of Chalcedon:

a) When the Egyptians and other monophysite bishops reacted because of his dyophysite formula, shouting: “No one should divide the undivided; no one should say the one two”⁶⁵, he agreed with them while underlining at the same time his opposition to Monophysitism, with the following statement: “Anathema to splitting, anathema to dividing the two natures after the union; but also anathema to not knowing the peculiarity of the natures”⁶⁶.

b) Also, when Eustathios of Beirut, also obviously alarmed by Basil’s dyophysite formula and other dyophysite expressions that were heard at the Council, expressed the fear that there was a danger for some to claim that “a doctrinal decision was taken to say two divided natures after the union”⁶⁷, then Basil interrupted him abruptly and, wanting to make clear the difference of the Orthodox Christological doctrine from Nestorianism and Monophysitism, he emphatically gave the following clarification: “We know the natures, we do not divide them; we do not say them either divided or confused”⁶⁸.

In the Nestorian division and in the Monophysite confusion of the natures Basil puts up their simple “knowledge,” which is not understood differently than the Cyrillian way as a distinction of natures “only in a theoretical manner”. The expressions “to know the natures” and “to know the peculiarity of the natures”, which Basil used above, are identical to each other. “To know the natures” means “to know the peculiarity of the natures”. In this sense, as we understand, these expressions are parallel with the expression “the difference of the natures is not ignored” that Cyril used in the above-mentioned passage of his *Letter to John of Antioch*, where he interprets the “two perfect [natures]” of the Formulary of Reunion⁶⁹. Of course there are other similar expressions that Cyril used mainly in his letters after the Reconciliation of 433⁷⁰, expressions that Basil certainly knew, because he was, as it seems from his Christological statements in the Endemousa Synod (448) and in the so called “Robber” Synod (449), well learned of both two aspects of Cyril’s Christology. However, we have the opinion that the term «γνωρίζειν» (“to know”) in its various forms, which Basil consciously and persistently connects with the “two natures”, can only be derived from the expression «μὴ ἀγνοῖται» (= “not to be ignored” = “to be known”) of the above-mentioned Cyrillian passage. This not only because both participles “known” (v. 7 and 11) in his Confession are organically connected with the expressions “perfect... divinity... and perfect

⁶⁵ See Mansi, VI, 636; ACO II,1,1,93.

⁶⁶ See Mansi, op. cit.; ACO, op. cit.: «Ἀνάθεμα τῷ μερίζοντι ἀνάθεμα τῷ διαιροῦντι τὰς δύο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν· ἀνάθεμα δὲ καὶ τῷ μὴ γνωρίζοντι τὸ ἰδιάζον τῶν φύσεων».

⁶⁷ See Mansi, VI, 744; ACO II,1,1,143.

⁶⁸ See Mansi, op. cit.; ACO, op. cit.: «Γνωρίζομεν τὰς φύσεις, οὐ διαιροῦμεν· οὔτε διηρημένας οὔτε συγκεχυμένας λέγομεν».

⁶⁹ See footnote 58.

⁷⁰ See the particular expressions: «τὸ εἶδέναι τῶν φύσεων τὴν διαφορὰν» (*Epistle 44, Πρὸς Εὐλόγιον πρεσβύτερον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, PG 77, 225B; ACO I,1,4,35); «ἐν ψιλαῖς διελόντες ἐννοίαις καὶ ὡς ἐν ἰσχυαῖς θεωρίας ἦτοι νοῦ φαντασίας τὴν διαφορὰν δεξάμενοι» (*Epistle 46, Πρὸς Σούκκενσον ἐπίσκοπον Διοκαισαρείας ἐπιστολὴ Β΄*, PG 77, 245A; ACO I,1,6,162); «Καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο νοηθεῖν ἂν ἡ τῶν φύσεων, ἦγουν ὑποστάσεων διαφορὰ· οὐ γάρ που ταυτὸν ἐν ποιότητι φυσικῇ θεότης καὶ ἀνθρωπότης» (*Epistle 40, Πρὸς Ἀκάκιον ἐπίσκοπον Μελιτηνῆς*, PG 77, 193BC; ACO I,1,4,27).

humanity” (v. 7) and “in two natures” (v. 11) respectively, which also originate from the same Cyrillian passage, but also because the “two natures,” which are attached with the verb “to know” or “to be known”, mean, as we have seen, according to Basil just as in the above-mentioned Cyrillian passage: as perfect divinity and perfect humanity.

Consequently, even if Basil’s dyophysite formula has an Antiochian or nestorianizing form, we can reasonably accept with certainty that he essentially produces it from Cyril. Only in the way that Basil understands and uses his dyophysite formula can be understood, according to the teaching of Cyril, the distinction of natures of the incarnate Word after the union, without risking a danger of splitting His person. Exactly for that reason in relation with the expressions “to know the natures” or “to know the peculiarity of the natures”, which are certainly associated with the dyophysite formula of his Confession, Basil feels, as we have seen, the need to emphasize the “unconfused” and “indivisible” character of the two natures. This emphasis is indeed done in such a way as to be considered an integral element of “knowing the natures” and by extension of his dyophysite formula. Moreover, it is by no coincidence that since the Endemousa Synod of 448, where his dyophysite formula was expressed for the first time, Basil stresses with particular emphasis the unconfused and indivisible character of the two natures, while rejecting both Nestorianism and Monophysitism⁷¹. In his two-sided struggle against the two extreme and opposite amongst them Christological heresies his dyophysite formula is the most effective weapon in his hands, based on the *Letter of Cyril to John of Antioch*.

Exactly for this reason the value of Basil’s dyophysite formula for the addressing against both Nestorianism and Monophysitism on the basis of the Christological teaching of Cyril was certainly not ignored by the Fathers of Chalcedon, who in the Definition they composed, as supported by our related study⁷², sought not only to give a visibly Cyrillian character, but also to keep it intact from the few additions and modifications proposed in the Council. Consequently, when during the fifth session of the Council there arose a question of replacing the formula “of two natures” («ἐκ δύο φύσεων») of the original Definition with another phrase, deriving from the *Tome of Leo* and having a clear dyophysite character, the Committee set up for the revision of the original Definition preferred for this purpose instead of the dyophysite formula of Pope Leo, which was proposed by the imperial representatives⁷³, Basil’s dyophysite formula, which had a Cyrillian origin and harmonised perfectly with the general Cyrillian character of the original Definition⁷⁴. Indeed, the Committee which was set up for the revision of the original Definition, in order to make clear in the text of the final Definition the Cyrillian

⁷¹ See the remark made by Basil to Eutyches because of his monophysite confession at the Endemousa Synod of 488: «ἐάν μή μετά τήν ἔνωσιν ἀ χω ρ ί σ τ ο υ ς και ἀ σ υ γ χ ύ τ ο υ ς εἴτης δύο φύσεις σύγχυσιν λέγεις και σύγκρασιν» (Mansi VI, 637; ACO II,1,1,93. See also Mansi VI, 817 f.; ACO II,1,1,175).

⁷² See G. D. Martzelos, *Γένεση και πηγές τοῦ Ὁρου τῆς Χαλκηδόνας. Συμβολή στην ιστορικοδογματική διερεύνηση τοῦ Ὁρου τῆς Δ' Οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου*, P. Pournaras Pub., Thessaloniki 1986, pp. 93, 136, 197.

⁷³ See Mansi VII, 105; ACO II,1,2,125[321]: «Οἱ μεγαλοπρεπέστατοι και ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες εἶπον· Πρόσθετε οὖν τῷ ὄρω κατά τήν ψήφον τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατρός ἡμῶν Λέοντος δύο φύσεις εἶναι ἡνωμένας ἀτρέπτως και ἀμερίστως και ἀσυγχύτως ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ».

⁷⁴ See G. D. Martzelos, *op. cit.*, pp. 175 f., 200.

origin of the new dyophysite formula and to thus exclude the possibility of being considered as Nestorian, expressed the double perfection not in the form of the Formulary of Reunion (“perfect God and perfect man”), which echoed the Antiochian mode of expression, but in the interpretative form that Cyril gave in his *Letter to John of Antioch* (“perfect...in divinity and perfect the same in humanity”), on the basis of which Basil, as we have seen, produces his dyophysite formula⁷⁵. For this reason the revision Committee formulated the double perfection in the text of the final Definition as follows: «τέλειον τόν αὐτόν ἐν θεότητι καί τέλειον τόν αὐτόν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι» - “perfect the same in divinity and perfect the same in humanity” (v. 5-6). With this manner, the revision Committee of the original Definition not only achieved to make the Cyrillian origin of the new dyophysite formula irrefutable, but also strongly highlighted its intimate and inseparable relationship with the “double perfection” in the text of the final Definition⁷⁶.

After this necessary modification of the double perfection in the verse 5 of the original Definition the revision committee thought it well to repeat this verse in the text of the final Definition, but with other words on the basis of Cyril’s *3rd Letter to Nestorius*, that annotates the Christological part of the Symbol of Nicaea, stressing especially that Christ is “true God”⁷⁷ and “the same God and man as well”⁷⁸. For this reason the revision committee replaced the noun «τέλειος» (“perfect”) of the verse 5 of the original Definition with the adverb «ἀληθῶς» (“truly”), so that the verse 7 may come to light in the text of the final Definition.

All these modifications of the first part of the original Definition were exclusively determined, as it is clear, by the necessary modification of its second part, because they were tightly connected with the effort of the revision committee to underline in an indisputable way the Cyrillian character of the new dyophysite formula in the text of the final Definition.

As far as the theological character of the four adverbs («ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίστως») - “unconfusedly, immutably, undivisibly, inseparably”) in the new dyophysite formula is concerned, we have to point out that it is also out and out Cyrillian. Of course these adverbs are actually a common property of the fore-Cyrillian theological tradition⁷⁹; we must keep in mind, however, that at least the first three of them were often used by Cyril and in this way they were indissolubly connected with his Christological teaching⁸⁰, while the fourth one, referring to the unity of the two natures in

⁷⁵ See also *op. cit.*, p. 207 f.

⁷⁶ See also G. D. Martzelos, *Ἡ Χριστολογία τοῦ Βασιλείου Σελευκείας καί ἡ οἰκουμένηκη σημασία της*, P. Pournaras Pub., Thessaloniki 1990, p. 242 f.

⁷⁷ See PG 77, 109C; Mansi IV, 1072; ACO I,1,1,35. Cf. PG 77, 120C; 121A; Mansi IV, 1081; 1084; ACO I,1,1,40 f.

⁷⁸ See PG 77, 120C, 121A; Mansi IV, 1081; 1084; ACO I,1,1,40 f.

⁷⁹ See for example Amphilochius of Iconium, *Fragm. 15, Ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Σέλευκον ἐπιστολῆς*, PG 39, 113B. See also Athanasius of Alexandria, *Εἰς τόν 98 ψαλμόν* 5, PG 27, 421C; Didimus of Alexandria, *Περὶ Ἁγίας Τριάδος* 3,6, PG 39, 844B; 3,13, PG 39, 861A; 3, 18, PG 39, 884D; 3,20, PG 39, 896A; Gregory of Nyssa, *Ἀντιρρητικός πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολιναρίου* 21, PG 45, 1165A; Marcus Eremita, *Εἰς τόν Μελχισεδέκ* 5, PG 65, 1124A.

⁸⁰ See *Ἐξήγησις εἰς τό κατά Λουκᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον* 2, PG 72, 484C; *Ἀπολογητικός ὑπέρ τῶν δώδεκα κεφαλαίων πρὸς τοὺς τῆς Ἀνατολῆς ἐπίσκοπους* 11, PG 76, 376C; *Πρὸς Σούκκενσον ἐπίσκοπον Διοκαιοσαρείας ἐπιστολή Α΄*, PG 77, 232BC; *Πρὸς Σούκκενσον ἐπίσκοπον Διοκαιοσαρείας ἐπιστολή Β΄*, PG 77, 245C.

the “one and the same” person of Christ, expresses clearly, like the third one, the quintessence of his teaching against Nestorius⁸¹. Exactly for this reason, as we have seen above, the first three of them, and even in the same order they are in the Definition, were used in the Statement of the bishops of Eastern Illyricum on the Orthodoxy of Leo’s *Tome* and its agreement with Cyril. In order to estimate duly this fact, we have to take into account that the Illyrian bishops were not only warm defenders of Cyril’s Christology; they were also those who posed in the Council the question of agreement of Leo’s *Tome* with the *3rd Letter* of Cyril to Nestorius. Moreover, their Statement reflects, as Diepen rightly noticed, the first and the fourth Anathematism of this letter to Nestorius⁸².

After the first and the second part of the original Definition have been so amazingly adapted to the Christological teaching of St. Cyril, one would expect, even according to the demands of the papal and imperial representatives, that at least the only passage from Leo’s *Tome* existing in the Definition (verses 19-20) ought to remain as it is the *Tome* and not to be adapted to the teaching of Cyril. Nevertheless the completely opposite has happened.

As we have said, in the place of the Leonine passage there existed in the original Definition the passage «ἀποτελεσασῶν δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν ἕνα κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ υἰὸν θεότητος τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος διὰ τῆς ἀφράστου καὶ ἀπορρήτου πρὸς ἐνότητα συνδρομῆς» from Cyril’s *2nd Letter to Nestorius*. This poses though rightfully the question: What is the reason that this Leonine passage was added in the text of the final Definition in replacement of the above-mentioned passage of Cyril which, as it seems from the Minutes of the Council, was neither disputed nor demanded to be modified or replaced?

We hold the opinion that after the adoption of Basil’s of Seleucia dyophysite formula in the most crucial part of the Definition, the revision committee thought it well according to the main demand of the papal and imperial representatives to replace the above-mentioned passage of Cyril in the original Definition with a characteristic dyophysite passage from Leo’s *Tome*. So this modification in the third part of the original Definition has to do also with the basic and necessary modification of its second part, and concretely with the adoption of Basil’s dyophysite formula in the text of the final Definition.

The main reason for which the revision committee chose this passage from Leo’s *Tome* was most probably that it is parallel with the whole passage there existed in the original Definition (verses 16-19) from Cyril’s *2nd Letter to Nestorius*. We must even notice that this choice was absolutely rightful, especially after the contestation of Leo’s *Tome* and its defense on the basis of parallel passages from Cyril. Only in this way the orthodoxy of this characteristic dyophysite passage of the *Tome* could be safeguarded and made undisputable. In other words the revision committee, in order to satisfy the will of the papal and imperial representatives, added a characteristic dyophysite passage from

⁸¹ See also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

⁸² See H. M. Diepen, « Les douzes Anathématismes au Concile d’Éphèse et jusqu’en 519 », in: *Revue Thomiste* 55(1955), pp. 335 f.; *ibid.*, *Douzes dialogues de Christologie ancienne*, Roma 1960, pp. 119 ff.

Leo's *Tome* in the text of the final Definition, it took care, however, that this passage may completely agree with a similar passage of Cyril.

This specific interest of the revision committee is clear also from the philological and theological modifications it brought about this Leonine passage. Thus, although this passage in the Greek translation of the *Tome* begins with the expression «Σωζομένης τοίνυν...» and ends with the participle «συνιούσης», in the text of the final Definition it begins with the expression «σωζομένης δέ μᾶλλον...» and ends with the participle «συντρεχούσης». This fact reveals the interest of the revision committee to adapt the beginning and the end of this passage to the beginning («ἀποτελεσαῶν δέ μᾶλλον») and the end («συνδρομῆς») of the Cyrillian passage it replaced. This is not, we think, a mere stylistic modification of the Leonine passage, in order that it may be from a philological point of view smoothly connected with the Cyrillian passage of the previous verse in the final Definition. If it were so, the modification of the participle «συνιούσης» in «συντρεχούσης» on the basis of the last word («συνδρομῆς») of the Cyrillian passage in the original Definition could not have happened, because both participles have the same semantic content. Moreover, we must take into account that the notion of the «συνδρομή» (“running together”) of Christ's two natures exists not only in this passage it was contained, as we believe, in the original Definition, but also in many other passages of Cyril and it is one of the most characteristic Cyrillian notions they declare the unbroken unity of the two natures in the one person of the incarnate Word. Precisely for these reasons we hold the opinion that this modification betrays clearly the effort of the revision committee to give an obvious Cyrillian character to the Leonine passage of the Definition.

Apart from that the basic modification of the Leonine passage it betrays its conformance with the Christology of Cyril is mainly the addition to it of the expression «καί μίαν ὑπόστασιν» (verse 20). Although the Greek word «ὑπόστασις» (substantia) in the Latin theological tradition was, as a matter of course, synonymous with the Greek word «φύσις» (natura), in the Leonine passage of the final Definition the word «ὑπόστασις» is identified semantically with the Greek word «πρόσωπον» (“person”), as in the *3rd Letter* of Cyril to Nestorius, in order that it obtains an ontological meaning and in this way its Nestorian understanding may be excluded. In any event, after all these modifications the Leonine passage in the Definition lost its initial character and obtained – mainly in the verse 20 – so an obvious Cyrillian character, that R. V. Sellers cannot even suspect that it comes from Leo's *Tome*, and for this reason he believes that this verse comes basically from Cyril⁸³!

Conclusion

After all these we have said, it is evident that the main and basic sources of the Definition of Chalcedon are the following: the Letter of Cyril to John of Antioch, his 2nd

⁸³ See *op. cit.*, pp. 220 f.

and 3rd *Letters to Nestorius*, Leo's *Tome* and the biblical passage *Hebr. 4,15*. Therefore the view that the Definition of Chalcedon is a mosaic of different or opposite Christological tendencies of the 5th century is oversimplified and misleading. As it has been proved, not only the verses which come directly from Cyril, but also those which come from modifications and additions to the original Definition give witness that the Chalcedonian Definition has a completely Cyrillian character. Certainly there is a synthesis of Alexandrine, Antiochian and Western Christological elements in the Definition, but this synthesis was made completely within the framework of Cyril's Christology. No Christological element was accepted in the Definition by either the committees of composition or revision, unless it had been completely adjusted to harmonize with his Christological teaching: The Formulary of Reunion was not accepted in the Definition with its Antiochian form, although it was approved by Cyril with this very form, but it was interpreted on the basis of the 2nd and 3rd Letters of Cyril to Nestorius and his Letter to John of Antioch. The dyophysite formula of Basil of Seleucia was preferred than that proposed by the imperial representatives, because it comes from the *Letter of Cyril to John of Antioch* and it is in absolute agreement with his Christological teaching. The four adverbs in the dyophysite formula of the Definition were accepted not only because they express laconically the anti-monophysite and anti-nestorian teaching of Cyril, but also because – at least the first three of them – were used *mot a mot* by Cyril himself. Finally, the Leonine passage was included in the Definition, because it is parallel with the passage from the 2nd *Letter of Cyril to Nestorius* which there existed, as we believe, in the original Definition and despite this, as we have seen, it was modified, in order to obtain an obvious Cyrillian character. In other words, care was taken especially in the final Definition that even the Christological elements which did not come directly from Cyril agree completely with his Christological teaching and express it faithfully.

This conclusion has a great historical-dogmatic significance because it stresses the unity of the Cyrillian Christology with that of Chalcedon and by extension the dogmatic agreement and unity of the Ecumenical Councils which were concerned with the Christological question. It also has a great ecclesiastical significance because it opens new horizons and perspectives for the promotion of the theological dialogue between Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians. In other words the identification of the Cyrillian character of the Chalcedonian Definition does not create only the presupposition for the successful progress and outcome of the theological dialogue between Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians; it also stresses at the same time the perennial value of the Cyrillian Christology for the formulation of the Christological doctrine, revealing in this way Cyril to be in fact an Ecumenical teacher of the Church.

