

IRINEU ION POPA
University of Craiova, Romania

Christology of Chalcedon, after the Council of Chalcedon

Unfortunately, even all the precautions taken into account by the Council of Chalcedon did not bring peace within the Church. If the West generally remained faithful to the dogmatic definition, very soon in the East there was to be a hostile reaction that had an impact even till today. Therefore, those who interpreted the formula of St. Cyril in the opposite direction of the two natures, considered the dogmatic judgments of Pope Leo as a victory, which meant for them a victory for Nestorianism¹. Consequently, this party did not recognize either the Council of Chalcedon or the local bishops, who acknowledged its definition, which began the creation of the heterodox monophysite Churches.

After the death of Marcian, the Byzantine emperors made considerable efforts to request that the Monophysites moved to orthodoxy, sometimes forcing the Orthodox to various dogmatic concessions. Among them, there is also Emperor Zeno, with his famous *Henotikon* who states that Jesus Christ is one, anathematizing both Nestorius and Eutyches, but breaking apart the good relations between East and West. This produced a schism which lasted from 484 until the time of Emperor Justinian who prominently restored, the Council of Chalcedon².

Finally, those who did not agree with the judgments of the Council of Chalcedon grouped themselves around Timothy Aelurus, chosen by them as Patriarch of Alexandria. He thought that the idea of the two natures was not in agreement with the teaching of St. Cyril and thus rejected the two natures, but condemned Eutyches. In harmony with Zeno's *Henotikon*, Timothy claimed that Christ was a perfect God and a perfect man, consubstantial with the Father, by Godhead and

¹ Their dissatisfaction also increased due to the fact that the council rehabilitated Theodoret and Ibas of Edessa, deposed by the council of Ephesus, the opponents of St. Cyril's anathematization.

A. HARNACK, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 2, Tübingen 1931⁵, p. 400–404.

consubstantial with us by manhood, but he did not admit to be said that in Christ there is human nature by Incarnation. This creed, was based by the Aelurus on the premise that human nature also involves a human person, i.e. nature means concrete existence. Thus, he said: “There is no nature that is not also hypostasis and not hypostasis that is not nature. If, then, they are two natures, there are necessarily two persons and two Christs”³. In this sense, Christ’s manhood is not nature, since it was never self-contained, which means that from the very moment of conception we can only speak of the divine nature of Christ, since it was the only self-contained. As such, only St. Cyril’s formulation “one nature of the Word incarnate” (μια φυσικτουθεουλογουσεσαρκωμενη), is valid.

His doctrinal successor, the patriarch of Antioch, Severus, held the same ideas, with one difference: that he accepted, if necessary, even the two natures from the definition of Chalcedon, but did not accept the formulation of Leo’s Tome. The basis of Severus and Severians’ misunderstanding was therefore, related to the inexplicable mixture of the terms hypostasis, nature and person; according to their thinking, Jesus Christ does not have a nature but is a nature. This is the reason why they harshly criticized the Council of Chalcedon, accusing them of Nestorianism, since they talked about Christ “in two natures” In one of his homilies, Severus stated:

Or, if in fact there’s only one hypostasis, there will be only one nature incarnate of God the Word, or if there are two natures, there will necessarily be two hypostases, and two persons, and Trinity will be found a three part composition (...) this is treacherous and deceitful and is intended to make us approve what is not and state as false what it truly is⁴.

In a letter of Eustace *The Monk*, Severus’ teaching is presented as follows:

If Christ will be known in two natures after the union, the union is dissolved, divided in two, and the secrecy will be broken; we’ll assign immortality to the divine nature and death to the human one⁵.

³ J. LEBON, *La christologie de Thimotee Aelure*, in: „Revue d’Histoire ecclesiastique” 9 (1908), no 4, p. 677–703.

⁴ SEVERUS, *Omilia 58*, in: *Les homélies cathédrales de Sévère d’Antioche*, éditées et trad. en français par M. Brière, in: R. GRAFFIN, F. NAU, *Patrologia Orientalis*, vol. VIII, Paris 1912, p. 225.

⁵ EUSTACE, *The Monk. Letter about two natures against Severus. To Timothy the Scholastic*, PG 86, 1, 932 AB.

This appeared in Severus' thought that by Leo's formulation, natures union descends to a relational communion and as such "if Logos does those of the Logos, and the body does those of the body, if the first shines through miracles and the latter is subject to passions, faces communion is relational and voluntary provision, as Nestorius the Fool said"⁶. Undoubtedly, these comments clearly unfounded, will not be overlooked by Leontius of Byzantium.

Analyzing this teaching, we see that Severus, in his argument, starts from the fact that the Logos is the subject of Jesus Christ's nature. Being bodiless He became flesh, without changing or becoming another, so He only had the originality of being different. In this way, the word is not a new topic, but a new nature where Jesus Christ is absolutely identical with the Logos⁷. Therefore, the body never pre-existed the Incarnation, being taken from the Virgin Mary, who, uniting physically, naturally with the Logos, made unity become the nature or hypostasis of the Logos⁸. This unity, says Severus, as well as St. Cyril, being the nature of the Logos, did not undergo any changes, since it is "the unique nature of the Logos incarnate" The fact that nature has a particular meaning for them, determines the fact never in their Christology to contemplate Jesus Christ in two natures but "of two natures"⁹ Obviously, recognizing the two natures even after the Incarnation, is only mind's eye seen (κατ'επινοίαν ενθεωρία)¹⁰; after contemplation, the idea of duality disappears and the power of their union no longer allows them to be two¹¹. In other words, the union of the two natures is not a mixture anymore, but a synthesis (συνθετος), without having a separate existence, although union excludes separation and mixture¹². In this case, although the Incarnation becomes composed and manhood does not exist by itself, but in the Logos, the nature, however, is not dual, but includes in the order of its existence a new element, that it did not have before¹³.

The fact that the two natures, in Severus' thinking are not real existences, but only thought, leads to the rejection of the works of the two natures, since, as Sever-

⁶ *Ibidem*, PG 86, 925 C.

⁷ M. JUGIE, *Monophysisme*, in: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. X, Paris 1929, col. 2221.

⁸ SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Homily 58*, PG 86, 224.

⁹ M. JUGIE, *Monophysisme*, col. 2223.

¹⁰ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Against Monophysites*, PG 86, II, 1845 C; EUSTACE, *The Monk. Letter about two natures against Severus*, PG 86, I, 908A, 921 AB, 936D.

¹¹ EUSTACE, *The Monk*, PG 86, 921 B.

¹² SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Letter to Sergio*, J. Lebon (ed.), CSCO, syr, ser. 4, t. 7, Louvain 1949, p. 94.

¹³ J. TIXERONT, *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, III, Paris 1924, p. 127–122.

us stated, approving their recognition would make two hypostases¹⁴. Therefore, one nature involves a single work in Christ, and from this point of view, the works become a common divine-human work. This is the reason why, he thinks that the formulation “of two natures” is better than the one “in two natures” Or, the formulation of the Chalcedon, which acknowledged two natures, acknowledged self-explanatory two works in the Savior. The consequences of this doctrine led to deprivation of human nature of one of its specific works, distinct from the divine one, which meant that it no longer was a whole nature.

Indeed, it is here the point where Severus overcomes the Cyrillian thinking¹⁵ about “only one nature of the Logos Incarnate”, agreeing only one work and one will of the Logos incarnate. Since he could not totally break away from St. Cyril’s thinking, Severus was in favor for features pass, but he did not consider them to be inner nature, so that it could not be compared to the Logos, the unique and ultimate subject of various attributes. Thus, the two natures of Emmanuel became one Hypostasis of the Logos¹⁶.

As it was noted, Severus continues St. Cyril’s Christological dyophysite ideas¹⁷ but in a monophysite language, being always in a continuous contradiction¹⁸. He stood opposed to any idea of mixing natures in Christ since, for him, there is no distinct human nature. When asked how could it be said that Christ was human, that He assumed human nature, body and soul, Severus replied: due to the fact that the unique nature of Christ possesses all natural qualities (ιδιωματα) of manhood¹⁹ As for mixing natures within Christ, Severus was the only Monophysite theologian who preached this, making us understand the fact that, he acknowledged two essences (ουσια) in Christ. Then, he thought that υποστασις and φυσις are synonymous terms, since they indicate the way of existence of a specific person, a specific group that has the same ουσια. When referring to the Savior, υποστασις

¹⁴ SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Against Grammat*, PG 86, 2, 1841.

¹⁵ Severus confesses one nature and one theandric hypostasis, one composed work as if it belonged to one. F. LOOFS, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*, „Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur“ 3 (1887), vol. 1–2, p. 50.

¹⁶ EUSTACE, *The Monk*, PG 86, I, 924 D.

¹⁷ St. Cyril’s language pointed out soteriological and kerygmatic realities, while Severus invested it with a precise philosophical meaning. For example, the notion de θεωρια had with him a docet consonance, which was not in the Saint’s thinking.

¹⁸ As it is known, Severus applies the Trinitarian terminology of the Cappadocian Fathers in Christology, which was highly inappropriately. For example, to equal essence with nature in Christology implies according to Severus, that the whole Holy Trinity incarnated.

¹⁹ SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Letter to Ecumenius*, “Patrologia Orientalis” 12 (1919), p. 176–177.

and φύσις they had to be synonymous, since His being is specifically unique, fully participating to the essence οὐσία, of God and the essence, οὐσία, of manhood²⁰. A consequence of this doctrine is, unfortunately, the birth of the Monothelite movement in the late sixth century.

Against Timothy and Severus, the Orthodox had to argue that the two natures and the two works are according to the Christological Cyrillian thinking, in order to defend the dogmatic Christological definition of Chalcedon labeled as Nestorianism. It is a well-known fact that St. Cyril thinks that the two natures are held by God the Word, although the definition based on the text of Pope Leo, gave the impression that the properties of the two natures created a person by equal formation but never was the divine person a person of human nature. Therefore, although, the formulation gave the impression that each nature has an autonomous activity, being a kind of person, however, the dogmatic decision, taken as a whole, meant something completely different. However, the council had confirmed both the epistles of Saint Cyril against Nestorius and the Tome of Leo to Flavian²¹.

Severus of Antioch, therefore, thought that the work of each nature acknowledged by the council, involves an individuality of each natures, leading to a human individuality in Christ. As such, the Antiochian thought that work and human nature can be in Christ, without thus involving a particular nature, since they were received and held by the Person of God the Word. But the phrases in the definition and Leo's *Tome* had to be explained in accordance with the Christology of Saint Cyril, stated in the council on dozen of occasions. In this sense, keeping nature and its specific work was held within the Hypostasis of the Logos, without forming a particular person based on it. Through it, the person of the Word is acknowledged, as carrier of natures and works, rejecting both Monophysitism and Nestorianism.

An important role in this period was played by the Scythian monks who appear to Constantinople in a providential moment. Rome and Constantinople being at loggerheads over Zeno's *Henotikon*, were now on the verge of a new schism caused by Christological issues. The formulation of the Scythian monks, "one of the Trinity suffered for us in the flesh" is meant to illustrate God the Word as the subject of human acts, which meant that human nature did not work independently and did

²⁰ For a detailed study of this terminology see: J. LEBON, *La christologie du monophysisme syrien: Étude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcedoine jusqu'à la constitution de l'Église jacobite*, Louvain 1909, p. 457–467.

²¹ It is true that Leo's *Tome* contained some phrases that gave the impression that human nature has its own independent work, as it is, for example, the following complex sentence: *agitutraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est verbo scilicet operante quod verbi est et carne exequente quod carnis est*.

not exist independently as its own hypostasis²². Moreover, this definition drove out the possibility that the Person of Jesus Christ would have resulted from the merging of the two natures and their work, which was a kind of Nestorianism²³.

The formulation of the Scythian monks, *Unus de Trinitate carne passus est*, was based on the inspired words of the Apostle Paul, who said that the Lord of glory was crucified (1Cor 2:8), the teachings of St. Ignatius Theophorus, who taught that Christ suffered²⁴, the words of St. Proclus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who was one of the close friends of St. Cyril of Alexandria and the dogmatic definition of the Council of Chalcedon. Teopash it ephrases are what we also find in the theology of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, as for example: “we need a God incarnate and crucified to resurrect” (εδεθημεν Θεου σεσαρκουμένου και νεκρουμένου)²⁵. Moreover, the Saint does not hesitate to talk about “blood of God” (αιμα Θεου) and about “God crucified” (Θεος σταυρουμένος)²⁶. The very Symbol of Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan faith clearly proclaimed Church’s faith “in the Son of God (...) who was incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary (...) was crucified for us people under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried” Then St. Cyril’s chief concern was to preserve the faith of Nicaea, endangered by Nestorius’ heresy, of the very fact that it did not regard Virgin Mary as Mother of God and the Son of God suffered in the flesh. As such, the Scythian monks did not bring any Christological news when using this

²² This formulation is rooted in St. Cyril’s thinking, who teaches that not man by himself, but God Himself in Jesus Christ suffered and died. So if Emmanuel is made of two natures, and after the union there is only one nature incarnate of the Logos, it means that He suffered in His own nature. St. Cyril replies: “What necessity is for Him to suffer in His own nature, if it is said that after the union He is one nature incarnated of the Logos? If in the divine reasoning of Ikonomy there were no thing to receive sufferings, they (the opponents) would be right. Since there is no element to suffer it would be absolutely imperative that sufferings go to the nature of the Logos. But the term «incarnated» comprises all reasoning of Ikonomy by flesh, since the Logos did not incarnate Logos otherwise, but it was taken from the seed of Abraham, was in all alike his brothers, took the form of a servant. Chatty, so in vain those who say that He must suffer many in His own nature, since the body is the subject of his sufferings, He being able to experience such things whilst the Logos is indifferent. But by asserting these we do not say that He is out of sufferings” In other words, Christ suffered in His earthly nature. In this sense, the only Son of God had to preserve within His inner nature both situations: 1. not to suffer Godhead-like; 2. to say that He suffers manhood-like. In conclusion, the One who endured the cross with honor for us and tasted death was not a common man and separated from the Logos of God, but the Lord of Glory Himself suffered in the flesh according to the scripture. See: I.G. COMAN, *And the word became flesh*, Timișoara 1993, p.113. St. Cyril’s teophasism is actually a comparison of body suffering to the Logos, the most eloquent expression of the qualities transfer of the two natures, which is undoubtedly based on the hypostatic union. Due to this transfer, the properties mix and take part ones to the others. This the reason why, divine things can be said about human nature and vice versa. But this only happens in the union state of the two natures, or kenosis state.

²³ We will extensively analyze this formulation when we present the Christological teaching of Emperor Justinian and The Fifth Ecumenical Council.

²⁴ ST. IGNATIUS THEOPHORUS, *Letter to the Romans*, VI, 3.

²⁵ ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Homily 45*, 28, PG 36, 661C; *Homily 30*, 5, PG 36, 109A.

²⁶ ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Homily 45*, 19, 22, 28, PG 36, 649C; 653A; 661D.

theopashite formulation. In fact, those who doubted the formulation of Scythian fathers were those who attributed the notion of sufferings to an unsuffering God. But was not it necessary for God the Word to make Himself death in order to defeat it? This was precisely the basis of soteriology of St. Gregory of Nazianzus and the St. Cyril of Alexandria. Antiochian theologians, led by Theodore of Mopsuestia, also acknowledged the fact that God had body, becoming a man, but they did not accept to say that God tasted death, since they did not accept to say that the Logos wholly united with human nature. Obviously, it was precisely the eternal and pre-existing hypostasis of the Logos which became subject to the death of Christ, since in Christ there is no other personal subject than the Word. St. Proclus in *The Tome to the Armenians*, from which Maxentius quotes, understood this perfectly when he wrote against Theodore of Mopsuestia:

He who confesses that He who was crucified, is God, also confesses that the Father and the Holy Spirit were crucified if the nature of the Trinity is one. As for me, I object and ask you: He who was crucified is one of the Trinity or someone else outside the Trinity? If it is one and the same, confusion is cleared. But if it is someone outside the Trinity, then the Lord is the fourth and He is outlandish of the seraphim's honor (...) But if we say that He was crucified in Godhead, we would introduce suffering into Trinity. But if we say that the Logos absorbed suffering within its body, by this we confess that the one who suffered is one of the Trinity, for the nature of Trinity did not suffer (...). Therefore it was crucified what was incarnated (...). But if crucified what was incarnated, it means that the Father and the Holy Spirit were not crucified; therefore one of the Trinity was crucified²⁷

According to this formulation, we understand that the Son of God, becoming Himself also the Son of man, through this union, God passed into Christ and Christ passed into God and what Christ suffered also suffered God. In this case, the very reason of Resurrection has its fulfillment in the act of Savior's death on the cross. Then God, being united with man, did not allow that there were any interval between man and Him, that is, to be believed that one is the Son of Man and another is the Son of God. The very words of the Lord testify to this: "No one has ascended into heaven, but He who has come down from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven" (John 3:13). All these are meant to illustrate the fact, which, while the Son of God spoke on earth, he testified that the Son of man was in heaven and that the same Son of man, about whom was said that will ascend into heaven, had already descended from the

²⁷ PROCLUS, *De fide*, III, to JOHN MAXENTIUS, *Libellus fidei*, IV, 2; X, 17, 18, 19, Schwartz, p. 61.

sky. These things are also strengthened by the words of the Symbol of Faith, which teach that the Son of God is united to the Son of Man, meaning that God is united with man, that neither in time nor in suffering can there be a separation between them, which means that a teopashite trend derives from the very soteriologic purpose of the Incarnation, the aim that the Son of God pursued from the beginning, in order to truly achieve it. Therefore, the suffering on the cross of the unsuffering One must be understood in the same way in which it is said that “man was deified”, that is not existentially, but by participation or cooperation of the two natures. In this regard, what one of the Scythian monks, John Maxentius asserted, is as follows: Holy Trinity after the incarnation remain Trinity, since the same God the Word, with His very own body, is part of the Trinity. This does not mean that His body is part of the being of the Holy Trinity, but because it is the body of God the Word, Who is one of the Holy Trinity; that He Himself and no one else has ascended into heaven, He who has descended from the sky. Therefore, we confess that God the Word suffered in flesh and was crucified in flesh, and was buried in flesh, according to St. Cyril who says:

If anyone does not confess that God the Logos suffered in flesh, was crucified in the flesh, tasted death in the flesh and became the first begotten of the dead, because He is life and life-giving, as God, anathema be it²⁸.

Therefore, Scythians’ teaching according to which the incarnate Son of God did not suffer in His Godhead or deity nature, but in his manhood nature or His body was clearly understood and expressed by them in accordance with the Holy Scripture and Fathers²⁹ Christ is one of the Trinity, with his very own body, and suffered for us in the flesh, though, in terms of flesh, He is not one of the being of Trinity, but He is the same with us. This fact point out that Godhead is not suffering like, but it can be confessed that God suffered in the flesh as Jesus Christ is born as true God³⁰, what St. Paul asserted as: “within Christ dwells, bodily, all the fullness of the Godhead” (Col 2:9).

From another point of view, the monks’ formulation aimed at both Nestorianism and Monophysitism. By the fact that they stated that one of the Trinity suffered and not God in general, they showed that not the whole Holy Trinity suffered, but only

²⁸ *Theopaschites*, in: F.L. CROSS, E.A. LIVINGSTONE (eds), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, London 1974, col. 1363–1364.

²⁹ Long before the teopashit crisis broke out, they have written about the incarnate Son of God who suffered not Godhead, but in flesh, theologians from Scythia as St. John Cassian in his work *On the Incarnation of the Lord*, Nicetas of Remesiana in his work *About the symbol of faith*.

³⁰ JOHN MAXENTIUS, *Capitul aedita contra nestorianos et pelagianos ad satisfactionem fratrum* 4

the Son who suffered in the flesh. Therefore, they said “he who does not say that God the Word was connected with the formation of the body and does not teach that He received human nature in his own hypostasis or person, considers the hypostasis of the Word as attached to the hypostasis of the body”³¹. Obviously, “the person differs from the nature, since the person means an indivisible unity of nature, and nature is known to mean common material, which more people can subsist from”³². By the fact that “One of the Trinity suffered in the flesh” there no longer exists the possibility to assign suffering to human subject, meaning that the phrase become the only singularized mark of the anti-Monophysite and anti-Nestorian Christology. Therefore, the Christological teachings of the Scythian monks, though for some seemed Monophysite³³, it was still pure Orthodox in accordance with the Chalcedonian definition³⁴. Their middle position testified that the Alexandrian and Antiochian Western definitions had to be balanced, while confirming the teachings of St. Cyril. Thus, the Orthodox divine worship will develop the teaching about God’s Son man-alike, doer of human acts, not as in western theology where God the Word alternates works the man Christ³⁵.

Leontius of Byzantium is undoubtedly the one who explained philosophically the definition of Chalcedon. In order to demonstrate this, he used the Aristotelian notions³⁶, so that his concern is much more than a concern for the differences be-

³¹ JOHN MAXENTIUS, *Libellus fidei*, IV, 2; Schwartz, p. 22.

³² JOHN MAXENTIUS, *Libellus fidei*, IV, 2, p. 23.

³³ This formula “One of the Holy Trinity suffered in the flesh” had been used without the addition “in the flesh” and especially with the exclusion of the two natures, by the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Peter Gnafeus. He had added to the Trisagion: “Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, Who you crucified for us, have mercy on us” MEYENDORFF, *Le Christ dans la Theologie byzantine*, Paris 1969, p. 41; V. SIBIESCU, *Împăratul Iustinian și ereziile*, București 1938, p. 66–71.

³⁴ See: *Călugării sciți daco-romani din secolul VI*, trad. N. Petrescu, in: “Mitropolia Oolteniei” (1985), no 3–4, p. 199–244; no 5–6, p. 391–441; no 9–10, p. 680–708; no 11–12, p. 783–793; introductiv study see: D. STANILOAE, *Contribuția călugărilor sciți la precizarea hristologiei la începutul sec. VI*, in: “Mitropolia Oolteniei” (1985), no 3–4, p. 199–244.

³⁵ Ioan Coman in his work writes: “And the Word became flesh, says that: Scythian fathers understood that Christianity brought into the world the truth that history and salvation through suffering on the cross are created. God has united heaven and earth through His suffering, through His cross. Life with the aim to heights, to creation and holiness involves permanent suffering and sacrifice. Probably, due to the Scythian monks’ tradition, father concludes, Romanians have kept the worship of crosses and triptychs all over the country. Our triptychs on which Christ is crucified in the center and the Father and the Holy Spirit, sometimes even the Mother of God into an icon attached to the to, perfectly illustrate the teopashit formula. Reverent stopping in front of these triptychs is meant to evoke moments of evaluation or new efforts in the rhythm of world or local history interlaced with suffering and hope, here being also the place where Christ gives the traveler’s first warning by the example of His own crucifixion” I.G. COMAN, *Și Cuvântul S-a făcut trup*, Timișoara, 1993, p. 248.

³⁶ Leontius prepares the concepts of nature, hypostasis and enhypostasis which he will use in Christology, in the study of the definitions and steps of the existences. He deals with being or existence, genus, species, individual, the attributes of being, inseparable or essential accidents, separable

tween nature and hypostasis, but he makes the next step in his argumentation and illustrates what the differences between them are. Thus, according to him, nature has the meaning of existence and hypostasis, the meaning of self existence. Therefore, Leontius, starting from this difference might assert against the Monophysite, that in Christ there was manhood reality, characterized by human genus and specific differences: rational and mortal. There is no doubt that the Savior was Godhead nature, endowed with the attributes of Godhead: incorruptibility and immortality. As we have seen, Severus of Antioch also acknowledged in Christ, after unification, these two categories of specific differences, which emphasized the absurdity of his claim that Christ was composed of two natures, the duality that has been suppressed by the union. In other words, if the general exists only in individual, it means that human nature never existed as such before the Incarnation³⁷ This proves the fact that the human nature of Christ did not exist without the hypostasis, so it is not self Hypostatic, but hypostasized in God the Word, meaning that it is enhypostasized (ενυποστατος)³⁸, or has subsistence (υποσθηναι) in the Word³⁹

The examples given by Leontius in order to support such teachings remind us of St. Cyril, who gave an example of the union of two natures in one hypostasis without a merger or alteration of their, i.e. the soul and body⁴⁰, or red hot iron⁴¹. Therefore, the Word has taken from our nature within His Own Hypostasis a certain self-nature, remaining intact as the hypostasis of fire in the oven remains intact after the ignition of the iron. Therefore, within the Hypostasis the synthesis of natures has been carried out, without resulting in a composed nature or any composed hypostasis, but after the Incarnation the characteristic of the Logos' hypostasis has

or attributive ones. See: F. LOOFS, *Leontius von Byzanz*, p. 60–63; J. TIXERONT, *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquite chretienne*, III, p. 153–154; GRUMEL, *Leonce de Bysance*, in: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. IX, Paris 1920, col. 405–407.

³⁷ PG 86, 1367D.

³⁸ PG 86, 1277D.

³⁹ PG 86, 2, 1944C.

⁴⁰ Leontius often makes reference to the union of the soul with the body, which have a common hypostasis, but they have their own natures and different reasons. LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Against Nestorians and Eutychians*, PG 86, I, 1280. Justinian, as we shall see, realized the inconvenience of this example. The image of man, composed of body and soul, was used by the Monophysite, who did not have Origenistic tendencies as happened in Leontius's case, meaning that soul and body form a single human nature. Man's example, of course, can be used only in terms of the hypostatic union in Christ, and not for that of the two natures, that are not either complementary, as the soul is to the body and *vice versa* or simultaneously created, because the divine nature, uncreated, pre-existed before the Incarnation. J. LEBON, *Le Monophysisme Sévérien: Études historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcedoine jusqu'à la constitution de l'Église jacobite*, Louvain 1909, p. 80–82.

⁴¹ PG 86, 1304C.

become even more non-composed, crowding more simple characteristics⁴². However, when talking about the

Lord we do not know only a particular hypostasis of His, since we do not say that Savior's manhood subsists in its own hypostasis, but in the hypostasis of the Word, from the beginning; we do not even know now simply the hypostasis of the Word as being now only the hypostasis of the Word, since together with manhood subsists in it the Word of the same person after its unspoken union. Hence, we know now that it is common to both of them, one and the same, the hypostasis which pre-existed the human being, which was before particular to the Word within the common being of Godhead, but creating the human nature and uniting it with His own one. As soon as it started to be the hypostasis of the nature of body, it transformed from particular to common and became more complex. Now, the hypostasis of the Word is not only different as it was before, based on its characteristic of being born, by the Father and the Spirit, but also, due to the fact that it is created of several natures and natural characteristics and hence of more personal features (...) Therefore, we must righteously know that the nature of the Word is common to the Father and the Spirit and to all the people who are not of the Holy Virgin, being common only to the body taken of the Holy Mother, and again the body taken of the Mother of God. Our own nature is a common one with all of Adam and the particular hypostasis to us and to the Father and to the Holy Spirit is common only with the Word⁴³.

Thus, the Godhead Logos personified human nature (ενπροσωποποιησεν), being both one of the Holy Trinity, and one of us humans. Thereby, Leontius states:

as it is One or a hypostasis of the three Hypostases of the Godhead nature, in the same way there is a hypostasis of the many hypostases of manhood nature. It is one of the hypostases of the Trinity after the hypostasis of Godhead and manhood and one of the hypostases of manhood after the hypostasis of Godhead and manhood. Therefore, He, among the Godhead, abounds in human attributes⁴⁴

and among the manhood excels due to His divine nature⁴⁵.

⁴² LEONTIUS, *Adv. Nest.*, I, PG 86, 1485.

⁴³ LEONTIUS, *Adv. Nest.*, II, PG 86, 1568; 1716; the hypostasis the one, which was previously known through its undone characteristics, now having its hypostatic features completely created out of the reasons and things done (PG 86, 1596).

⁴⁴ Ενμεντες θειαις διατωναν θρωπινωνιδιω ματωνκατα φυσινπλεονιζουσα.

⁴⁵ LEONTIUS, *Adv. Nest.*, VII, PG 86, 1768.

As it is well known, the Monophysite illustrated the fact that the union between the Godhead and manhood nature in Christ is natural, neither the body nor the soul existed in an independent form, but only as part of the unique human nature. Therefore, Christ after the union is a nature whose elements are inseparable. Leontius not only rejects the notion of “physical union”, but he emphasizes the fact that the soul is “an independent incorporeal essence” (ουσια ασωματος αυτοκινητος) and that the soul and body are ontologically perfect by themselves (ουκ ατελη καθ’εαυτα)⁴⁶, which means that the analogy goes more to the dyophysite direction than to the monophysite one about the Incarnation. The objection that the opponents immediately formulated against this concept was on the one hand, a union of two hypostases and, on the other hand, the pre-existence of Christ’s manhood. Indeed, Leontius defined hypostasis as existence “by itself” (καθ’εαυτον) and therefore he ontologically admitted as possible the pre-existence of Christ’s manhood, as a hypostasis that can very well be formed of preexisting entities (e.g. the union of body and soul at the resurrection). But, in the case of Christ the Savior he could have never existed as “simple man” (ψυλος ανθρωπος)⁴⁷.

Thus, Christ’s manhood is not un-hypostasized, since it exists, but it is not a hypostasis, since it does not exist for itself. It is en-hypostatical, since it exists within the Logos it belongs to, which gives it the power to exist, self-receiving. St. Cyril of Alexandria, somewhere in the dialogue *That One is Christ* stated:

So after the indissoluble union, which was taken, becomes self-possession of the one who takes; it’s a rightful way to see that Jesus is God, the Son of the true God, the one and only Son as the Word of God the Father, that He was born on one hand Godhead before the ages, on the other hand the same one is born lately in the flash of a woman, for the face of the servant is not another’s, but of Himself⁴⁸.

From this point of view, the saint submitted to the heresy, which from the two natures made one person, and after that one confused person, a formula and, more important, an explanation that should grant the dogma of one person in Jesus Christ. This formula also existed in St. Cyril’s sits contentedly alongside the un-hypostasized and en-hypostatical conception as he states:

⁴⁶ LEONTIUS, *Adv. Eutih. et Nest.*, I, PG 86, 1281B.

⁴⁷ LEONTIUS, *Epilysis*, PG 86, 1944C; M. RICHARD, *Léonce de Byzance était-il origéniste?*, in: “Revue des Études Byzantines”, 5 (1947), no 1, p. 58–60.

⁴⁸ ST. CHIRIL, *Că Unul este Hristos*, apud T. SEVICIU, *Doctrina hristologică Sf. Chiril al Alexandriei în lumina tendințelor actuale de apropiere dintre Biserica Ortodoxă și Vechile Biserici Orientale*, Timișoara, 1973, p. 32.

So we say that the body was the Word's own and not in any case of any man, particularly and separately, as if Christ and Son would mean that is One aside himself. And as our body is said to be in its own particularly for each of us, in the same way we need to understand in the case of Christ, that it is One⁴⁹

In order to get a clearer image, below is what Leontius says about en-hypostasis:

The hypostasis and en-hypostasis are not identical, as something is the essence and something else what is in the essence. The hypostasis indicates someone, while en-hypostasis indicates the essence. The first defines the person through characteristic features; en-hypostasis proves that there is no accident that has its existence in another and is not self considered. These are all qualities that are called essential and attributive, none of them is essential, meaning things self existing, but all are regarded in relation to the essence, as, for example, color in body science in soul. Therefore, who says «it is not an un-hypostasized nature», is the one who tells the truth, but does not draw rightful conclusions the one who asserts that what is not un-hypostasized is hypostasis, as if someone speaking truly, would say that there is no body without shape, but then he would wrongly conclude that the shape is a body and it cannot be seen in the body⁵⁰.

Thence, nature not necessarily being hypostasis and person, Leontius proves to the Nestorians the fact that they are not entitled to conclude, from the duality of natures in Christ, the duality of people and hypostases. In turn, the Monophysite wrongly concluded based on the unity of hypostasis and person, to the unity of nature. Definitely, en-hypostasis applies to the qualities called essential and assigned to essence, since they are neither accidents nor essentials. They share the same existence with the being to which they are completing. It is true that those qualities are not independent, as it is the human nature of Christ, which, apart from Christ, is in thousands of other individuals; however, en-hypostatic being and that of the features are presented as being one and the same thing⁵¹. As such, human nature distinguishes by its own existence within the hypostasis of the Logos and thus Christ is not nature anymore, but a Person⁵².

⁴⁹ ST. CHIRIL *Apologie pentru cele douăsprezece capitole contra episcopilor orientali*, apud SEVICIU, *Doctrina hristologică Sf. Chiril*, p. 32.

⁵⁰ LEONTIUS, *Against Nestorius*, PG 86, 1277D, 1280A.

⁵¹ LEONTIUS, *Against Severus's arguments*, PG 86, I, 1944C.

⁵² LEONTIUS, *Against Nestorians*, PG 86, I, 1289B–1292B.

As for works, they are interlaced with natures, being one piece of work of the flesh and one piece of work of the Godhead⁵³. In order not to be understood as expressions of individual natures, Leontius sees them only as presences of features (ιδιοτητες) of the two natures made present by the unique hypostasis, not being present due to their very presence⁵⁴. In this way, Christ the Savior is the unique subject and the creator of the two works, which means that natures never fall apart in their works⁵⁵. However, God the Word, although He assimilates so intimately the human nature and work, yet he does not change after Godhead, and He continues to be the Godhead hypostasis. Thus, we can say about Him that is the subject of nature and human acts, in the meaning given by the formula of St. Cyril, and that His person is made out of the merge of the features of the two natures, as it is illustrated in the phrase of Leon in the definition of Chalcedon, being perfect God and perfect man.

The fact that Leontius refuses to accept Christ's hypostasis composed of the Godhead and manhood nature is closer to Western Christology. However, in his opinion, the hypostasis of the Word appropriates the attributes of human nature, and it is not the human nature that provides them by its own initiative, as one might understand from the teaching of Pope Leo. Thence, God the Word is the hypostasis of manhood nature and human acts bearer, and not the manhood hypostasis is the bearer of Godhead acts or a complex hypostasis⁵⁶. Therefore, God is man bearer and not man is God bearer as is the case of the saints, "to be understood", as Leontius "emphasizes, which is added to manhood hypostasis, meaning Godhead nature; and in Christ to be glorified what is added to Godhead hypostasis, meaning manhood nature"⁵⁷

Leontius in his Christological thinking, severely criticizes relational and voluntary union of the two natures of the doctrine of the Nestorians and praises existential union⁵⁸, although this union is within Chalcedonian orthodoxy limits. Moreover,

⁵³ LEONTIUS, *Against Nestorians*, PG 86, I, 1320AB.

⁵⁴ LEONTIUS, *Against Severus's arguments*, PG 86, II, 1932C.

⁵⁵ Meaning that natures do not divide according to works (PG 86, 1320AB).

⁵⁶ St. Maximus the Confessor and St. John Damascene use the phrase of complex hypostasis, referring to one and the same person or "Godhead hypostasis" ST. MAXIM, *Opuscula theologica et polemica*, PG 91, 204; ST. JOHN DAMASCENE, *Exp. Ort. Fid.* III, 5, 7. Patriarch Photios will highlight this formulation later, saying that the hypostasis before the Incarnation and after the Incarnation, is one and the same, but those around the hypostasis are not the same. Father Staniloae adds to these emphases the following explanation: "We could say more exactly that Godhead attributes which He has before the incarnation are *ιδια*, proper's, those received through the incarnation are assimilated (*ιδιοποιη*)" D. STANILOAE, *Definiția dogmatică de la Calcedon*, p. 428.

⁵⁷ LEONTIUS, *Adv. Nest.*, VI, PG 86, 1753.

⁵⁸ LEONTIUS, *Ad. Aftar. et Nest.*, 41, PG 86, I, 1380D; *Ad. Nest. Et Eutih.*, PG 86, 1304A, 1305CD.

Leontius did not acknowledge either the hypostatic union in the incarnate Logos, refusing, however, to acknowledge the fact that the Savior Christ could ignore or be unaware of certain things, since He was sinless⁵⁹

From the presented ones one could clearly see how the Christological definition of Chalcedon has finally found its theological formulas. It will be further completed with the doctrine of the two wills and two works in one hypostasis presented by Saint Maximus the Confessor, who will apply to works what Leontius stated about natures. However, Leontius' terminology being too abstract, did not become part of worship, whereas the teachings of St. Cyril remained dominant in the life and practice of the Orthodox Church. Westerners exclusive love for the Antiochian formulas⁶⁰ remained linked to the worship of man Jesus, as a model of moral life, suffering on the cross, glory of man, for which He receive sin return as reward, created grace, equivalent to the sacrifice made, without meeting effectively with the son of God manlike. Orthodoxy, however, speaks of God the Word as hypostasis of the assumed manhood which He Godheads. From this point of view, hymnography and iconography imply divine transcendence, descended into immanence, man living the experience of being in Christ and uniting with Christ.

An important chapter in post-Chalcedonian Christology is the acceptance of identity between the union hypostasis and pre-existing hypostasis of the Logos. Through this identification St. Cyril's doctrine with that of the Council of Chalcedon was reconnected. A great merit to the success of this mission was that of another Leontius, this time from Jerusalem. His teaching is radically different from that of his twin in Byzantium. In opposition with Origenism, Leontius of Jerusalem, totally rejects the possibility of pre-existence of Christ's manhood⁶¹. In this sense, he states:

⁵⁹ The notion of lack of knowledge for the Greek spirit was automatically associated with sin, as seen in Evagrian thinking. See: EVAGRIAN, *Adv. Incor. et Nest.*, PG 86, 1373B.

⁶⁰ The Catholic Western hardly accepted the decisions of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, which condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia, the writings of Theodoret against Saint Cyrus of Alexandria and the letter of Ibas of Edessa against Cyril. They believed that through these convictions Justinian based even more the position of St. Cyril in relation to the definition of Chalcedon. Moreover, they never considered as heretical the writings of these condemned, their spirit being preserved up today in the theology and church life. "How could we explain Catholics' confident humanism, says Father Staniloaeor Protestants' tragic humanism, their consciousness about God's inaccessible transcendence, about the distance between God and man, about divine transcendence and human immanence without their attachment to Nestorian and Antiochian rationalistic teaching" D. STANILOAE, *Definiția dogmatică de la Calcedon*, p. 432; KARSAVIN, *Sur le deux natures dans le Christ*, in: "Logos" (1928), no 1, p. 94–95.

⁶¹ Leontius of Byzantium understand soul and body as ontological entities perfect in themselves and hypostasis conceived as a self sufficient existence κατ' εαυτον. This led to the idea of existence in Christ of two hypostases, or three, since he refused to consider the Logos as Christ. See: J. MEYENDORFF, *Hristosîn gândi reacreștinăr ăsariteană*, trans. N. Buga, Bucharest 1997, p. 98.

give a metaphysical definition of the hypostasis⁷¹. Undoubtedly, his way of defining hypostasis goes to the right direction, his thinking made progress as compared to the Christology of St. Cyril's. In this sense, Leontius understands the formula "one of the Trinity suffered for us" as part of the work of manhood Logos. This is God who remains unchanged in his Godhead nature, but suffers in His manhood nature, which means that since His conception in the womb of Our Virgin, has completely assimilated manhood nature is His, as His Godhead nature is. This is the reason why we can say that the Godhead Logos, which is a self-owned hypostasis and not a product of the Godhead nature, but an entity ontologically distinct from the Godhead nature, The Ego possessing Godhead nature and who appropriated manhood nature, has suffered hypostatically in His flesh, died and resurrected:

the Word, thus, Leontius says, suffered because of His hypostasis, since it is in His hypostasis where he appropriated suffering manhood human as an addition to His unchanging nature, therefore what is said about His changing essence can be applied to the hypostasis⁷².

It is clear the fact that the hypostasis of the Logos pre-exists before the Incarnation and after the Incarnation it also became the hypostasis of manhood nature. In this case, manhood nature, belonging to the hypostasis of the Logos is Godhead and imbued with divine energies, becoming a source of divine life itself. Therefore, Leontius says:

⁷¹ Since Chalcedon, when there was sorted out the distinction between nature and hypostasis in Christology, the defenders of this synod applied to the theology of the incarnation the terminology which the Cappadocian Fathers used to explain the mystery of the Holy Trinity. It is true that this procedure was not without difficulties either, especially because the Chalcedonian did not want to accept it in any way. According to St. Basil, as noted above, God is only one nature in three hypostases, and according to the Chalcedonian, in Christ there is a hypostasis and two natures. In both cases, the hypostasis is for "who" and nature for "what" If nature is assigned some particular characteristics, it is inevitable to reach two hypostases in Christ. If we define hypostasis existence in itself as Leontius of Byzantium thought, it tends to reach a third of gods in the Holy Trinity. And if we considered Godhead hypostases as relations, as it is in Catholic theology, within the divine essence, we would result into the teopashit interpretation where divine nature is subject to suffering. Following this teaching were each the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, who acknowledged in Christ a human being subject to all sufferings and human experiences. However, we must emphasize the fact that the notion of hypostasis to the Cappadocian Fathers cannot be simply reduced either to that of particular or to that of relation. Therefore, hypostasis is not a product of nature, but it is the one where nature exists, meaning the very principle of the existence of nature. Only understanding hypostasis as such can be applied to Christology because it involves the possibility of complete human existence, without being limited within the hypostasis of the Logos. This vision supposes the fact that God as personal and transcendent being, is in no way the prisoner of His own nature, His existence being capable of Godhead external acts to His nature, which means that He can freely and personally undertake a full human existence while he still remains God. J. MEYENDORFF, *Le Christ dans la Théologie byzantine*, p. 102–103.

⁷² LEONTIUS, *Adv. Nest.* VII, 9, PG 86, 1768 A.

due to the organic union (συνμφια) with God, suddenly, through an intimate union (συνανακρατικης) according to the hypostasis, the wealth of Godhead entered the man who was in Christ (τωκυριακω ανθρωπω), His particular manhood nature (ειςτηνιδικηνφουσιν αυτου); whereas manhood, those who come from the seed of Adam, body of the Church (...) they do not participate than through contemplation of the natural union of man who is the Lord and who was the first of us to receive the benefits such as the leaven lump, as Unique Son (Joh 1:18), first born (Rom 8:29), as a member of the body, as head (...) (Ef 1:22), unique Mediator between God and men (1Tm 2:5), the man Jesus Christ, our Lord⁷³.

This latter argument is the basis of the soteriological doctrine of our Godhead, since the manhood nature of the Logos, hypostasized in Him, is penetrated by His divine energies, becoming the leaven that leavens the lump of all manhood itself. As it can be seen, there is no question in this work of connecting any “created grace” Definitely, this teaching is totally unfamiliar to the Fathers’ thinking and to the definition of the Council of Chalcedon, precisely because manhood nature itself is made to achieve real communion with God and participate in the uncreated divine life. Moreover, St. Maximus, as we shall see, through His teaching about the two works and two wills of Christ, will prove that the participation of manhood nature in the Godhead is not in any way marked by passivity, but on the contrary it has a genuine restored activity⁷⁴.

*

Literature

Călugăriiscitiidaco-romani dinsecolul VI, trans. Petrescu, in: “Mitropolia Olteniei” (1985), no 3–4, p. 199–244; no 5–6, p. 391–441; no 9–10, p. 680–708; no 11–12, p. 783–793.

COMAN I.G., *And the word became flesh*, Timișoara 1993.

EUSTACE THE MONK, *Letter about two natures against Severus, To Timothy the Scholastic*, PG 86, 1, 932 AB.

F.L. CROSS, E.A. LIVINGSTONE, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, London 1974.

⁷³ LEONTIUS, *Adv. Nest.* I, 18, PG 86, 1468BC.

⁷⁴ J. MEYENDORFF, *Le Christ dans la Théologie byzantine*, p. 106.

- GRUMEL, *Leonce de Bysance*, in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. IX, Paris 1920, col. 405–407.
- HARNACK A. VON, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. II, Tübingen Mohr 1931.
- JOHN MAXENTIUS, *Libellus fidei*, IV, 2; Schwartz.
- JUGIE M., *Monophysisme*, in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. X, Paris 1929, col. 2221.
- LEBON, J., *La christologie de Thimotee Aelure*, in: “Revue d’Histoire ecclésiastique”, 9 (1908), no 4, p. 677–703.
- LEBON, J., *La christologie du monophysisme syrien: Étude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la resistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcedoine jusqu’à la constitution de l’Église jacobite*, Louvain 1909.
- LEBON, J., *Le Monophysisme Sévérien: Études historique, littéraire et theologique sur la résistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcedoine jusqu’à la constitution de l’Église jacobite*, Louvain 1909.
- LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Against Monophysites*, PG 86, II, 1845 C.
- LEONTIUS, *Adv. Eutih. et Nest.*, I, PG 86, 1281B.
- LEONTIUS, *Adv. Nest.*, VII, PG 86, 1768.
- LEONTIUS, *Epilysis*, PG 86, 1944C.
- Les homélies cathédrales de Sévèred’ Antioche*, M. BRIÈRE (ed.), in: R. GRAFFIN, F. NAU, “Patrologia Orientalis” 8 (1912).
- LOOFS F., *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*, in: „Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur“ 3 (1887), vol. 1–2.
- MEYENDORFF J., *Hristos în gândire acreștină săriteană*, trans. N. Buga, Bucharest 1997.
- MEYENDORFF J., *Le Christ dans la Theology bysantine*, Paris, 1969.
- PROCLUS, *De fide*, III, to John Maxentius, *Libellus fidei*, IV, 2; X, 17, 18, 19, Schwartz.
- RICHARD M., *Léonce de Byzanceétait-ilorigeniste?*, in: “Revue des Études Byzantines” 5 (1947), no 1, p. 31–66.
- SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Against Grammat*, PG 86, 2, 1841.
- SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Homily 58*, PG 86, 224.
- SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Letter to Ecumenius*, in: “Patrologia Orientalis”, 12 (1916).
- SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH, *Letter to Sergio*, pub. J. Lebon, CSCO, syr, ser. 4, vol. 7, Louvain, 1949.
- SEVICIU T., *Doctrina hristologică a Sf. Chiril al Alexandriei în luminaten dințelor actuale de apropierea între Biserica Ortodoxăși Vechile Biserici Orientale*, Timișoara 1973.

Sibiescu V., *Împăratul Iustinian și ereziile*, București 1938.

ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Homily 45*, 28, PG 36, 661C; *Homily 30*, 5, PG 36, 109A.

ST. JOHN DAMASCENE, *Exp. Ort. Fid.* III, 5, 7.

ST. MAXIM, *Opuscula theologica et polemica*, PG 91, 204.

STANILOAE D., *Contribuția călugărilor sciți la precizarea hristologiei la începutul sec. VI*, in: "Mitropolia Olteniei" (1985), no 3–4, p. 199–244.

TIXERONT J., *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, III, Paris 1924.

*

Abstract: Those who interpreted the formula of St. Cyril in the opposite direction of the two natures, considered the dogmatic judgments of Pope Leo as a victory, which meant for them a victory of Nestorianism. Consequently, this party did not recognize either the Council of Chalcedon or the local bishops, who received its definition, creating a beginning for the heterodox monophysite Churches. Analyzing this period, we can see that Severus, in his argument, starts from the fact that the Logos is the subject of Jesus Christ's nature. Being bodiless He became flesh, without changing or becoming another, so He only had the originality of being different. In this way, the word is not a new topic, but a new nature where Jesus Christ is absolutely identical with the Logos. An important role in this period was also played by the Scythian monks who appear to Constantinople in a providential moment. Rome and Constantinople being at loggerheads over Zeno's *Henotikon*, were now on the verge of a new schism caused by the Christological issue. Therefore, the present study is an analysis on the definition of the Council of Chalcedon in contrast with doctrinal evolutions and arguments. It is with these concerns that we will try to show that in Jesus Christ the manhood nature itself is made to achieve real communion with God and to participate in the uncreated divine life. In this support, St. Maximus will prove that the participation of manhood nature in the Godhead is not in any way marked by passivity, but on the contrary it is genuinely restored.

Key words: Chalcedon doctrine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, Orthodox Church doctrine, Zeno's *Henotikon*.

Streszczenie: Chrystologia Chalcedonu po Soborze Chalcedońskim. Opozycyjni interpretatorzy formuły św. Cyryla na temat dwóch natur traktowali dogmatyczny osąd papieża Leona jako zwycięstwo odniesione przez nestorianizm. W konsekwencji nie uznali oni Soboru Chalcedońskiego oraz biskupów będących jego zwolennikami i przyczynili się do powstania heterodoksyjnych Kościołów monofizyckich. Studium tego okresu ukazuje, że Sewer w swej argumentacji wychodzi od faktu, że Logos jest podmiotem natury Jezusa Chrystusa. Będąc bezcielesnym, stał się człowiekiem bez jakiegokolwiek zmiany. Stąd jedy-

nie patrząc na Jego pochodzenie można ukazać Jego inność. W ten sposób Słowo nie jest nowym tematem, ale nową naturą, w której Jezus Chrystus jest całkowicie identyczny z Logosem. W tym okresie ważną rolę odgrywali również scytyjscy mnisi, którzy opatrzościowo pojawili się w Konstantynopolu. Będąc w konflikcie dotyczącym *Henotikonu* Zenona, Rzym i Konstantynopol znalazły się na skraju nowej schizmy, sprowokowanej problemami chrystologicznymi. Niniejsze studium stanowi analizę orzeczeń Chalcedonu w konfrontacji z powyższymi tendencjami. Autor podejmuje próbę ukazania faktu, iż w Jezusie Chrystusie ludzka natura służy osiągnięciu prawdziwej komunii z Bogiem i uczestnictwa w niestworzonym boskim życiu.

Słowa kluczowe: doktryna Chalcedonu, św. Cyryl Aleksandryjski, doktryna Kościoła prawosławnego, *Henotikon* Zenona.