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PART 1

SOPHRONIUS AND HIS
SYNODICAL LETTER
I.1 AFTER CHALCEDON: AN OVERVIEW

The developments in ecclesiastical and political affairs in the seventh century can only be understood in the context of the Council of Chalcedon, which assembled in 451, and consequently an overview is called for here of the resolutions of the council itself and of their subsequent fortunes. In this section the broad lines of the controversy about Chalcedon will be given, with references to secondary works which will help to elucidate the various stages of the controversy. A more detailed discussion of the context of the first phase of the great christological debate in the seventh century follows in section 1.3.1.

The definition of faith which the council of 451 promulgated was to have far-reaching effects, not only ecclesiastically but also politically during the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries and beyond.1 While the definition outlawed the extremes of Eutychianism and Nestorianism—the former seen as calling the reality of Christ’s human nature into question, the latter, his divine nature—and attempted a balance between the theological terminology of Antioch and Alexandria, it proclaimed Christ ‘in two natures’ as opposed to ‘from two natures’, the phrase favoured by the Alexandrians. Furthermore, it declared the controversial Tome of Pope Leo I to be orthodox, although this document was regarded in the East as smacking of Nestorianism. To eastern Christians the definition of Chalcedon was seen as an interpretation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed (325, 381), whereas Pope Leo regarded the definition as absolute and admitting of no addition or subtraction. Politically significant was the resolution of the council which gave to the church of Constantinople the same privileges in the East as the church of Rome enjoyed in the West, thereby downgrading the positions of the ancient churches of Antioch and Alexandria.

The definition of Chalcedon was ratified by a decree issued in the names of the emperors Marcian and Valentinian III on 7 February 452, enjoining on Christians in both East and West obedience to the decisions of the council. This edict was accorded a turbulent reception in Palestine, Egypt, and Antioch. For example, the bishop of Jerusalem, Juvenal, an adherent of the council, was deposed by force and had to be restored, also by force, by the emperor. In Alexandria the deposition of the patriarch Dioscorus, who had been condemned and excommunicated by the council, was not accepted by his followers, who refused to recognize his successor. Antioch became increasingly anti-Chalcedonian, particularly under the leadership of Peter the Fuller, who, seemingly with the help of the Isaurian general Zeno, had himself installed as patriarch in the absence of the patriarch Martyrius, a supporter of the Chalcedonian definition. In Antioch too the unrest was such that in 471 the emperor Leo (457–74) intervened to remove Peter. It was Peter the Fuller who was credited with introducing into the doxology ‘Holy God, holy mighty, holy immortal, have mercy on us’ (the Trisagion or Thrice-holy) the words ‘who was crucified for us’, because he understood the doxology to be addressed to Christ, the second person of the Trinity. Those who objected to the addition, who were mostly from Constantinople, did so because they took the Trisagion to be directed to the Trinity, so that the addition would ascribe suffering to the divine substance. The Trisagion was to play an important role throughout sixth- and seventh-century christological debate.

The divisiveness occasioned by the council is patent, inter alia, from two disparate bodies of evidence dating from the second half of the fifth century and the early sixth century—imperial documents intended to restore unity and peace to the empire on

---


the one hand, and on the other, a large quantity of popular literature from both sides of the Chalcedonian divide. The first in a series of imperial statements which continued into the middle of the seventh century was the *Encyclical* of the usurper Basiliscus (475–6), in which the *Tome* of Leo and the ‘innovation’ of Chalcedon were anathematized, and the creeds of the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople (381), and Ephesus I (431) and II (449) were upheld. Since this document left the status of the patriarch of Constantinople up in the air, it was subsequently rescinded and replaced by an *Antencyclical* in which Eutyches and Nestorius were condemned and the rights of the patriarchate of Constantinople were guaranteed. When the emperor Zeno (474–91) returned to reclaim the throne, he rescinded both documents of Basiliscus and reinforced the position of the patriarch of Constantinople. An uneasy peace ensued. In 482 Zeno published the *Henoticon* or document of union, which was eventually enforced throughout the eastern empire. In the *Henoticon* no anathema was placed on the *Tome*, the definition of Chalcedon, or the phrase ‘in two natures’; instead, the primacy of Nicaea was stressed. As a diplomatic initiative the document was successful in the short term, but in the long term it was unable to unite the extreme anti-Chalcedonians; because of its failure to proclaim Chalcedon unequivocally it also aroused the suspicions of Rome, to the extent that in 484 a schism occurred between East and West—known as the Acacian schism after the Constantinopolitan patriarch of the time—which was to last thirty-five years.

On his accession to the throne in 491 the emperor Anastasius (491–518) used the *Henoticon* as an instrument for effecting unity by interpreting it as being in no sense an annulment of the definition of Chalcedon. Thus, cities which had a majority of Chalcedonians or anti-Chalcedonians he allowed to be governed

---


by bishops sympathetic to their stance. As a policy, however, this caused confusion and polarization, and eventually Anastasius commissioned a *Typos* or Regulation, which was to be imitated in the seventh century, whereby Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo were explicitly anathematized. The *Typos* was drawn up by the anti-Chalcedonian monk Severus, future patriarch of Antioch, and it was probably not given the status of an official policy.

Severus had arrived in the capital in 508 with an entourage of 200 Palestinian monks to seek the emperor’s protection for anti-Chalcedonians, who were being harassed by their opponents in the region. Before Severus’ arrival, the militant anti-Chalcedonian bishop Philoxenus of Mabbog in Syria had left Constantinople, where he had participated in a synod of anti-Chalcedonians convened by Anastasius. Both Philoxenus and the younger Severus would be content only with an outright condemnation of Chalcedon, and they developed a theological partnership which has been described as a turning-point in the history of incarnational theology. Between them they were to galvanize the politics and the theological vocabulary of the anti-Chalcedonian cause. Severus in particular, who was the first anti-Chalcedonian to treat expressly the problem of activities (*energeiai*) in Christ, was to remain a significant and contentious figure in the debate about the council of 451 into the seventh century, where both supporters and enemies of the doctrine of monoenergism, or one activity in Christ, claimed him for their side.

In the face of the determined opposition of Philoxenus and Severus, some moderate adherents of Chalcedon were almost

---


forced into some measure of reconciliation. Attempts were made to bring the two contentious formulae—‘in two natures’ and ‘from two natures’—into alignment, and to demonstrate that Cyril of Alexandria, who for the anti-Chalcedonians was the touchstone of orthodoxy, was in agreement with Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. This movement, often called neo-Chalcedonianism or neo-Cyrillianism, was influential throughout the sixth century and gave rise to a substantial number of theological works, among which is the emperor Justinian’s edict *On the Right Faith*. In fact, the question of the relationship of Cyril to the Chalcedonian definition was to characterize theological debate in the sixth and seventh centuries, as both sides claimed the sometimes contrary christology of the great Alexandrian as a witness for their stand with regard to Chalcedon.\(^9\)

Paradoxically, the eirenics policies of the emperor Anastasius resulted in the crystallization of the anti-Chalcedonian position and the further polarization of both parties in the dispute about Chalcedon. On the accession of Justin (518–27) after Anastasius’ death in 518, the pro-Chalcedonian populace in Constantinople left the new emperor in no doubt about what they wanted—the proclamation of the definition of Chalcedon and the banishment of the influential Severus. Justin acceded. The four ecumenical councils were proclaimed, and the feast of the Council of Chalcedon was inaugurated (16 July 518). The new emperor also began repairing relations with the West. While officially Chalcedonian orthodoxy was triumphant, Egypt remained uncompromisingly opposed to Chalcedon, and became the place of asylum for anti-Chalcedonians like Severus when they were banished or persecuted. Justin’s successor, his nephew Justinian (527–65), gradually relaxed the persecution of anti-Chalcedonians, but he was determined to end the split between adherents and opponents of the council of 451 by far-reaching administrative measures and ecclesiastical policies. Nevertheless, the polarization of both

parties went a step further in about 530, when the anti-Chalcedonian bishop John of Tella began to ordain a separate clergy—a step which was to lead eventually to the separation of the anti-Chalcedonian churches. In 542/3 the first anti-Chalcedonian bishops were ordained by Theodosius, the successor of Severus as leader of this party: Jacob Baradacius was ordained for Edessa and Theodore of Arabia for Bostra. Through the missionary efforts of Jacob in particular the anti-Chalcedonian church was consolidated from Asia Minor to Nubia. This affiliation of churches in Syria came to be known as ‘Jacobite’.

In his efforts to unify the empire, Justinian was personally involved in the debate over the council of 451, composing several edicts, and embracing the theopaschite formula of the Trisagion in every christological document which appeared during his reign. In an embryonic form, the issue of the activities (enegeiai) of Christ was thus introduced into theological debate. In 544 he published an edict condemning the Three Chapters, which is no longer extant. The term ‘Three Chapters’ referred to: (1) the person and works of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), the teacher of Nestorius; (2) the works of Theodoret of Cyrillus (d. c.466) against Cyril’s Twelve Chapters against Nestorius; and (3) the so-called Letter of Ibas of Edessa (d. 457) to Mari the Persian, in which the incarnation of the Word was denied and Cyril was presented as a follower of the heretical Apollinaris of Laodicea. While the intention in condemning these three works was to allay anti-Chalcedonian suspicions about the Nestorianism of Chalcedon, it backfired because the edict contained no condemnation of the council itself. In the West the edict was considered a betrayal of an ecumenical council. Justinian returned to the problem of the Three Chapters in his edict On the Right Faith (551), in which he attempted to supplement the

---

Chalcedonian definition with Cyrillian terms, particularly those of Cyril’s Twelve Chapters against Nestorius. In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth anathema of the edict, the emperor once again condemned the Three Chapters, a condemnation which was to be repeated at the councils of 553 and 680/1. The influence of this edict in christological controversy continued into the seventh century.

Meanwhile the anti-Chalcedonian churches were increasingly dogged by internal divisions. During his exile in Egypt, Severus of Antioch had locked horns with the banished bishop of Hali-carnassus, Julian, according to whom calling Christ’s body ‘corruptible’ (phtharios) or subject to human suffering was tantamount to saying that Christ’s suffering was caused by sin. While Julian’s doctrine, ‘aphthartodocetism’ as it was dubbed by its detractors, was rejected by many adherents and opponents of Chalcedon, it also attracted a substantial number of Christians, especially in Armenia and in Alexandria, where they came to be known as Gaianites. The most famous adherent was the emperor Justinian himself, who embraced the doctrine shortly before his death.

From the anti-Julianist party in Alexandria came the anti-Chalcedonian deacon Themistius, who in the 530s promulgated in Constantinople his doctrine concerning the ignorance of Christ: just as Christ’s body was subject to death and corruption, so also was his human mind finite and subject to ignorance. Although this doctrine was fundamentally Severan and relied on the idea of one activity in Christ, it outraged anti-Chalcedonians, who soon called Themistius and his followers ‘Agnoetai’ or those who do not know. It seems that Chalcedonians were also attracted by this doctrine and that Justinian promulgated an edict against it. However, agnoetic teaching certainly continued to the end of

17 Evagrius, HE I, 39.
the sixth century,\textsuperscript{18} if not later, and Themistius, together with Apollinaris of Laodicea and Severus, was condemned by the council of 680/1.\textsuperscript{19}

The splintering of the anti-Chalcedonians did not stop with the Julianists and the Agnoetai. In around 557 a certain John Askotzangiès started to teach that in the divinity there are three substances or natures, just as there are three hypostases. John’s disciple, the Alexandrian intellectual John Philoponus, was to become the main exponent of this doctrine, which was an attempt to align anti-Chalcedonian christology and trinitarian terminology by using Aristotelian terms.\textsuperscript{20} Despite the fact that this resulted in a merely verbal tritheism, its adherents were called disparagingly ‘tritheists’, and between 560 and 564 Theodosius, the successor of Severus of Antioch as leader of the anti-Chalcedonian party, was forced to intervene and refute the doctrine in a substantial tractate. After this point the history of trithism goes hand in hand with the activities of Paul of Beit Ukkame (the Black), whose consecration as anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch in c.557 was to have far-reaching consequences for the anti-Chalcedonian movement until well into the seventh century.\textsuperscript{21}

Paul’s election, which took place at the request of Theodosius, was an unpopular move among adherents of the one-nature christology, for reasons which we cannot entirely explain, and led quickly to a schism between bishop Jacob Baradæus and his followers (Jacobites) and the supporters of Paul, called ‘Paulites’.


\textsuperscript{19} See Tanner, i. 4126.


\textsuperscript{21} For the details of Paul’s patriarchate see Frend, \textit{Monophysite Movement}, 323–8. On the remarkable dossier which survives in defence of Paul see J.-B. Chabot, \textit{Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandarum}, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 17 (Louvain: Sécrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1905), text; 103 (Louvain: Sécrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1933); trans., analysis, and commentary in Van Roey and Allen, \textit{Monophysite Texts}, 265–303.
Eventually Paul was anathematized by the patriarch Damian of Alexandria, while the Jacobites took matters into their own hands and in 581 consecrated Peter of Callinicum patriarch of Antioch. Peter and Damian came to blows when the former criticized the latter’s treatise against tritheism. This episode, characterized by futile and tempestuous meetings between the two patriarchs, led to a rupture between their churches, which was to last until their successors were able to restore unity of a sort in 616.

Meanwhile, disruption of another sort had been occurring in monastic circles in Palestine. Following ideas attributed to the controversial third-century theologian Origen, some monks believed that in the apokatastasis, or restoration of all things at the end of time, all would be equal to Christ; others, believing in the pre-existence of the soul, maintained that the pre-existing human soul of Christ was the first-born of all creation. A third group vehemently opposed these so-called Origenists. Controversy over the supposed ideas of Origen was not new, but this time matters came to such a pass that in 543 Justinian himself wrote a tract against Origen and Origenists, containing nine anathemata on Origenistic doctrine. This work was ratified by a synod in the following year, and at the Fifth Ecumenical Council in

---


Constantinople in 553 Origen and his works were condemned, together with his disciples Evagrius of Pontus (c.346–99) and Didymus the Blind (d. c.398). Echoes of these Origenist troubles would resound in seventh-century theological debate. On this episode see Chitty, *The Desert a City*, 123–9; Grillmeier, *CCT* 2/2, 383–410.

Among Justinian’s last endeavours in the ecclesiastical arena was the convocation of the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553. It is no surprise that this gathering ratified all the emperor’s religious policies and proclaimed four councils, the theopaschite formula, the orthodoxy of the Cyrillist chrisological tradition, and the Cyrillist or neo-Chalcedonian understanding of Chalcedon. It also condemned the Three Chapters once more. Because at this gathering the West was under-represented, and Pope Vigilius was under house arrest for its duration, it succeeded only in driving another wedge between East and West.

Justinian’s vigorous ecclesiastical policies having failed to produce unity between Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians, the emperor Justin II (565–78) initially tried conciliatory ploys, whereby, for example, the creed of Constantinople I (381) was read aloud at liturgies, thus leaving Ephesus and Chalcedon in abeyance. After various generous attempts to reconcile anti-Chalcedonians, in 571 the emperor published an edict, sometimes known as the *Second Henotic*, which was couched in Chalcedonian terms but contained no mention of the council of 451. When this, too, failed, Justin began to persecute opponents of Chalcedon.

Under Justin II’s successors, Tiberius (578–82) and Maurice (582–602), the empire was increasingly beset by wars in the Balkans and against Persia, and, given the seeming hopelessness of reconciling Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians, formal negotiations with the latter were abandoned. Stability among this latter group was further threatened in 584, when the anti-Chalcedonian leader of the Arab federation and protector of the

---

eastern border, the prince al-Moundhir, fell under suspicion of treachery to the Byzantine state, and many members of Arab tribes joined the Persians, thus posing problems for the strategic safety of the empire.

After an eight-year reign by the tyrant Phocas, the emperor Heraclius (610–41) inherited an empire which, ecclesiastically speaking, was fraught with dangers. There was an enduring split between the strategically crucial anti-Chalcedonian patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, which had begun in the 580s under the patriarchs Peter of Antioch (formerly of Callinicum) and Damian of Alexandria, and rendered any hope of rapprochement between Chalcedonians and a unified anti-Chalcedonian bloc seemingly beyond reach. Like Justinian, Heraclius was not in favour of religious pluralism, and this explains the concerted efforts towards ecclesiastical unity during his reign, and, in particular, the doctrine of monoenergism, or one activity (energeia) in Christ, which he championed. Aided by the politically astute Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, the emperor proposed a christological formula which was designed to be acceptable to both parties in the dispute about Chalcedon. Fathers on both sides had used this language, which had the advantage also of deflecting debate from the issue of one or two natures in Christ, and monoenergist doctrine seems to have had at least some of its roots in neo-Chalcedonianism or neo-Cyrillianism—as indeed did dyoenergist doctrine. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the theological implications of the monoenergist formula had been fully realized by either Heraclius or Sergius, although a number of theologians had been consulted on the matter. Indeed, as the dossier of monoenergist documents in this volume indicates, with the exception of the Synodical Letter of the patriarch Sophronius of Jerusalem (634–9), there was little sustained theological discussion in written form on the expression ‘one activity in Christ’. A monoenergist document, called variously Pact of Union,

---

Announcement, and Nine Chapters, was published in Alexandria by Cyrus, the local patriarch, in June 633, but, after objections by Sophronius, soon to be patriarch of Jerusalem, in the same year it was modified by the patriarch Sergius in another document, the Psophos or Resolution, which outlawed any discussion of one or two activities in Christ, as well as the possibility of two contrary wills. Shortly after this the bishop of Rome, Honorius (625–38), entered the theological debate, speaking of ‘one will of our Lord Jesus Christ’, an expression which was to secure him an invidious reputation as the founder of the monothelete heresy, or the doctrine of one will in Christ which was inexorably intertwined with monoenergism. While the monoenergist compromise was successful in some areas for a short time, as we shall see in detail below, it was ultimately a failure, and was replaced by the doctrine of monotheletism in a document called the Ekthesis or Statement, which was drafted by the patriarch Sergius in 638. To be noted, however, is the fact that the one energia in Christ is still subliminally present in monothelete documents. Maximus the Confessor, the disciple of Sophronius, strenuously opposed monotheletism, even in the face of another edict, the Typos or Regulation, which was issued in 647/8 and outlawed any mention of one or two activities or wills in Christ. The Typos engendered such opposition in both East and West that a synod was convened by Pope Martin in October 649 to condemn both it and the Ekthesis. At this Lateran Synod, where Maximus and eastern monks played a prominent role behind the scenes, various documents pertaining to the monoenergist and monothelete debate were read out, or at least recorded, and the patriarchs of Constantinople, who had instigated the converging doctrines, were anathematized together with their writings and followers. This condemnation was not taken kindly in the East, and

---

10 This term is used to translate the Greek πληροφορία.
11 Document 3 in the monoenergist dossier; Part 3 below.
12 Document 9 in the monoenergist dossier; Part 3 below.
13 On this see Hovorun, Will, Action and Freedom, 163–7.
15 On the Lateran Council see Murphy and Sherwood, Constantinople II und III, 212–87; Allen and Neil, Maximus and Companions, 19–21.
eventually led to the arrest and exile of Martín, Maximus, and his two disciples. The doctrine of two wills in Christ, which had been so strenuously championed by Maximus and Martín, was vindicated at the Sixth Ecumenical Council in Constantinople of 680/1, where again many documents pertaining to the monoenergism–monothelete debate were scrutinized, authenticated, or read aloud, thus ensuring their preservation.\(^{36}\) While the issues of monoenergism and monotheletism brought the christological debates of the early church to a close, there was a brief resurgence of monothelete doctrine in the reign of the emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–13).

Although they concentrate on the monoenergist dispute, the translated documents in this volume cannot but be relevant to the next phase of the dispute, namely monotheletism. The two doctrines, inexorably intertwined as has been stated above, were not brought into an explicit relationship by the political and ecclesiastical architects of monoenergism only because the architects focused on the *energēia* of Christ, as did the Severans or anti-Chalcedonians, with whom a rapprochement was keenly sought.

### 1.2 SOPHIST, MONK, AND PATRIARCH

We come now to the biography of Sophronius, one of the most influential figures spanning the ecclesiastical troubles in East and West from the sixth to the seventh centuries. It was only in the twentieth century that the identification of Sophronius the sophist, and Sophronius the monk and patriarch, was plausibly

established. Born at Damascus around 550, Sophronius was to become pupil and friend of the Palestinian monk and hagiographer John Moschus and master of the theologian Maximus the Confessor. He was to lead a long life, involved in ecclesiastical disputes concerning the Council of Chalcedon, until his death as patriarch of Jerusalem in 638 or 639. His Syrian pedigree—it is possible that he was bilingual—was both a determining stylistic factor in his literary compositions and an aid to familiarity with the developments among Syrian anti-Chalcedonians. Sophronius was trained first as a sophist, or a teacher of rhetoric, and embraced the monastic life only after being edified by the monasticism he witnessed while on a visit to Egypt with John Moschus in about 578. For many details of his earlier life we are indebted to the anonymous Prologue to Moschus' monastic hagiographical work, the Spiritual Meadow or New Paradise (CPG 7376).


19 On this point see von Schönborn, Sophrone, 55.


Éléments sous droits d'auteur
The trip to Egypt was apparently the first of many travels which Sophronius undertook throughout the Mediterranean world. It brought him and his friend into contact not only with the monks of Egypt, but also with the Chalcedonian patriarch Eulogius (580–608), who was active in writing against anti-Chalcedonian groups in Alexandria and elsewhere. Furthermore, the sojourn gave him prestige among Egyptian Chalcedonians and a first-hand knowledge of the Egyptian church which was to stand him in good stead in the theological debate about the one activity in Christ.

After returning to Palestine, Sophronius entered the monastery of St Theodosius, located on a hilltop north-east of Bethlehem, which had been founded about 479, and, like other monasteries in Judaea, had fought in the intervening period on behalf of the Chalcedonian position. Like many others, too, the monks of St Theodosius had also been anti-Origenist in the controversy in Palestine during the reign of Justinian, a fact which clearly influenced both Sophronius and Maximus. Equally influential was the ten-year period which John and Sophronius spent on Sinai, where Moschus found many materials for the Spiritual Meadow.


42 See Sophronius’ detailed renunciation of Origenism in the Synodical Letter 2.4; on Maximus’ familiarity with Origenist doctrines see Brock, ‘Syriac Life’, 321–2.
Sinai and the neighbouring bishopric Pharan had close ties historically and ecclesiastically with both Jerusalem and Alexandria. Perhaps the initial ideas of a monoenergist doctrine were already in the air while Sophronius and John were in Sinai, since the real intellectual author of this doctrine appears to have been Theodore, Chalcedonian patriarch of Pharan, who between 615 and 617 gave his approbation of the doctrine to the emperor Heraclius.

From Sinai the two friends returned to Palestine, to the New Lavra in Judaea, from where the Origenist monks had been expelled after the final session of the Fifth Ecumenical Council on 2 June 553. However, once again, towards 609, they left Palestine, on this occasion unwillingly, before the approach of the Persians. Their escape-route was to lead them through Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor to Selucia, and from there for a second time to Egypt. Here they became intimates of another Chalcedonian patriarch, John the Almsgiver (610–20), whose biography they wrote jointly. Here too Sophronius was cured of an eye ailment, apparently through the intercession of Saints Cyrus and John, whose shrine was located at Menuthis (Aboukir). This prompted him to write the *Account of the Miracles of Saints Cyrus and John* (CPG 7646).

When Jerusalem fell to the Persians in 614, Sophronius and John, in a significant move, made their way from Egypt to Rome. As staunch Chalcedonians, they could count on a sympathetic reception there among Greek monks. The ties between Rome

---

45 See Chitty, *The Desert a City*, 129.
47 See Chadwick, *John Moschus and His Friend*, 58. For the view that the pair went not to Rome but to New Rome, i.e. Constantinople, see K. Rozemond, ‘Jean Mosch, patriarche de Jérusalem en exil (614–634)’, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 31 (1977), 60–2. The argument that John went to Constantinople and died there has been amplified by E. Follieri, ‘Dove e quando morì Giovanni Mosco?’, *Rivista di Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, 25 (1988), 36–59, and refuted by A. Louth, ‘Did Moschus Really Die in Constantinople?’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 49 (1993), 149–54. Sansterre, *Les Moines grecs*, i. 19, makes the important point that in the seventh century not only monks and clergy but also probably laity fled to Rome to escape Persians and Arabs.
and Chalcedonian monks from the East were to become significant in the seventh century, as the career of Maximus the Confessor would demonstrate. Rome would also assume the role of a natural ally for the patriarch Sophronius in his political and geographical isolation in the see of Jerusalem. It was in Rome that, shortly before his death, John Moschus compiled the hagiographical materials he had collected into the *Spiritual Meadow*. Sophronius became the literary executor of this work, and also had the responsibility of taking his friend's body to its final resting-place on Mount Sinai. In the event, the Arab incursions rendered the burial there impossible, and John's remains were conveyed to the monastery of St Theodosius.

It seems that Sophronius subsequently remained at St Theodosius from 619 to about 626, when we find him in North Africa in the company of a number of Greek monks, among whom was Maximus. These monks in all probability belonged to the circle of John Moschus, and had been forced to flee Egypt before the Arab advance. It is worth noting that the first documents translated in the monoenergist dossier below, namely, the first letter of Cyrus of Alexandria to Sergius of Constantinople and Sergius' reply to it, date from the year 626. The push toward a monoenergist doctrine had become overt.

We next encounter the monk Sophronius in Alexandria in 633, just before the union between the Chalcedonians and Theodosians/Severans (an anti-Chalcedonian group) engineered by Cyrus on the basis of the supposedly Dionysian formula of 'one theandric activity'. The monk's concern about this term, which soon after was enshrined in the document of union (*Annunciation...*).
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48 See further C. von Schönborn, 'La Primauté romaine vue d'Orient, pendant la querelle du monoénergisme et du monothéétisme (VIIe s.), *Istina*, 20 (1975), 476–90, on eastern perspectives of Rome during this period.


52 See the monoenergist dossier, document 6, Part 3 below.
(Plerophoria), also known as the Pact of Union and Nine Chapters, led him to argue with Cyrus on the issue: he 'implored, begged, and demanded from Cyrus, falling at his feet, not to proclaim any such thing'. Subsequently Sophronius travelled to Constantinople to have the patriarch Sergius arbitrate the matter, before he continued to Jerusalem. The holy city had been without a patriarch since late 631, when the Chalcedonian Modestus died. The ambitious Sergius, bishop of Joppa, however, who was ready to accede to imperial designs for unity based on the monoenergist formula, had taken over and had been ordaining bishops.

Against this background, the election of Sophronius as patriarch must have been seen as a check to imperial ecclesiastical policies in Palestine, unless it was conditional on his willingness to remain silent on the subject of 'activities' in Christ. In any case, the tenor of his Synodical Letter, which his fellow patriarchs awaited after his elevation at the beginning of 634, was going to be crucial. The rejection of the letter by Sergius of Constantinople, who then attempted to blacken Sophronius to Honorius of Rome, marked the beginning of the final stage of monoenergism properly speaking.

On ascending the patriarchal throne, Sophronius found himself threatened by the approach of the Arabs externally, and by opposition within the eastern church itself, where the incumbents of the other sees were in agreement with the imperial policy for ecclesiastical unity based on the monoenergist formula. The new patriarch turned to the church where he had previously found refuge with his friend John Moschus—the church of Rome. Since Sophronius himself was prevented from travelling by the Arab incursions, his emissary, Stephen of Dor, went to Rome to alert the church there of the innovation on doctrine which had taken
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53 See the monoenergist dossier, document 3, Part 3 below.
54 See Maximus the Confessor, excerpt from the Letter to Peter the Illustrious, PG 91, 143CD (= Opuscula theologica et polemica 12, CPG 7657 [12]), a document dating from 643–4, according to P. Sherwood, An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor, Studia Anselmiana, 39 (Rome: Herder, 1952), 52 no. 76. Cf. Winkelmann, Der Streit, 110–11, nr. 88.
55 See the monoenergist dossier, document 6, Part 3 below; cf. van Dieten, Geschichte, 32.
56 See the testimony of Sophronius' emissary, Stephen of Dor, at the Lateran Council in 649, ACO 3 ser. sec. I, 46, 1–4.
57 This is the surmise of Meyendorff, Imperial Unity, 354 with n. 60, contra von Schönborn, Sophron, 89.
place in the East. The incursions culminated in the surrender of Jerusalem by Sophronius to the Arab prince Omar in February 638. Yet another defeat was to be witnessed by the patriarch before his death on 11 March 638 or 639, namely the emperor Heraclius’ publication of the Ekthesis or Statement in 638, in which all discussion of one or two activities in Christ was forbidden and a doctrine of ‘one will’ was expounded.\(^58\) Sophronius’ fight on behalf of Chalcedonian orthodoxy was to be taken up and, with refined argumentation and terminology, continued by his disciple Maximus the Confessor, one of the greatest speculative theologians of the eastern church.\(^59\)

If we accept the identification of Sophronius the sophist and Sophronius the monk and patriarch, it is possible to attribute a variety of literary compositions to the one author. Although Sophronius’ sophistic training is evident to a greater or lesser degree in all his works, it comes especially to the fore in the anacondic verses (\textit{CPG} 7650),\(^60\) epigrams (\textit{CPG} 7651),\(^61\) and idiometric verses (\textit{CPG} 7652), as well as in the panegyric verses (\textit{CPG} 7652), and in the panegyric works on Saints Cyrus and John (\textit{CPG} 7648)\(^62\) and John the Theologian (\textit{CPG} 7648). His hagiographical works are the \textit{Account of the Miracles of Saints Cyrus and John} and the \textit{Life of John the Almsgiver}, the latter, as already mentioned, being composed in collaboration with John Moschus. In addition we have seven extant homilies (\textit{CPG} 7637–49), the most arresting of

\(^{58}\) See the monoenergist dossier, document 9, Part 3 below. On 639 as the year of Sophronius’ death see von Schönborn, \textit{Sophrone}, 97, n. 136; van Dieten, \textit{Geschichte}, 50, proposes 638, and is supported e.g. by Bathrellos, \textit{The Byzantine Christ}, 64, n. 10, on the grounds that it is unlikely that the patriarch Sergius of Constantinople would have promulgated the \textit{Ekthesis} while Sophronius was still alive.

\(^{59}\) See further Bathrellos, \textit{The Byzantine Christ}, and Hoverin, \textit{Will, Action and Freedom}.


which is On the Birth of Christ, delivered on Sunday, 25 December 634, when the Arabs had the Church of the Nativity in their possession. Properly speaking, we have only two dogmatic works: the Letter to ArcADIUS of Cyprus (PG 7636), which survives in a Syriac translation, and the Synodical Letter, which receives its first annotated English translation below. The Letter to ArcADIUS seems to pre-date the monoenergist dispute, and deals with the Trisagion or Thrice-Holy, the liturgical prayer which was of importance in later monoenergist debate. Finally, among the works which may be considered authentic, there is a liturgical prayer for the blessing of the waters on the feast of the Theophany or Epiphany (6 January) (PG 7653). It is possible that in 634/5 Sophronius was also responsible for the compilation of a florilegium of 600 anti-monoenergist citations from the Fathers, in response to the challenge thrown to him by Sergius and reported by that patriarch in his first letter to Honorius (end of 633 or beginning of 634).

The Synodical Letter is thus the sole surviving work of Sophronius where we find a systematic presentation of the patriarch’s theology. It is also significant as the only document in the monoenergist dispute where we find a sustained presentation of a theological case, although the patriarch is understandably reluctant to be explicit on the question of one or two activities in Christ. Nonetheless, Sophronius’ letter put the monoenergist debate publicly on a theological footing, and portrayed monoenergism as
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being akin to one-nature christology. As a consequence of this, and of Sergius’ rejection of the document, monoenergism as a political strategy for achieving unity was made to appear inadequate. The translated documents in the monoenergist dossier below demonstrate that the protagonists in the dispute had already touched on the problem of the will or wills in Christ; it was to this aspect of christology that debate was steered by the publication of the *Ekthesis* in 638.

1.3 THE CONTEXT OF THE SYNODICAL LETTER

1.3.1 The religious politics of the emperor Heraclius

Both politically and ecclesiastically the situation which faced Heraclius on his succession to imperial power after the demise of the tyrant Phocas in 610 was fraught with danger. Not only was there an enduring split between the strategically crucial patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, but stability among anti-Chalcedonian groups themselves was threatened by the dissolution of the Arab federation in 584, an association in which the prince Moundhir had acted as patron of anti-Chalcedonians and intercessor with the Byzantine government. Many members of the Arab tribes had joined the Persians, seriously affecting both the opponents of Chalcedon, whose political arm was now cut off, and the strategic safety of the empire.

Like Justinian, Heraclius was not in favour of religious pluralism. This characteristic, combined with the fact that the splits between anti-Chalcedonians posed a threat to the safety of the empire, beset as it was by the Avars, Persians, and Arabs, explains the concerted efforts towards ecclesiastical unity during his reign, and, in particular, the monoenergist movement. Aided by the politically astute Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, the emperor Heraclius proposed a christological formula which was designed to be acceptable to both parties in the dispute about Chalcedon—the formula of one ‘activity’ (*energeia*) in Christ. Fathers on both sides had used this language, which had the advantage also of deflecting debate from the issue of one or two
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natures in Christ. The concept of one activity in Christ had also become a cornerstone of faith for the followers of Severus of Antioch. As the dossier of translated monenergist documents in Part 3 indicates, with the exception of Sophronius’ *Synodical Letter* there was little sustained theological debate in written form on the expression ‘one activity’, and in fact both sides used the term as if they were already agreed upon its meaning.

The first major attempt at ecclesiastical unity in Heraclius’ reign occurred in 616, when the imperial official Nicetas took a hand in the reconciliation of the Antiochene and Alexandrian anti-Chalcedonians, who had been at loggerheads since the time of Paul the Black. The Antiochene patriarch Athanasius Gammal (594/5–630/1), known as the ‘camel-driver’ to the Greeks, travelled to Egypt in the company of a number of his bishops and signed a document of union with the Alexandrian patriarch Anastasius (604–19), whose epithet *apozygarios* or ‘unyoker’ in the *Synodical Letter* (2.6.2) seems to be the invention of Sophronius. Although the sophist and monk had left Egypt at the time of the Persian advance some two years previously, he would have still been well informed about the circumstances of this union, which took place during the patriarchate of his admired patron, John the Almsgiver. While the source of the Chalcedonian chronographer Theophanes ridicules the union as ‘wissy-washy’, Sophronius derides both parties for attaching themselves ‘to their agreement on which they disagreed and which brought no agreement’. The epithet ‘unyoker’ which Sophronius applies to Anastasius of Alexandria suggests that the latter was responsible for the failure of the union, but it may have been chosen to parody Athanasius’ sobriquet ‘camel-driver’. The fact that several of the signatories to the document of union in 616 are anathematized by Sophronius in the *Synodical Letter* proves once again his familiarity with the anti-Chalcedonian churches of Syria and Alexandria.

---

68 Ibid. 108–11.
The union of 616 was of short duration, possibly not least because of the death of Anastasius in 619, but it was not to be Heraclius' only unsuccessful attempt at ecclesiastical unity. After peace with the Avars was negotiated in 623/4, the emperor turned his attention to the Armenian church, which did not recognize Chalcedon. His initial meetings with the Armenians in 622 culminated in 633 at a synod in Theodosiopolis (Karin or Erzerum) in Armenia, where a union was effected between the Armenian and Byzantine churches, and the Armenians, with some ambivalence, eventually accepted the Council of Chalcedon. This arrangement, however, terminated after the death of Heraclius, when in 648–9 the Synod of Dvin rejected the terms of agreement.

In 631 Heraclius made Cyrus, the bishop of Phasis (Poti) in Lazica, Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, and at the same time gave him the civil rank of augustalis (prefect). In this move the anti-Chalcedonian patriarch Benjamin, who is anathematized by Sophronius in the Synodical Letter (2.6.2), was forced to flee the city and to live in exile until his death in 665. Clearly Cyrus was expected to achieve success in bringing about ecclesiastical unity, and, indeed, only two years later he was able to report to the patriarch Sergius of Constantinople that in large tracts of Egypt he had united the anti-Chalcedonian Theodosians with the Chalcedonians. This was the union which Sophronius had tried unsuccessfully to impede because it rested on the monenergist formula.

The peace which was negotiated with Persia and which enabled the true cross to be returned to Jerusalem also enabled the
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71 On this treaty and its probable date see Kaegi, *Heraclius Emperor of Byzantium*, 120–1.
74 On Benjamin, who led his church under Persian, Byzantine, and Islamic rule, see Grullmeier, *CCT* 2/4, 81–6 (chapter written by Theresa Hainthaler), with lit.
activities in Christ. Although the work of Menas was subsequently rejected by the Sixth Council as spurious, it is certainly genuine, and was regarded as such by Cyrus and others to whom Sergius had sent it. The same cannot be said of the work *On the Trinity and the Incarnation* by (Ps.) Eulogius, which presupposes a knowledge of the monenergist debate that would have been impossible as early as the time of Eulogius of Alexandria (580–604).

A period of about nine years separates Sergius’ reply to Cyrus from the next document in the dossier (no. 3), which is the *Announcement (Plerophoria), Pact of Union*, or document of union in nine articles of faith promulgated in Alexandria on 3 June 633 by Cyrus, who, as we have seen, had meanwhile become both patriarch and *augustalis* (prefect). The crucial seventh article of this text, in which the expression ‘one theandric activity’ is used, was read aloud separately at the Lateran synod in 649, and the entire document was read out at the thirteenth session of the Sixth Council. It was the interpretation of the expression ‘one theandric activity’, ascribed to (Ps.) Dionysius the Areopagite, to which Sophronius had objected before the promulgation of the *Announcement*. The expression, which appears first on the lips of anti-Chalcedonians in 523, is in fact a misquotation of Ps. Dionysius’ ‘a new theandric activity’, which Sophronius is careful to quote properly in his *Synodical Letter* (2.3.16). Otherwise the terms of the document of union are Cyrillian, Chalcedonian, and, in the anathemata of the ninth article of faith, those of the Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553.

For most of the events which intervened between Cyrus’ Second Letter to Sergius and the fifth document in the monenergist dossier, namely Sergius’ Second Letter to Cyrus, we have to rely on the Syriac *Life of Maximus the Confessor* and on Sergius’ First Letter to Honorius (document 6 of the dossier). From the
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43 See ibid. 45–6, nr. 1.
44 See ibid. 50, nr. 7.
Life, in which for the purposes of polemic Sophronius plays a subordinate role to his pupil Maximus, we find evidence of the epistolary altercation which arose between the future patriarch of Jerusalem and Arcadius, archbishop of Cyprus, on the subject of the liturgical prayer known as the Trisagion or Thrice-Holy.\textsuperscript{37} According to the Syriac Life, Sophronius eventually wrote to Arcadius asking him to invite Cyrus of Alexandria, Honorius of Rome, and Sergius of Constantinople to a synod, in order to investigate the dissent which had arisen over the Trisagion. Arcadius responded by convoking a synod on Cyprus, where seemingly the (dyoenergist) doctrine of Sophronius and Maximus was anathematized, and a letter to this effect was sent to Heraclius. In an early work from this time, Against those who say that one activity in Christ is to be confessed (CPG 7697 [5]),\textsuperscript{38} Maximus took up the challenge of the monoenergist party.

Both Sergius and Heraclius intervened at this point, as we are informed by document 6 in the dossier, Sergius’ First Letter to Honorius. In a Psephos or Resolution, which can be dated to August 633, the patriarch of Constantinople stated that there should be no more talk of either one or two activities in Christ, and that after the union effected in Alexandria Cyrus should in future avoid mention of one or two activities. Likewise, Sophronius was to agree henceforth not to speak of one or two activities in Christ. It is reasonable to assume that these concessions were made in the face of the objections which had been raised by Sophronius and Maximus to the doctrine of monoenergism.\textsuperscript{39} Sergius’ Psephos was ratified soon after by an ordinance (keleusis) promulgated by the emperor Heraclius, who forbade discussion on the subject of the number of activities in Christ.\textsuperscript{40} The evidence for this ordinance is also contained in Sergius’ First Letter to Honorius.

Soon after the publication of the Psephos, so Sergius’ First Letter to Honorius informs us, Sergius also wrote to Sophronius with the order that there should be no future debate about one or two activities, and that he should be ‘content with the safe and tried-and-true correct teaching of the holy Fathers’.\textsuperscript{41} According

\textsuperscript{37} These are nrs. 29–34 in Winkelmann, Der Streit, 67–71.
\textsuperscript{38} Opuscula theologica et dogmatica 5, PG 91, 64–5; Winkelmann, Der Streit, 72–3, nr. 35.
\textsuperscript{39} See Winkelmann, Der Streit, 73–4, nr. 36.
\textsuperscript{40} See ibid. 74, nr. 37.
\textsuperscript{41} See ibid. 75, nr. 38.
to Sergius, Sophronius was happy with these conditions, and from a letter which Maximus wrote to the abbot (hegoumenos) Pyrrhus at the end of 633 or the beginning of 634, in which Sophronius’ disciple accepted the Psephos, we may judge that this was in fact the case.\textsuperscript{92} It appears that in August or September 633 Sergius wrote to the emperor via the imperial finance minister (sakellarios) concerning the steps he had taken in Sophronius’ regard.\textsuperscript{93}

At this juncture Sergius composed his Second Letter to Cyrus, document 5 in our monoenergist dossier, which was read aloud at the Lateran synod.\textsuperscript{94} Although Sergius is clearly writing in reply to Cyrus’ Second Letter to him (document 4), the patriarch of Constantinople is in fact responding to the contents of the Announcement (document 3). Ostensibly quoting verbatim from that document, he brings out and commends the main points made by Cyrus. The small discrepancies between the text of the Announcement and these citations are possibly attributable to the manner in which the text has been transmitted, rather than to deliberate changes on Sergius’ part. One instance is, however, striking: whereas in Article VII Cyrus had written the supposedly Dionysian term ‘one theandric activity’, Sergius renders this with the bald expression ‘one activity’. For the rest, the emphasis in the letter is on the unity of Christ’s natures. Cyrus is commended for his ‘orthodox teaching’, which is put in the context of Heraclius’ attempts to make ecclesiastical peace.

As we have already seen, the sixth document in the monoenergist dossier, Sergius’ First Letter to Honorius, which dates from the end of 633 or the beginning of 634, is of crucial importance for a reconstruction of the monoenergist debate and the part played by Sophronius in it.\textsuperscript{95} It also marks the first step in the correspondence with Honorius that was to have dire con-

\textsuperscript{92} Letter 19 (cf. CPG 7699), PG 91, 589C–98B. See further Winkelmann, Der Streit, 77, nr. 42.

\textsuperscript{93} See Winkelmann, Der Streit, 75–6, nr. 39.

\textsuperscript{94} See ibid. 76, nr. 40.

sequences for the bishop of Rome. Like document 2 in the dossier, with which it has points in common, it was read aloud at the twelfth session of the Sixth Council. It is fortunate for the historian that in his letter Sergius takes considerable pains to inform Honorius of the details in the course of events regarding the monoenergist debate from his own point of view, which includes a negative attitude to Sophronius. As in his First Letter to Cyrus, here too Sergius relates the dispute which Heraclius had with Bishop Paul the One-eyed and refers to the letter which Menas of Constantinople wrote to Vigilius of Rome. Our knowledge of the movements of Sophronius immediately before and after the publication of the Announcement we owe to Sergius here. An important part of the letter summarizing the contents of the Psephos deals with the difficulties which have arisen concerning the expression ‘one activity’, which is said to alienate and confuse some who hear it, even if it was used by some of the Fathers. Similarly, the expression ‘two activities’ is inadmissible, because it was not used by the Fathers. Since the terms ‘activity’ and ‘will’ were used in strict correlation in christological debate, Sergius continues with an explicit condemnation of the expression ‘two wills’, and emphasizes that it is the one Christ who acts. It was this stand which was to be taken by Honorius to its logical conclusion in his reply to Sergius’ letter. The stand of the patriarch of Constantinople is also repeated in document 9 of the dossier, the Ektthesis.

The seventh document in the monoenergist dossier, Honorius’ First Letter to Sergius, was also read out at the twelfth session of the Sixth Council. Like his Second Letter to Sergius, this survives in its most complete form in a Greek translation of the Latin original. In turgid prose, with a patchwork of scriptural citations, the bishop of Rome acknowledges receipt of Sergius’ letter and echoes his sentiments about Sophronius. At the same time Honorius bears witness to the letter which Sergius wrote to Sophronius after the publication of the ordinance (keleusis).

In the course of repudiating the expression ‘two activities’ which Sophronius had used and stressing the primacy of the union of the two natures in Christ, Honorius injudiciously adds that ‘we confess one will (thelena) in our Lord Jesus Christ’. At the end of his letter the bishop urges Sergius to avoid the expressions ‘one
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97 On the document see Winkelmann, Der Streit, 79–80, nr. 44, with lit.
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activity' or 'two activities'. With the statement of the one will in Christ the monoenergist debate was destined to change direction: four years later the publication of the *Ekthesis* was to be the official announcement of monotheletism. Given the correlation of the terms 'activity' and 'will' in christological debate, however, the issues remained in part the same, and continued to be bedevilled by a confusion over whether the terms related to the person or the natures in Christ. Lacking in theological sophistication, Honorius was unable to calculate the potential effect of his declaration of 'one will', much less to envisage the sentence of anathema which was passed on him for this monothelete utterance by the council of 680/1.  

When events had already come to such a pass, the terminology of Sophronius' *Synodical Letter*, which is chronologically the next document in the monoenergist dispute, seems almost superseded. The patriarch of Jerusalem makes no reference to the union of 633 or to the *Psephos*; he subordinates activity to nature, showing implicitly that the doctrine of two activities is a logical consequence of the doctrine of two natures. Equally pointedly, he uses the expression 'a new and theandric activity' of the incarnate Christ, as opposed to the version 'one theandric activity', which he links with opponents of Chalcedon, and to Sergius' 'one activity'. From this time on 'a new theandric activity' became part of the vocabulary of orthodoxy. While Sophronius does not mention 'two activities' explicitly, his rejection of the expression 'one activity', together with the Chalcedonian tone of his *Letter*, leaves his position with regard to monoenergism in no doubt. This conclusion is substantiated by Photius' information that after the composition of his *synodika* in late 634 the patriarch of Jerusalem also turned to compiling a florilegium of 600 citations from the Fathers in order to refute the monoenergists. We are told by another later source that the contents of Sophronius' *Synodical Letter* were approved by a synod of bishops in Jerusalem after its
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102 See Winkelmann, *Der Streit*, 82–3, nr. 46, with lit.
promulgation. At the council of 680/1 the document was declared to be ‘in accordance with the true faith and with apostolic teachings, and with the teachings of the holy and approved Fathers’.

The eighth document in the monoenergist dossier, Honorius’ Second Letter to Sergius, which dates to 634/5, advises us that the bishop of Rome had written to both Sophronius and Cyrus to persuade them to avoid the proclamation of ‘two activities’ and to acquiesce in the terms of the Psephos. The Second Letter is transmitted only in the fragments read out at the thirteenth session of the Sixth Council.

With the promulgation of the Ektthesis or Statement, the last document in the monoenergist dossier, the debate shifts from the terminology associated with the activity or activities in Christ to that of the will or wills. Composed by Sergius some time before its publication in 638, and subsequently read aloud at the Lateran synod, the document has much in common with the contents of the Psephos as reported by Sergius in his First Letter to Honorius, as well as with Justinian’s edict On the Right Faith. All talk of one or two activities is outlawed; the expression ‘two activities’ is singled out as being more Nestorian than Nestorius, who did not dare to introduce the concomitant ‘two wills’; and one will is confessed in Christ. In November of the same year as its promulgation the Ektthesis achieved the status of law, and penalties were set down for those who did not abide by its contents. How

102 ACO II, 2, 2, 586, 10-11.
103 See Winkelmann, Der Streit, 83, nr. 47.
104 See ibid, 85-6, nr. 50, with lit.
108 See Winkelmann, Der Streit, 86, nr. 51.
unsuccessful Heraclius (d. 641) and his successors were in enforcing ecclesiastical unity can be judged from the fact that, despite the death of Sophronius, opposition to the Ektthesis increased, particularly in the West, and the edict was rescinded only ten years later by the Typos or Regulation.

1.4 CONTENT AND STYLE OF THE SYNODICAL LETTER

1.4.1. Introduction

Sophronius’ introduction to his Synodical Letter is highly rhetorical in tone. The patriarch contrasts the tranquillity of his former life with the burdens of the patriarchal office, calling on Job to corroborate his statements on changing fortunes. Job 29: 2–10 is then quoted, which Sophronius elaborates by means of eleven clauses beginning with the word ‘when’ (2.1.4). In an exaggeration, he claims that his present lack of tranquillity has been caused by the ‘tyrannous methods’ of the clergy, monks, and laity of Jerusalem, who have forced him physically (sc. to become their patriarch), for reasons which Sophronius does not know or understand (2.1.5). This is to be taken as a modesty topos, in that the new patriarch is claiming his unworthiness to be elected, rather than pretending ignorance of the political circumstances of his elevation to office. In a captatio benevolentiae Sophronius requests Sergius’ help and support as both father and brother, promising on his part to maintain close ties with the patriarch of Constantinople and to be of like mind with him in matters of faith. Next Sophronius broaches the custom of the synodical letter, which, according to him, is the product of an apostolic and ancient tradition (2.1.6), and in keeping with which those who are just beginning their hierarchical office refer to their peers concerning what they believe in matters of faith. Paul is made the model for this custom on the grounds that he too went to Jerusalem and ‘subjected himself to the holy disciples who were ahead of him’. Sophronius also follows this custom, which is ‘corroborated by apostolic argument’, and he is sending his profession of faith to Sergius to be tested. Sophronius’ beliefs have been formed also by the preaching of Sergius.
1.4.2. *Trinitarian profession of faith*

Sophronius opens his trinitarian profession of faith with statements which are predominantly from the Creed of Nicaea (325), supplemented by the additions of the Council of Constantinople (381) on the procession of the Spirit from the Father (2.2.1). Implicit in this section is a rebuttal of tritheism, the doctrine which developed in the sixth century among the anti-Chalcedonians in Syria and Egypt, as discussed above. This doctrine, or at least its memory, endured into the seventh century, but for Chalcedonians such as Sophronius tritheism is synonymous with John Philoponus, and they are not informed about the early stages of the development of the doctrine.\footnote{For another trinitarian profession of faith in Sophronius see *Homily on the Annunciation*, *PG* 87(3), 3217B–3224B. Cf. von Schönborn, *Sophron*., 119–156.} Stressing the unity of the Trinity and its three hypostases in terms similar to those in Justinian’s tract *On the Right Faith* (2.2.2),\footnote{On tritheism see 1.1 above.} Sophronius excludes a unity in the Trinity that is subject to number or division, which leads, he says, to the Arian position of partitioning the one godhead into three dissimilar godheads. At the same time he rejects the idea that the three hypostases in the Trinity are contracted or reduced into one person, as he claims the Sabellians advocate. There is no Trinity if the three hypostases are collected into one person, nor if the single unit of the Trinity is extended into three essences, three natures, and three godheads. The first of these errors, he asserts, results in Jewish monotheism, the second in polytheistic paganism, like that of Arius (2.2.3). The dangers of both approaches are again emphasized. There follows a passage on the paradoxical nature of the Trinity which is both three and one, capable of being counted and yet shunning enumeration. It is not numbered in essences and natures and lordships, continues Sophronius, as the Arians and tritheists maintain. Although it has a divisibility in its persons, it remains indivisible. The patriarch anathematizes the doctrines of three gods or natures or essences in the Trinity and those who hold such beliefs, but then proceeds to stress that each person in the Trinity is perfect God and at the same time the same God, sharing one nature. To assert that there are three natures in the Trinity is to invent many different gods.

\footnote{ed. Schwartz, 72, 16–19; trans. Wesche, 164: ‘... we worship One in Three and Three in One, maintaining the paradox of their division and union.’}
(2.2.4–5). The individuality of Father, Son, and Spirit is professed: just as each possesses ‘God’, so too does each have the characteristic, immutable, and unmovable property of the person which belongs to it and to it alone (2.2.6).

Concluding this trinitarian profession of faith, where he has been at pains to reject the extremes of Arianism, Sabellianism, and tritheism, Sophronius calls the Trinity holy, of the same substance, eternal, sovereign, demiurge, and queen. Claiming that he has had to be brief because of the concise nature of the synodical letter, he proceeds now to explain his belief in the flesh-taking of one of the Trinity, God the Word and Son (2.2.7).

1.4.3. Christological profession of faith\textsuperscript{114}

The descent of the pre-existent Word into the womb of Mary and his enfleshment there, states the patriarch, took place not in appearance, as the Manichaeans and Valentinians assert, but in truth. The Word became human ‘to cleanse like with like’ (2.3.1). In order to exclude Paul of Samosata and the Nestorians, who were believed to have advocated that the Word was united to an existing human being, the patriarch maintains that the Word became flesh by being united with a human body, which did not exist previously and was not different from ours. The union is hypostatic, and Christ’s existence is true and undivided, suffering neither division nor change nor confusion, states Sophronius, following the definition of Chalcedon (2.3.2). Being born in a human body from the Virgin, God the Word showed that Mary was properly and truly Theotokos,\textsuperscript{115} a fact which shatters the position of Nestorius and his followers. This last is, of course, a reference to the word ‘Christotokos’, coined by Nestorius (2.3.3). From this Sophronius proceeds naturally to affirm the two births in Christ, the first a birth in eternity from the Father, and a second in time from Mary, tenets found in the definition of Chalcedon and in Justinian’s tract \textit{On the Right Faith}.\textsuperscript{116} Remaining with the

\textsuperscript{114} On Sophronius’ christology see G. Cosma, \textit{De \textquoteright{}oconomia\textquoteright{} incarnationis secundum S. Sophronium Hierosolymitanum}, Diss. (Rome: Urbaniana, 1949), 31; von Schönborn, \textit{Sophron.,} 157–224.


Chalcedonian definition of faith, the patriarch professes Christ perfect in divinity and in humanity. As in much of the remainder of this incarnational profession of faith, he denounces the two extremes of Nestorius and Eutyches, the former separating the two hypostatically united natures, the latter confusing them, such that Christ became a new, third entity. Both Eutyches and Nestorius are said to have underestimated the hypostatic union in different ways. In the following passage Sophronius deals with the effects of this hypostatic union and of the composite character of the hypostasis. Reaffirming once more the doctrine of two births, he introduces the Cyrillian formula, 'one incarnate nature of the God Word', taking issue with Apollinaris, Eutyches, and Dioscorus, who are presented as having denied the true humanity of Christ in different ways (2.3.4). In Cyrillian terms, Sophronius proclaims the preservation of the properties of the two natures in the union. On the one hand the union is an essential one, that is, a union of essences, contrary to Nestorian doctrine, where the union is non-essential and one of equal honour and of identity of will, or an association by the act of will and by identity; on the other hand, the union does not result in a confusion and alteration of the Word, as Eutyches believed (2.3.5). Sophronius explicitly rejects both Nestorian and Eutychian teaching, repeating his proclamation of the hypostatic union in Christ. Still concentrating on the effects of this union, the patriarch professes his belief in Christ in Chalcedonian terms; he has two natures, and is both perfect in Godhead and perfect in humanity, consubstantial with the Father regarding his divinity, consubstantial with his mother and with us regarding his humanity. This leads to a combination of both lowly and sublime attributes in the one Christ, some of which have always existed because he has an external nature, while others came about when he assumed our human nature (2.3.6). Yet again Sophronius emphasizes the fact that Christ is one from two, without division and without confusion. Because Christ is perceived to be undivided in each of the natures, he performs the acts of each essence naturally, according to the essential quality of each or its natural property. If his nature were single, as his hypostasis and person are, he could not do this (2.3.7).

117 On Cyril’s use of this phrase and on its background and later history see Wickham, Cyril of Alexandria, 62, n. 3.
The patriarch has now arrived at his profession of faith in the *communicatio idiomatum* in Christ, refusing to separate his human acts and assign them alone to the human nature, or to assign his divine acts alone to his divine nature, as Nestorius did, but following Cyril in attributing all deeds to the one and the same Christ and Son (2.3.8).  

In the terms of the *Tome* of Leo, a document which was anathema to the anti-Chalcedonians because of its perceived Nestorianism, Sophronius maintains that in the union the Word achieves what is proper to the Word, and the body what is proper to the body. Nor does this leave the door open for Nestorius, warns Sophronius, because we do not glorify two Christs and two Sons, but speak of one and the same Son and Christ who accomplishes both lofty and lowly acts. On the other hand, this does not introduce change and confusion into the union, thereby vindicating Eutyches and Dioscorus (2.3.9).

Returning to Leo’s terminology, Sophronius states his belief in one and the same Christ and Son who performed both acts, which puts him in agreement with neither of the extreme positions of Nestorius and Eutyches. While in the preceding passages the patriarch has often used the verb ‘to act’ (*energein*) in referring to acts performed by Christ, and has expressed himself in words similar to Sergius’ ‘one and the same being active’, for the first time in his letter he now uses the word ‘activity’ (*energeia*) in a christological sense, claiming that each essential, natural, and corresponding activity proceeds indivisibly from each essence and nature. The operating principle in Christ is thus attributed to the two natures, and it is therefore a question of two activities. Sophronius is at pains to make it clear that although the two natures have met in the hypostatic union, they do not have one essential, natural, and indistinguishable activity. He will not

---

118 Found with variations *passim* in Cyril’s works; see e.g. Third Letter to Nestorius, in Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria*, p. 25, ch. 8: ‘Accordingly all the sayings contained in the Gospels must be referred to a single person, to the one incarnate subject of the Word.’ Cf. McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, 207–12.

119 See the *Tome* in Tanner, i. *79*: ‘The activity of each form is what is proper to it in communion with the other: that is, the Word performs what belongs to the Word, and the flesh accomplishes what belongs to the flesh.’

120 See e.g. the *Tome* in Tanner, i. *80a*: ‘So it is on account of this oneness of the person, which must be understood in both natures, that we both read that the son of man came down from heaven, when the Son of God took flesh from the virgin from whom he was born, and again that the Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried . . .’
profess one, single activity of two natures; if he did, he would be forced to speak of one essence and one nature, as the Headless Ones, that is, the anti-Chalcedonians, do.\textsuperscript{121} Here we have a clear rejection by Sophronius of anti-Chalcedonian monoenergists, and at the same time an association of the doctrine of monoenergism with one-nature christology (2.3.10). The activity proper to each of the two essences and two natures, from which in turn the hypostatic union was effected, has to be professed in order not to confuse the two natures; and these natures are recognized from the activities and only from them, and the difference of the essences is always understood from the difference of the activities. But each word and each activity derive from one and the same Christ and Son and from his one hypostasis. Because it is one and the same Christ who performs both divine and human actions, Nestorius is blocked; because what is proper to each nature remains unconfused after the union, Eutyches is reduced to ashes (2.3.11).

Next, Christ’s human activities, which are the same as ours, and then his divine activities are discussed. Sophronius believes that, when Christ willed it, he gave to his human nature the right time to operate and to suffer what was proper to it. In a true human body that was possible, mortal, and corruptible he permitted it to suffer and do what was appropriate to its own nature until his resurrection from the dead (2.3.12–13). (Here the patriarch is in fact implying ‘an indissoluble relation’ between the activity and the will.\textsuperscript{122}) All the subordinate acts, on the other hand—and these are listed by the patriarch in rhyme—belonged to God the Word, even if they were effected through the flesh and the body, because the Word truly became incarnate while remaining one Son, producing each activity from himself, both divine and human.

\textsuperscript{121} The ‘Headless Ones’ (\textit{Akephaloi}) was a term applied to those more rigorous anti-Chalcedonians in Egypt who did not accept the eirenical document, the \textit{Hedicon}, promulgated by the emperor Zeno in 482, and separated themselves from their patriarch. Thus they had no visible hierarchy and were ‘headless’. By the Chalcedonians the term came to be used generically of anti-Chalcedonians, as here. For Sophronius’ use of the expression elsewhere see the first heresiology, 2.5.1, below; \textit{Homily on the Annunciation}, \textit{PG} 87 (3), 3224A–3224B; \textit{Homily on the Presentation}, ed. Usener, 13, col. 2, 18 (on which homily see, in general, P. Allen, ‘The Greek Homiletic Tradition of the Feast of the Hypapante: The Place of Sophronios of Jerusalem’, in K. Belke \textit{et al.} (eds.), \textit{Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag} (Vienna, Cologne, and Wiener: Böhlau Verlag, 2007), 1–12.

\textsuperscript{122} See further Hovorun, \textit{Will, Action and Freedom}, 150–1.
Relying on Theodoret, although the source of the citation is not named, Sophronius advocates dividing expressions concerning the Son between the two natures (2.3.14–15). Emphasizing once again that all the deeds belong to the one Emmanuel, also the words and the activities, he explains that some of them are fitting for the divinity and others for the humanity, while yet a third group occupies a middle position. This last group belongs to a power (dynamis) which the patriarch, following Ps. Dionysius the Areopagite, calls 'the new and theandric activity'. While in his Announcement or document of union Cyrus had used the phrase 'one theandric activity', Sophronius avoids this misquotation of the formula of Ps. Dionysius (2.3.16).

The rest of the christological section is a summing up of what has gone before, based generally on scriptural references and the definitions of Nicaea, Constantinople I, and Chalcedon. There is, however, no further mention of the words 'activity' or 'activities' (2.3.17).

1.4.4. Profession of faith in creation

Although this was not general practice in a synodical letter, Sophronius adds a section on creation to his profession of faith in the Trinity and in Christ. The explanation of its anti-Origenistic tenor is to be sought in the patriarch's familiarity with the Origenist controversy in Palestine in the sixth century and in his reliance on Justinian's condemnation of Origen.

The creation of the visible world, explains Sophronius, was the work of one God, Father, Son, and Spirit, the Father making everything through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The perceptible parts of creation will have an end in time, while the intellectual will not corrupt or die (2.4.1). Thus, the souls of human beings, and angels, have been given the grace of incorruptibility, but it is not the case that souls existed eternally before the existence of bodies or before the creation of the visible world, as Origen and his disciples, Didymus and Evagrius, say (2.4.2). The passage

---

124 On this term see above.
125 Text of Justinian’s anti-Origenist canons of 553 in *ACO* IV, 1, 248–9; English trans. in Grillmeier, *GCT* 2/2, 404–5.
which follows is an unsystematic denunciation of Origenist doctrine inspired by Justinian’s *Edict Against Origen* and by the anathemata of Constantinople II against Origenist views. According to Sophronius, Origen and his followers deny the resurrection of the body and the existence of Eden, and claim that the heavenly hosts resulted from a primordial condemnation and deviation. They teach that all rational things were produced in a unity of minds, and abuse the creation of the waters above heaven. This last charge is not found in the anathemata of 553 but in Justinian’s *Edict Against Origen* (2.4.3). The Origenists, continues the patriarch, claim that punishment in the next world will not be eternal, and that all perceptible things and rational creatures are corruptible. Furthermore, they believe in a restoration (*apokatastasis*) of angels, human beings, and demons. All these doctrines are rejected by Sophronius, who writes to Sergius that his own beliefs are based on apostolic and evangelical preaching, the Prophets and the Law, the Fathers and teachers (2.4.4).

1.4.5. **Councils**

The ‘ancient tradition’ of the synodical letter makes it appropriate now for Sophronius to declare his position on councils and synods. At the outset he states his acceptance of four ecumenical councils. The first of these, Nicaea (325), which was attended by 318 Fathers, condemned Arius. Next, the Council of Constantinople I (381), at which 150 Fathers were present, condemned Macedonius, Apollinaris, and Magnus. The third council, that of Ephesus I in 431, rejected Nestorius by a consensus of 200 Fathers. Sophronius does not recognize Ephesus II (449), the so-called Robber Council, on the grounds of Dioscorus’ role in it and its Eutychian leanings. The fourth council, during which 630 Fathers gathered at Chalcedon (451), condemned Eutyches and Dioscorus and stamped out the last vestiges of Nestorianism. In addition to these four councils, Sophronius recognizes a fifth, that of Constantinople II (553), but does not give the total number of participants. This fifth council, he explains, condemned Origen and his writings, the teachings of Evagrius and Didymus, Theodore of Mopsuestia

---

126 Diekamp, *Origenistische Streitigkeiten*, 107–8, remarks that we may assume that in the composition of the *Synodical Letter* Sophronius went to the trouble of faithfully reproducing historical truth, and to this end probably consulted the *acta* of the council of 553.
and his writings, the writings of Theodoret against Cyril and in defence of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore, and finally the so-called Letter of Ibas to Mari the Persian.\textsuperscript{127} The patriarch recognizes what all five councils recognized, and anathematizes and rejects whomever they anathematized and rejected (2.5.1).

Now that he has expressed his acceptance of the councils in their condemnations and anathemata, Sophronius begins to follow the councils' positive definitions. Noteworthy is the fact that the fifth council does not receive a mention individually or explicitly in this part of the profession of faith (2.5.2). Cyril's writings, especially those against Nestorius and the synodical letter to the bishops of the East, are accepted, as well as the writings of the eastern bishops recognized by Cyril (2.5.3). Equally worthy of honour is Leo's \textit{Tome to Flavian}, directed, says Sophronius, against Eutyches and Nestorius. The patriarch cleaves to all of Leo's writings, 'as if they came from the mouth of the leader Peter' (2.5.4). Sophronius then repeats his acceptance of the five councils, Cyril's writings and the letter of the eastern bishops. Again Leo's \textit{Tome} receives explicit recognition, and is equated with the definitions of Peter; Cyril's works, on the other hand, have the authority of Mark. Accepting all that the holy catholic church approves, the patriarch anathematizes anew whatever the church disapproves, speaking disparagingly of 'little books and little pamphlets and teachings that are hostile to God and interpolated', as well as of heretical and unorthodox personalities (2.5.5).

In a sentence of transition Sophronius explains that he will make an inventory of such persons. This is ostensibly the motivation for the heresiologies.

\textbf{1.4.6. Heresiologies}

There are, in fact, two separate lists of heretics whom the patriarch proceeds to anathematize. The first is a list of more than 120 individual heresiarchs and heretics, beginning with Simon Magus, including Samaritans, Gnostics, and Valentinians, and important christological heretics such as Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, Arius, Apollinaris, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, Eutyches, and Disocorius. Part of this list is devoted to Severus and other

\textsuperscript{127} On the work of this council see Grillmeier, \textit{CCT} 2/2, 438–62.
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anti-Chalcedonians of the sixth century, until Sophronius arrives at his own time and anathematizes Athanasius the Syrian (the camel-driver), anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Anastasius the Unyoker (αποζύγαριος), anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, and a number of so-called heretics, who, says the patriarch, are still alive, like Benjamin, anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, and Menas, leader of the Gaianite party in Alexandria. Without pre-empting the investigation below into this heresiology, we can note here that not all the names which appear in this first inventory are representatives of a heterodox christology.

The same holds true for the second list, in which about forty groups or schools are anathematized. The list begins with the Nicolaitecs and ends with the mention of five anti-Chalcedonian sects or groups. There is no relationship, either explicit or implicit, between this list and the first one, except that anti-Chalcedonians are given a heretical pedigree in both. Not content with confining his anathemata to those mentioned in the two heresiologies, Sophronius next puts a global anathema on every other heresiarch and schism which the holy catholic church anathematizes, and on all who think like them. What he does believe in he has already expounded to Sergius, but only partially and briefly, because, as he explains once more, of the summary form of the synodical letter.

1.4.7. Conclusion

Like the introduction, the conclusion to the Synodical Letter is rhetorical. It is expressed in terms flattering to Sergius, whose position as chief among the patriarchs of the East is emphasized. Sophronius again addresses a captatio benevolentiae to Sergius, who is requested to inspect the Synodical Letter both as a father and brother, remedying any faults or omissions arising from the brevity with which Sophronius claims he has written, or from his rhetorical inability. Just as in the introduction, Sophronius begs Sergius to behave as a brother and a father. When he has received Sergius’ answer (which, of course, would mean that the Synodical Letter had been approved in Constantinople), for his part Sophronius will demonstrate his affection for him, which is that of a child and a brother. Although it is not said expressly, the patriarch of Jerusalem is advocating the acceptance of his synodika, and communion
with Sergius. The new patriarch begs his more experienced addressee to help him in his pastoral duties, lest the flock of Christ be harmed. Furthermore, Sergius is asked to pray for the well-being of the emperor Heraclius and empress Martina, and for their victory over barbarians, but particularly over Saracens, who ‘through our sins have now unexpectedly risen up against us and are carrying everything off as booty’. Through Sergius’ prayers the insolent Saracens would be defeated and peace would return to the Byzantine empire. Finally the patriarch of Constantinople is urged to look kindly on the emissaries whose task it is to take Sophronius’ Synodical Letter to Constantinople. They are named as the deacon Leontius, from the Church of the Anastasis (Resurrection) in Jerusalem, who is also kanikellarios (official) and protonotarios (first secretary) of the patriarchate, and a certain Polyeuktos, who is given no further epithet. These men are supposed to bring Sergius’ reply back with them. Greetings are sent from all the clergy in Jerusalem to those in Constantinople.

1.4.8. Implications

While in the trinitarian section of his profession of faith Sophronius’ language is Nicene, and he is concerned with rejecting the Arians, Sabellians, and tritheists, in the extensive christological section his language is Cyrillian, Leonine, and above all Chalcedonian, directed against Dioscorus and Eutyches on the one hand, and Nestorius on the other. Here too he shows influence of Justinian’s tract On the Right Faith. While the patriarch does not make the explicit statement that there are two activities in Christ, and on this account could be judged to be adhering to the letter of Sergius’ directive, he states clearly that each of the two natures in Christ has an activity, and more than once uses the plural word ‘activities’. Furthermore, he rejects explicitly the idea of one, single activity in Christ, which he associates with the opponents of Chalcedon. In several reprises the patriarch emphasizes that, while proceeding from each of the two natures, each activity

128 See Winkelmann, Der Streit, 23, nr. 6, on the fact that the Byzantines did not recognize the definitive nature of the Arab conquest; cf. Kaegi, Heraclius Emperor of Byzantium, 239, who remarks that Sophronius’ words here are ‘an explicit acknowledgment that ecclesiastical leaders, who were quarreling about Christology, had not expected the Muslim torrent’.

derives from the one, composite, single hypostasis in Christ. Although these repeated emphases on the one hypostasis could be attributed to Sophronius’ verbosity, it could also be argued that they are an accommodation of Sergius’ demand that instead of ‘one activity’ or ‘two activities’, one should speak of ‘one and the same person operating’. On the other hand, Sophronius implicitly rejects Cyrus’ and Sergius’ modification of Ps. Dionysius’ ‘one theandric activity’ and links it with the anti-Chalcedonians. Since this term formed the basis of the Alexandrian union of 633, it would not take much on Sergius’ part to interpret Sophronius’ remarks here as a rejection of the agreement between Alexandrian Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians to accept one activity in Christ. The fact that the discussion of the question of activities in Christ occupies only a small space in Sophronius’ elephantine Synodical Letter is significant. Notwithstanding this, for Sergius on reading the synodika there could remain no doubt about Sophronius’ position regarding two activities in Christ.

As far as the synopsis of councils is concerned, Sophronius manifests himself as a strict Chalcedonian. His ambivalence concerning the status of Constantinople II (553), which refined and reaffirmed the tenets of 451, is to be attributed to the lukewarm reception which Justinian’s council enjoyed even among some Chalcedonians, because it was conducted against the wishes of Pope Vigilius and without his participation.\(^{130}\)

In the two heresiologies the patriarch of Jerusalem proves once again that he is a partisan of Chalcedon by his anathematization of a list of opponents to Chalcedon. As well as vouching for his (Chalcedonian) orthodoxy, both inventories are polemical in intent, inasmuch as the anti-Chalcedonians who appear in them are given a heretical pedigree by being associated with supposedly heterodox Christians of all hues from the time of Simon Magus onwards. Particularly noteworthy is the inclusion both of anti-Chalcedonians involved in the union of 616 between Antiochenes and Alexandrians, and of those who participated in the negotiations towards a union between Alexandrian Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians. The first union threatened Sophronius politically, the second both politically and dogmatically, but he is still not about to capitulate to the demands of the patriarch of Constantinople.

\(^{130}\) On this issue see Murphy and Sherwood, Konstantinopol II and III, 155–7.
All in all, it is not surprising that Sergius rejected Sophronius’ Synodical Letter, and sent the emissaries Leontius and Polyeuktos back to Jerusalem empty-handed.

1.4.9. Style

For the compiler of the Synodicon Vetus, an anonymous work dating perhaps from the ninth century, Sophronius was ‘the honey-tongued champion of truth’. While Photius was content to remark that the Synodical Letter ‘innovates on words everywhere, gambolling and leaping like a foal’, for more modern taste the patriarch of Jerusalem is wordy and often tediously rhetorical. Dorner branded the style of the Synodical Letter as ‘very turgid and bombastic’, claiming that the work was ‘characterized by a spirit of hatred towards heretics, reminding one of an Epiphanius’; Krumbacher denounced the rhetorical length and dogmatic breadth of the homilies and complained of the long excursuses in the Synodical Letter, and Baynes remarked that we could only be grateful that Sophronius refrained from rewriting the Spiritual Meadow. Writing of The Miracles of Cyrus and John, Duffy noted that the work ‘oozes with the kind of rhetoric that tends to alienate the unaccustomed or unsympathetic eye and ear’, although he concluded more sympathetically that Sophronius was ‘an accomplished artist who composed with a careful eye and ear for all parts of his work’. Not only are the introduction and conclusion to the Letter predictably highly rhetorical in tone, but there are passages where for effect the patriarch employs rhyme (2.2.2), symmetry, anaphora, and rhyme together (2.1.4), and repetition (2.3.4). All of this presents a considerable challenge

131 Synodicon Vetus, 111, ff. 131; p. xiii on the date.
132 Bibl., cod. 231, 286b; ed. Henry, v. 64.
134 K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527–1453), Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, IX.B, 1, Abt., 2nd edn. (Munich: Beck, 1897), i. 672 and 189, respectively.
136 J. Duffy, ‘Observations on Sophronius’ Miracles of Cyrus and John’, 71 and 76; respectively.
to the translator. A fair number of citations from scripture and from the Fathers appears in the Letter. Photius’ comment that Sophronius ‘innovates on words everywhere’ is borne out in the Synodical Letter especially in the heresiologies, where names are devised for heresiarchs and their followers. All this having been said, it must be admitted that it is wordiness, not rhetorical pretension, that distinguishes Sophronius’ Letter from most of the documents in the monoenergist dossier (Part 3).

1.5. GENRE AND FUNCTION OF SYNODICAL LETTERS

1.5.1. The Synodical Letter of Sophronius

The genre to which Sophronius’ Synodical Letter belongs is outlined by the patriarch himself in his introduction (2.1.6):

An apostolic and ancient tradition has prevailed in the holy churches of God throughout the whole world, whereby those acceding to the hierarchy frankly refer in all respects to those who have administered the high-priesthood before them, as to how they should think and maintain the faith which the most wise Paul has handed on to them with the utmost safeguards. . . . Accordingly we also observe this custom, and, because we deem an excellent law all that was done fittingly by older generations, especially when confirmed by apostolic practice, we write how it stands with us concerning the faith, and we send it to You, wise in the things of God, to be tested, lest we seem to have changed the ancient landmarks which our fathers positioned (Prov. 22: 28).

While synodical letters (synodika) in the broadest sense are letters following on a synod, in which synodical decrees are communicated, in the narrow sense synodical letters are those written by a patriarch soon after his consecration, conveying the news of his election by the synod which presided over it. The synodika, which were carried to the fellow patriarchs of the new incumbent by emissaries chosen from the local clergy, constituted the official beginning of the new patriarch’s term of office, and required recognition and response from the addressees. Since the purpose of these instruments of ecclesial communion, especially in times of doctrinal dispute, was to prove the orthodoxy of the writers, synodika normally contain a profession of faith, a statement by the new patriarch concerning what councils he recognizes and what doctrines he espouses, and an outline of those doctrines he
condemns. Hence Sophronius outlines his trinitarian and christological belief, states the councils which he recognizes, and provides a list of both heretics and heresies which he condemns and anathematizes. As the first official act of the new patriarch, the dispatch of the synodika was crucial in securing the inclusion of the new patriarch’s name in the diptychs of other churches as proof of his orthodoxy. Severus of Antioch (512–18) advises an episcopal correspondent either to accept a synodical letter, or to write to its author saying that if he shows himself orthodox the recipient will enter into communion with him. Tellingly, Severus adds: ‘But I am wondering whether a man who accepts a synodical letter is not obliged to communicate with those who bring this to him.’ A letter of Pope Gregory I of Rome proves that there was no contact between the new patriarch and his peers until the dispatch and approval of his synodika. It is Gregory too who queries the contents of a list of condemned heresiarchs sent to him in the synodika of Cyriacus, patriarch of Constantinople, in 596: the bishop of Rome requests clarification concerning the name Eudoxius, which is unknown to him. Further insights into the etiquette of the synodical letter are given by Photius in his Bibliotheca. According to him, Eulogius of Alexandria (580–607) had addressed a synodical letter to the bishop of Rome, presumably Pelagius II. The latter replied with the criticism that it was incomplete, because it had not mentioned explicitly either the names of the four (sic) holy synods, nor the places where they had been held, nor the number of participants at each of them; neither had the Tome

---


139 Letter VI.65 to Athanasius presbyter; ed. Ewald and Hartmann, i. 438, ll. 24–6. See The Letters of Gregory the Great, trans. J. C. R. Martyn, introduction and notes by C. P. Hanlon, 3 vols. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies, 2004), ii. 450. Although Mazal, Die Prooimien, 42, claims that under certain circumstances it was possible for a patriarch to compile a synodical letter at a later stage and to declare his doctrinal position then, he gives no example to illustrate this.

140 See Letter VII.5; ed. Ewald and Hartmann, i. 448, ll. 19–32; trans. Martyn and Hanlon, ii. 458. See further J. McClure, ‘Handbooks Against Heresy in the West, from the Late Fourth to the Late Sixth Centuries’, Journal of Theological Studies, 88, 30 (1979), 186–97.
of Leo been mentioned expressly. Furthermore, continued the bishop of Rome, neither Eutyches, nor Disocorus, nor Severus had been anathematized, and the (Chalcedonian) expression ‘in two [natures]’ had not been proclaimed as unambiguously as it should have been.\footnote{On the number of councils see under sec. 1.5–3, below: Photius, "Bibl., cod. 230, 267a; ed. Henry, v. 8, 1–12.}

Considering the number of such inaugural letters which must have been written in the ancient church, it is perhaps surprising that more of them have not come down to us intact.\footnote{The mortality rate is huge. From 448 to 1389 for Constantinople, for instance, Mazal, "De Prooimion", 42–3, lists only eighteen surviving patriarchal confessions of faith, and not all of these are inaugural synodical letters.} Significantly, several of those which have been transmitted in their entirety owe their survival to their inclusion in synodical proceedings or in dossiers compiled for a particular purpose. Sophronius’ letter itself, in the exemplar sent to Sergius of Constantinople, has been preserved thanks to its inclusion in the proceedings of the Sixth Ecumenical Council of 680/1; an extract was used by the compiler of the Doctrina Patrum, an extensive florilegium which is closely connected to the circle of Sophronius’ disciple, Maximus the Confessor.\footnote{Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi. Ein Griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts. Zum ersten Mal vollständig herausgegeben und untersucht von F. Dieckamp. 2. Auflage mit Korrekturen und Nachträgen von B. Phanourgakis, herausgegeben von E. Chrysos (Münster: Aschendorff, 1981).}

The general outline of these synodika and the expectations of their recipients are clear: a captatio benevolentiae, and a reference to the ancient custom of sending the letters, a trinitarian profession of faith which is followed by a christological statement on the part of the writer, who also declares his position vis-à-vis ecumenical councils and anathematizes a number of heretics, especially those opposed to his christological stance. That the form of the synodical letter was standard is evident from the report of Photius concerning the synodika of Eulogius of Alexandria. Equally typical are the references by the new patriarch to his brothers as both brothers and fathers. As far as the lists of heretics are concerned, Photius and his source are silent; one may conjecture that such lists were not compiled afresh in every synodical letter, but that, especially in the same patriarchate and among those of like belief, they already lay at the disposal of the new patriarch. In the case of Sophronius, this conjecture will be discussed further below.
The most striking feature of the Letter of Sophronius is its length. Even allowing for some habitual verbosity on the part of the patriarch of Jerusalem, we have to assume that the unusually large proportions of his inaugural letter reflect the seriousness with which he regarded the dogmatic positions which he puts forward. Also divergent is Sophronius' inclusion of a section on creation: although the first mention of creation in a conciliar symbol seems to be that of the Council of Braga I in 563 (560?), this is an unusual theme in synodical letters. While he adheres to the genre of the synodical letter, in its proportions and to a lesser degree in content Sophronius' work resembles rather a dogmatic treatise, such as the work On the Heresies and Synods of Germanus of Constantinople (715–30). The attention which he pays to councils and heretics far surpasses the norm of synodika. On this account I shall shortly situate these aspects of his Letter in the genres of council synopses and heresiologies.

1.5.2. The function of synodical letters in the theological debates of the seventh century

That a synodical letter could function as much as a political statement as a doctrinal profession is clear from the case of Sophronius. We know that, besides being sent to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who rejected it, the Letter also went to Honorius of Rome, who also refused it. On the other hand, Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, whom Sophronius had previously tried to dissuade from accepting the one-activity formula, was not sent a copy. I have already discussed the influence of Sophronius' Letter on subsequent events, particularly on the publication of the Ekthesis. In the subsequent history of the monoenergist–monothelite debate the dispatch or withholding of synodical letters

---


146 Although the contention of the author of the Life of Maximus, PG 90, 80AB, and of Recension 3 of the biography in Neil and Allen, Recension 3, 56–7, is that Cyrus also received a copy. See von Schönborn, Sophronie, 100, n. 4.
by the patriarchs of Constantinople, as well as the contents of the documents themselves, illustrates the importance they could assume.

On his accession to the throne of Constantinople on 1 October 641, the patriarch Paul dispatched synodika in which he avoided mentioning the Ektlesis, published three years before, and failed to take a stand on the monothelete question, a fact which Pope Theodore queried in his reply. The synodika of Paul's successor, Peter (654–66), were rejected by Pope Eugenius. The next incumbent, the patriarch Thomas II (667–9), composed synodika intended for Pope Vitalian, but they were never sent, supposedly owing to the threat of an Arab invasion in Constantinople. The fact that they were read out and pronounced orthodox at the council of 680/1 suggests that Thomas had sidestepped the burning issue of activity and will in Christ. The synodical letters of John IV (669–75) and Constantine I (675–7) were refused in Rome and the authors' names were consequently excluded from the diptychs. Because of what had befallen his predecessors, the patriarch Theodore I (677–9) did not bother to send the customary letter to Rome, while his successor, George I (679–86), also apparently sent nothing to Pope Agatho.

1.5.3. The council synopsis

In an important article Joseph Munitiz distinguishes three main types of council synopses: (i) anonymous synopses; (ii) short treatises on the councils attributable to authors, such as the work On the Heresies and Councils of Germanus of Constantinople; (iii) the very brief résumé, ‘in which only two or three lines are dedicated to each council: examples occur in numerous professiones fidei . . . and in numerous miniature treatises’; these résumés are either anonymous or signed. The synopsis of the councils in Sophronius’

147 Winkelmann, Der Streit, 103, nr. 76. See also van Diemen, Geschichte, 77 and 82, for the sources and a discussion of the episode.
148 Winkelmann, Der Streit, 141–2, nr. 133. See also van Diemen, Geschichte, 109.
149 Cf. Winkelmann, Der Streit, 158, nr. 155. See also van Diemen, Geschichte, 117–18.
150 Cf. Winkelmann, Der Streit, 158, nr. 155. See too van Diemen, Geschichte, 120–1 and 123.
151 On Theodore, cf. Winkelmann, Der Streit, 158, nr. 155, and on both patriarchs see van Diemen, Geschichte, 125–6 and 132.
Letter is assigned by Munitiz to the third category. It deserves to be said here that the inclusion of a conciliar synopsis, like the heresiology, ensured the transmission of Sophronius’ work in fragments.

While Sophronius is brief in his treatment of the councils, he is also determined to leave nothing unsaid. As in the heresiology, his approach has two facets. Alluding once again to the ancient custom in synodical letters of enumerating the councils that one recognizes, he makes explicit his acceptance of the ‘four great and holy and ecumenical synods’, namely Nicea (325) with its 318 participants, which condemned Arius; Constantinople (381) with its 150 Fathers, which, according to the patriarch, put an end simultaneously to the heresies of Macedonius, Apollinaris, and Magnus; Ephesus (431) with 200 Fathers, where Nestorian was rejected; and Chalcedon (451) with 630 participants, which condemned Eutyches, Dioscorus, and Nestorius. In addition Sophronius accepts a ‘fifth ecumenical synod which came into existence after them’, namely Constantinople II (553), where Origen and his writings were anathematized, as well as the teachings of Evagrius and Didymus, and he follows this council in rejecting Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings, the writings of Theodoret, and the so-called Letter of Ibas to Mari the Persian. The number of participants at this council is not mentioned. Subsequently he expresses his approval of ‘these five holy and blessed synods’ and their symbol of faith. Whereas in the first part of his synopsis he had ratified their condemnations of heretics and heretical writings, now he ratifies the persons and writings whom they accepted. Chiefly these are Cyril of Alexandria, his second and third letters to Nestorius and his Twelve Chapters, and his Formula of Reunion; the letters of the eastern bishops to Cyril; Leo’s Tome or Letter to Flavian; and in fact all of Leo’s writings and Cyril’s as well. The two pillars of orthodoxy for Sophronius are thus Cyril and Leo—a clear harking-back to the inspiration and terminology of Chalcedon, especially as these were refined by Constantinople II.


With one exception, the terms of Sophronius' conciliar synopsis are unremarkable in a post-Chalcedonian profession of faith in the two natures of Christ. The one curiosity is the claim that Constantinople I condemned Macedonius, Apollinaris, and Magnus, names which reappear a little later in the list of heresiarchs. While the followers of Macedonius and Apollinaris figure in the anathemata of the canons of this council, there is no mention of Magnus.\(^{154}\) In fact, there is no evidence for the existence of a heresiarch of this name at the time of Constantinople I, or in the circle of Apollinarians. The names of Macedonius and 'Magnus the Apollinarian' are condemned together; however, in Justinian's tract *On the Right Faith*.\(^{155}\) Whether or not one follows Lietzmann in identifying Magnus with Maximus the Cynic, who, according to Theodoret, manifested Apollinarian tendencies,\(^{156}\) Sophronius' indebtedness, whether direct or indirect, to Justinian's dogmatic writings seems beyond doubt. Furthermore, one suspects that the name Magnus may have been taken over by the patriarch uncritically from an existing synopsis, although Photius too reproduces the name from his reading of Sophronius' *Letter*.\(^{157}\) In the sections of Justinian's letter of 550 which passed into Greek in the historical works of George Hamartolos and George Cedrenus, the name of Magnus has been omitted, perhaps because it was unknown or irrelevant.\(^{158}\)

Thus, Sophronius' conciliar synopsis, which is more extensive than those in other surviving synodical letters, continues the theme already visible in his trinitarian and christological professions of faith, namely his adherence to the first three ecumenical councils, to the Council of Chalcedon and to the reaffirmation of it in Constantinople II, as well as to the christology of Cyril and the terminology of Leo of Rome. Sophronius' dependence on Justinian's dogmatic works, whether his knowledge of them is first- or second-hand, is once again evident.

\(^{154}\) See Tanner, i. *35.
\(^{155}\) ed. Schwartz, 90, 2–6; trans. Wesche, 181.
\(^{157}\) *Bibl.*, cod. 231, 286b; ed. Henry, v. 94.
1.5.4. Study of the heresiologies

As Christoph von Schönborn suspected, these heresiologies indeed need to be studied closely in their own right, if only for the light they throw on the patriarch’s methodology in his synodika. Like the conciliar synopsis, Sophronius’ lists of heretics are both more extensive than heresiologies in other synodical letters, and they embody a twofold approach. The heresiology, as Aloys Grillmeier demonstrated, was particularly favoured in the post-Chalcedonian period, and was by no means confined to synodika. Its purpose was chiefly polemical. Sophronius argues for his orthodoxy on the grounds that he anathematizes a catalogue of heresiarchs and heretics, numbering more than 120, and another list of about forty heresies or groups of heretics. The size of both these lists exceeds the scope of the heresiologies contained in other synodika, but, at the same time, with few exceptions they remain lists of names rather than descriptions of the origin and nature of particular heresies, such as we find, for example, in the anonymous writing On the Sects, the work of Timothy of Constantinople On Those Who Join the Church, or that of George the Hieromonn, the latter writing about the same time as Sophronius. A striking aspect of Sophronius’ Letter is the separation between heresiarchs and heretics on the one hand, and heresies on the other. In the three great exempla of heresiological works, Hippolytus’ Philosophoumena or Refutation of All Heresies,
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159 For details on the multitude of names which appear in the following pages the reader is referred to EEC and to A. Marjanen and P. Loumanen (eds.), A Companion to Second-Century Christian ‘Heresies’, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 76 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005).
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the *Panarium* or *Medicine Chest* of Epiphanius of Salamis,\(^{168}\) and Theodoret’s *Compendium of Heretical Fables*,\(^{169}\) as well as in their successors (with the notable exception of Timothy of Constantinople), heretics and heresies are treated indiscriminately. It is also worth noting that there is no apparent correlation between Sophronius’ list of persons and his list of heresies. Again one suspects that the patriarch wished to give as complete a picture of heretics and heresy as he could, that there were two distinct catalogues available to him in Jerusalem, and that he simply used both of them.

The heresiologies in Sophronius’ *Synodical Letter* have been analysed by Cosma, but in a manner which is both unsystematic and too schematic, and from a starting-point which tends toward the hagiographical. Cosma divides his examination of the heresiologies into five parts: (1) the heresies which saw in Christ a mere human being; (2) the docetists and others who were in error concerning Christ’s humanity; (3) the heretics who maintained that the union between the Logos and Christ was a moral one; (4) Eutyches; (5) the heretics opposed to the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. As the detailed examination below of Sophronius’ lists will show, this schema is too neat. Furthermore, Cosma is not uniformly interested in identifying the individual heretics or heretical groups mentioned by Sophronius.\(^{170}\) This is even more reason for an examination of the heresiologies.

In what follows, the sources of Sophronius’ two heresiological lists are identified as far as possible. It soon becomes apparent that his greatest debt is to Epiphanius’ *Medicine Chest* and Theodoret’s *Compendium*. Whether this debt is direct or indirect will engage our attention further on. Sophronius’ sources for the period after Nestorius and down to his own time cannot be determined on the basis of comparison with the contents of any other written extant source.

Sophronius opens his heresiologies with the name of Simon Magus, regarded as the father of all heresies. The early heretics Cleobius, Menander, Dositheus, and Gortheus are all found in


\(^{169}\) CPG 6223; PG 83, 336–556.

\(^{170}\) Cosma, *De’oconomia’ incarnationis*, 3–79.
Theodoret, where they are classified as Samaritans, but here they are combined with Philetes, Hermogenes, and Alexander the Coppersmith, names seemingly intercalated from information in Paul's letters to Timothy. Of the group Satorinus, Masbotheus, Hachrian, and Basilides, the Menandrans Satorinus and Basilides belong together and are found so in Epiphanius and Hippolytus, while in Theodoret they are adjacent. In Sophronius' list, however, they are separated by the inclusion of two followers of Simon Magus. From Dositheus down to Isidore, the son of Basilides, the source is predominantly Theodoret, but it is not used in sequence and is intercalated wrongly. While the name of Ebion is misplaced in relation to the order in Epiphanius and Theodoret, where it occurs later, from Carpocrates to Procles the list once more follows Theodoret's order and contents. Conversely, Cerinthus and Merinthus both come from Epiphanius. From Valentinus to Colorbasus we have the names of representatives of the Valentinian sect, with the exception of Artemon, who, as presented by Theodoret, held a doctrine similar to that of Theodotus the Tanner and his followers. Although Florinus and Blastus were adherents of Valentinus, Theodoret does not mention the three in successive order. The list from Secundus to Mark, on the other hand, mirrors the sequence of names in the *Compendium*. Colorbasus, a Valentinian, belongs with his teacher Mark, as here in Sophronius and in Hippolytus and Epiphanius, whereas in Theodoret the two names are separated. Perhaps Sophronius' list follows Epiphanius' order here, or else it relies on an anti-Valentinian source. Of the names Ademis, Theodotus the Tanner, Theodotus, and Euphrates, Ademis and Euphrates, as representatives of the Ophite Peratic school, should be together; as they are in Hippolytus and Theodoret, rather than straddling the two Theodotoi, who were both adherents of the sect which claimed that the scriptures had been interpolated.

With the names from Monoimus the Arab to Harmonius, the son of Bardesanes, we find Theodoret's sequence once more, except that Asclepiodotus in Theodoret is called Asclepiades, and is found in the company of Theodotus the Tanner and his followers, Apollonides and Hermophilus. Timothy of Constantinople also assigns Asclepiodotus (*sic*) to the sect of Theodotus. Clearly this is another example of wrong intercalation in Sophronius' list. Hermophilus, as I have said, needs to be grouped with the followers of Theodotus the Tanner, rather than left hanging after
Harmonius. Of the next three names, Cerdo, Sacerdo, and Marcion, the first and third occur together in Theodoret, but for the rest Sacerdo is unknown. The name probably derives from the corruption of an epithet attributed to Cerdo.\textsuperscript{171} Sophronius is fond of applying opprobrious epithets to heretics, but since other anti-heretical writers are as well, it is difficult to determine the point at which the corruption took place, and whether the patriarch himself was responsible for the epithet or whether he found the non-existent Sacerdo in a model. From Apelles to Synerus, with the exception of Apollonides, who should be in the company of Theodotus the Tanner, Asclepiodotus, and Hermophilus, we have the names of adherents of an offshoot of the sect of Marcion of Pontus, which are also found together in Theodoret. Theodotus the Money-changer is presented both out of context and out of the sequence given him by Theodoret. In his supposed error this Theodotus was related to Theodotus the Tanner and his circle, and is introduced immediately after them in the \textit{Compendium}. The well-known names Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla occur together in both Epiphanius and Theodoret, making it impossible to decide which served Sophronius as a source.

From Nepos to Macedonius it is difficult to discover a rationale for the order of names. The mention of two Origens does not derive from either Epiphanius or Theodoret (who does not mention Origen at all), but is a common enough occurrence in the Patristic period. Navatus and Sabbatius, who belong together and are presented as such in Timothy of Constantinople and George the Hieromonk, are separated in Sophronius' catalogue by Paul of Samosata and Noetus of Smyrna and his two disciples. Since Sabbatius was a Constantinopolitan heretic, his name may have been supplied from a source connected with that city in a way that made it difficult for the compiler of the heresiology to put him in his correct context. Noetus, Epigonus (not Epigenus, as in Sophronius), and Cleomenes all appear to come from Theodoret. Next we have Manes, whose somewhat late appearance in the list chronologically speaking may be due to the fact that in Epiphanius he occurs only after Paul of Samosata. Despite the fact that in 596 Gregory of Rome had not heard of Eudoxius, the names from Arius to Eudoxius in Sophronius' heresiology

\textsuperscript{171} See the suggestions in \textit{PG} 85 (1), 15–16, n. 4.
were all well known in the East as representatives of various shades of Arianism, so that it is not necessary to assume that they were taken over from Epiphanius or Theodoret. The name of the African heretic Donatus, on the other hand, may well derive from Theodoret, because in Epiphanius, Donatus is grouped with the Novatians.

From Macedonius to Julian the odd ones out are the western heretics Pelagius and Celestius, who are also mentioned by Timothy of Constantinople. The juxtaposition of Macedonius, Apollinaris, and Magnus with the first Council of Constantinople (381) has already been mentioned in the discussion of Sophronius’ conciliar synopsis, and the source, whether direct or indirect, established as being Justinian’s treatise On the Right Faith. It is curious that in his Homily on the Presentation the patriarch of Jerusalem mentions Apollinaris and Polemo only. While George the Hieromonk includes the Apollinarian Polemo in his heresiology, and the Doctrina Patrum contains extracts of Apollinarian works where the names of Apollinaris, Polemo, and Julian feature, Sophronius’ source here, into which Pelagius and Celestius are wrongly intercalated, may originally have been an anti-Apollinarian one. As a group the names themselves are not well known in heresiological literature—even Theodoret has Polemius for Polemo and does not speak of Julian.

As already mentioned, from Nestorius, where Theodoret leaves off, to the end of the list of heretics’ names, no source can be established for Sophronius’ heresiology. It cannot be excluded that this part of the catalogue is the patriarch’s own work.

First we are given a group of so-called Nestorians. By the Cilicians Cyrus and John are meant Cyrus, bishop of Tyre, and John, bishop of Antioch, though neither of them qualifies for the epithets Nestorian or Cilician. The fact that both of them fell foul of Cyril of Alexandria seems to have been enough to ensure their inclusion in Sophronius’ list or its model. Eutyches, Dioscorus, and Barsumas belong together, but Zooras, the anti-Chalcedonian styliste who came to Constantinople with Severus of Antioch and was included in Justinian’s condemnation of the Severans in 536, is clearly misplaced. From Timothy Aelurus down to Jacob Baradaeus we have a list of fifth- and sixth-century anti-Chalcedonians, except that the names Lampetius, Didymus, and

Evagrius are wrongly intercalated. Lampetius appears to have been a follower of Marcian of Pontus; at least a Marcianist group called Lampetianoi are mentioned by Timothy of Constantinople and Maximus Confessor. Didymus (c.313–98) and Evagrius of Pontus (945–98), who were condemned at Constantinople II for their Origenism, as Sophronius himself has told us, are also out of place, both chronologically and doctrinally, in a list of anti-Chalcedonians. Julian, Felicissimus, Gaianas, and Dorotheus appear together as being aphthartodocetists: Felicissimus and Dorotheus are not well attested in heresiologies, but Sophronius will have been well informed about this heresy, which originated in Alexandria and still numbered adherents there at the time when he composed the Synodical Letter. From Paul the Black to Damian the list of anti-Chalcedonians continues. Themistius occurs later than he should, as the Agnoetai were already in evidence in the 530s. The attention which Sophronius pays him, to the extent of describing his heresy (albeit in simplistic and negative terms), and the fact that his name is placed somewhat late, may have been occasioned by the longevity and virulence of the agnostic debate both in Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian circles. The fact that Peter the Syrian (= of Callinicum) and Sergius the Armenian are designated sarcastically as ‘the leaders of the minor tritheism’, who ‘neither agreed with each other nor held the same opinions in the same way as each other’, shows the extent of Sophronius’ familiarity with the internal politics of the anti-Chalcedonian camp. The same is true of the next entry. Damian, anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria from 578 to 607, was indeed an opponent of Peter, as Sophronius points out, and was called a Sabellian by him. It was their enmity that caused disunity between the Jacobite and Egyptian churches which opposed Chalcedon.

Athanasius the Syrian, anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (595–634), and Anastasius apoxogarios (‘the unyoker’), anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, are now anathematized by Sophronius for the union between their two churches which was effected in 616 and put an uncertain end to the schism caused by the conflict between Peter and Damian. Next in the heresiology come living heretics, Benjamin of Alexandria, and the Syrians John, Sergius, Thomas, and Severus. From this list we can confirm that Athanasius II of Antioch had died before the composition of the Synodical Letter. The common denominator between these men
is their association with Athanasius and their involvement in the union of 616 or the meeting with the emperor Heraclius at Mabbog between 629 and 634. The last ‘heretics’ to be anathematized by Sophronius are Menas, Gaianite leader of Alexandria, and his followers. Unless Menas is to be identified with the brother of Benjamin of Alexandria, in which case he was a prominent anti-Chalcedonian who was allegedly tortured for his beliefs, Sophronius here gives the sole testimony to his existence.

What we have in Sophronius’ first heresiology is a list of names which relies chiefly on Epiphanius and Theodoret down to the advent of Nestorius. Unlike Augustine, the compiler of this list did not use the compendious Anakephalaiosis as a guide, but the work of Epiphanius itself. From the time of Nestorius onwards the list probably relies on one or more sources and the patriarch’s memory. Possibly the compiler of the list also had access to other specific additional information from anti-Valentinian, anti-Apollinarian, and anti-Julianist sources.

In the first part of the heresiology the preponderance of Gnostic heretics reflects the attention paid to them in the sources used. It must be said, however, that many of these sects had disappeared completely by Sophronius’ day, indeed long before it, and the relevance of others to the christological debate in which he was involved was very slight. Some heretics anathematized by the patriarch, such as Theodotus the Tanner, Navatus, and Sabellius, deviate not qua christology but qua discipline or praxis.

The striking aspect of the first heresiology is the number of misplaced names, the most serious being those of Theodotus the Tanner and his school, where the arrangement betrays a lack of understanding and probably too of interest. Zooras seems to be grouped with the earlier Barsumas simply because they were both Syrian monks, while the conjunction of Lampetius, Didymus, and Evagrius, although chronologically correct, overlooks the fact that they represented different doctrinal positions.

Even though Sophronius has intended to be as comprehensive as possible in his list, there are a couple of surprising omissions, like Marcellus of Ancyra, who appears not only in Theodoret but is also referred to in one of the patriarch’s own homilies. Also

172 Homily on the Annunciation, PG 87 (3), 3221C: ‘the Marcelluses.’
absent is Photinus, who, together with Paul of Samosata, was commonly considered in the Patristic period to have been a christological ancestor of Nestorius. Both Marcellus and Photinus were condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 381.

On the positive side, the mention of the Julianist Felicissimus and the Gaianite Dorotheus is a welcome addition to the otherwise sparse information we have about them from other sources.\(^{175}\) In addition, the appearance of the name of Athanasius the Syrian among those of dead heretics gives us a *terminus ante quem* for the Camel-driver’s death.

Generally speaking, the list of heresies or groups of heretics as far as the Messalians displays a sequence like that found in Theodoret, but the information in the *Compendium* is added to, probably directly or indirectly from Epiphanius. This is particularly the case with the Phrygians, Pepouzians, Artotyrites, Antidicomarianites, and Hieracites. Orthographical divergences from Theodoret’s text, however, make it unlikely that the *Compendium* was used directly. The name ‘Sophians’, which appears nowhere else, seems to be a corruption of ‘Ophians’, a group which Sophronius calls ‘Ophionites’. A further oddity is the inclusion of three obscure Arian sects (Psathyrians, Curtians, and Doulians) found in Theodoret, but not a fourth (Pithicanoi), without any explicit mention of Arianism itself. Similarly, one would have expected to find Origenists, Apollinarians, and Nestorians featuring in the heresiology. In comparison with the earlier heresies, especially the Gnostics, the list from the Eutychians onwards is very sketchy.

Even more than the first, the second heresiology gives the impression of being at least second-hand. The anti-Chalcedonian groups are tacked onto the end of a list largely consisting of Gnostic sects, with no attempt even to draw a line of pedigree from the Apollinarians or Dioscorans. Furthermore, there is no obvious relationship between this list of heresies and the previous list of heresiarchs and heretics. We seem to be dealing with a not very apposite heresiology which was at Sophronius’ disposal and which he used with few amendments to give more body to his confession of faith. Apart from the six groups of anti-Chalcedonians named at the end, it is of little relevance to the
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175 See Allen and Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, 49, for the evidence on Felicissimus; Maspero, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie*, 215, 223, 232, 244, 294, and 357, on Dorotheus.
debate over the two activities in Christ. Given the union of 616 between Damianites and Petrites, and the union of 633 between Theodosians and Alexandrian Chalcedonians, more to the point would have been the inclusion of the followers of Theodosius, Damian, and Peter of Callinicum, who themselves are already anathematized in the first heresiology.

1.5.5. Conclusion

While most of the second heresiological list gives the impression of having been taken over and updated with the names of several anti-Chalcedonian sects, it is more difficult to pass judgement on the first. It is possible to argue, however, that the first half as far as Nestorius lay at the disposal of Sophronius, and that this model, with all its errors of sequence, was based chiefly on Epiphanius and Theodoret. The second part, clearly anti-Chalcedonian in tenor, contains errors and half-correct information, which the patriarch was either not interested in, or not capable of, rectifying. The closer he comes to his own time, the more expansive and vitriolic he becomes. The whole list is less a theological tour de force and a proof of orthodoxy based on the naming and anathema of scores of sects, many extinct, obscure, and half-remembered, than a polemical exercise directed against eminent anti-Chalcedonians, particularly those involved in the unions of 616 and 633. By being included in a heresiology with all heresies before them, whether these are relevant to their christology or not, they are damned by association, as well as by the patriarch’s anathema. The idea of heretical succession is, of course, inherent in the genre of heresiology.176

Finally, we need to consider a practical problem faced by Sophronius in the composition of his heresiologies: how much time was at his disposal between his election as patriarch and the dispatch of his synodika for compiling such extensive lists? It would be more likely that his model was a list of heresies to which he and others in the patriarchate of Jerusalem had access, which could be used for various purposes, being made relevant at the end to the author’s specific aim.

176 Pourkier, L’Hérésiologie, 485.
I.6 THE TEXT AND ITS TRANSMISSION

The Greek text of the *Synodical Letter* which Agatho, lector and notarios (secretary) of the patriarch of Constantinople, read out at the eleventh session of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (680/1) was that of Sophronius' *synodika* to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople.\(^{177}\) It was this version which received a respectable Latin rendering when the Greek originals in the conciliar proceedings were translated in Rome during the years 682–701.\(^{178}\) The Greek text of the *Letter* and its Latin translation were edited by I. D. Mansi in volume XI of his collection of conciliar documents, and in 1990 received a modern edition at the hands of Rudolf Riedinger in *ACO* ser. sec. I, 410–94. The translation of the *Synodical Letter* below, which is the first complete version of the document to appear in a modern language,\(^{179}\) is essentially based on Riedinger's Greek text, although sometimes his punctuation and division into paragraphs are amended.

The document has also been transmitted in its entirety in Greek in another recension of the exemplar sent to Sergius, and in the version sent to Honorius of Rome, which differs appreciably from the text which went to the patriarch of Constantinople.\(^{180}\) In addition there is a number of abridged Greek versions of the *Synodical Letter*, one of which was published by Archimandrite Hippolytos in 1922.\(^{181}\) As already mentioned, an interpolated extract from the *Letter* sent to Honorius survives in the *Doctrina Patrum*. Parts of the work were used by later Byzantine writers.

---


\(^{179}\) A German paraphrase, rather than a translation, is found in H. Straubinger, 'Die Lehre des Patriarchen Sophronios von Jerusalem über die Trinität, die Incarnation und die Person Christi', *Der Katholik*, 87 (1907), 61–108, 175–98, and 251–65; there is a partial French translation in von Schönborn, *Sophronie*, 201–9.


\(^{181}\) Archimandrite Hippolytos, 'Σοφρονίων τοι ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Τερσολίμων λόγος δογματικός περὶ πίστεως', *Nēa Σιών*, 17 (1922), 178–86.
such as Nicephorus I of Constantinople. In fact, a large number of fragments survives, thanks to the free-standing nature of four of its sections: those on the Trinity, the incarnation, the synods, and the heresies.\footnote{See further Riedinger, ‘Die Nachkommen’, 92–4.}
PART 2

THE SYNODICAL LETTER

TEXT AND TRANSLATION
Epistula Synodica*

Δεσπότη τὰ πάντα ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ Σεργίῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Σωφρόνιος ἁρχεῖος δοῦλος τῆς ἁγίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πόλεως.

2.1.1. Βαβαί, βαβαί, παμμακάριστοι, πῶς μοι φίλον νῦν τὸ ἡσυχεῖν καὶ πολύ τοῦ πρὶν προσφιλέστερον, ἀφ’ οὗτος εἰς ἡσυχίας ἀπρόγνως εἰς πραγμάτων τίρβην ἐλήλυθα καὶ χειραίσι ταῖς καταντλοῦμαι τοῖς κύμαις βαβαί, βαβαί, θεοτίμητοι, πῶς μοι νῦν ἤδη τὸ ἐλάχιστον καὶ τοῦ πρὶν ὑμῶν μετρών ἡδύτερον, ἀφ’ οὗτος ἐκ κοπρίας καὶ γῆς καὶ ἀφάτου καὶ πολλῆς ταπεινότητος εἰς θόκον ἑραρχικὸν ἀνεληλυθά καὶ πολὺν όρῳ συνεξενυμένον τὸν κλύδωνα καὶ τὸν κλύδωνα παρόματούντα τῶν κύνδυνων· οὐκ οὕτω γὰρ ἡδύτα καθοράται τὰ ἡδύτα πρὸ τῆς τῶν ἁγιῶν πείρας καὶ γνώσεως, ὡς ὅταν [412] μετὰ πείρας καὶ ἔφοδον τῶν λυπηρῶν καταφαίνεται. οὕτως ὑγεία τοῖς μεθ’ ὑγείαν νοσούσι τρισόθητος, οὕτω γαλήνη τοῖς μετὰ γαληνῆς χειμαζομένοις ἐπίχαρτος, οὕτω πλοῦτος τοῖς μετὰ πλούτου πενομένους ἔρασμος, καὶ πάντα τῆς οὕτως ἀν ἵκναι τινονεντα, αὐτὰ μὲν οὕτα καὶ μένοντα φυσικῆ καὶ ὀσιῶδει ποιότητι, ὀποίοπερ καὶ πρὸ τῆς τῶν ἐναντίων πείρας ἐφαινοτέρα, κομψότερα δὲ μετὰ τὴν τοῦτον γνώσιν γνώσεων καὶ τοῖς αὐτὰ δεδεγνεμένοις πολὺ τιμιώτερα, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ποθεινότερα καὶ τερπνότερα.

2.1.2. Καὶ τούτῳ ἡμῖν Ἰωβ ὁ ἀοίδημος συμββῃμιται λαμπρότατα διὰ πείρας ἐκατέρων γενόμενος καὶ τὰς ψῆφους ὅρθας ὅριζόμενος, καὶ δίκαιος ἐν εἴῃ κριτῆς τῶν λεγομένων ἡμῖν προερχόμενος καὶ κρίσιν ὅριζον ἀπροσκληνή καὶ ἀδέκαστον, τὶ οὗν ἑκείνος ὁ ἀθλητῆς

* Numbers between square brackets refer to pages in Riedinger’s text; otherwise brackets mark a word or letter that should be deleted; pointed brackets signal an insertion, more often than not supplied from the Latin translation of the conciliar uta edited by Riedinger.
To the most holy Master in all things, and most blessed brother and fellow minister, Sergius,¹ archbishop and patriarch of Constantinople, Sophronius, useless servant (cf. Luke 17: 10) of the holy city of Christ our God [sends greetings].

2.1. INTRODUCTION

1. Oh! Oh! most blessed One, how dear to me now is tranquillity, and how much dearer than before, now that I have come from tranquil freedom into a turmoil of affairs and am engulfed by waves on land, as it were. Oh! Oh! one honoured by God, how sweet to me now is a lowly estate, and not a little sweeter than before, now that I have risen up from the dung-heap and the earth and from unspeakable and great lowliness to the high-priestly chair; and I see the great waves surging about it and the danger accompanying the waves. For delights are not perceived as delights in the same way before the experience and knowledge of vexations, as when they appear after the experience and onslaught of sorrows. So to those who are ill after having been healthy, health is thrice longed for; so to those tossed about in a storm after calm weather, calm weather is longed-for joy; so to those poor who were once wealthy, wealth is wholly desirable. And one may see that everything happens in this way—the very things that exist and remain in their natural and essential quality even as they appeared to be before the experience of their contraries, become more pleasant after one does have knowledge of them [sc. their contraries], and much more precious, not to say more longed for and more enjoyable, to those who have received them.

2. And in this regard, the celebrated Job will most clearly vote in our favour. Since he has experience of both and defines correct judgments, he would also be a just judge of what we have said, were he to come forward and determine a sentence which is impartial and unbribed. What, then, does that undefeated athlete

¹ This is the only occasion in the entire letter where Sergius is mentioned by name.
φησιν ὁ ἀδάμαστος ἰδιῶν τῶν παθῶν τὴν μετάβλησιν καὶ τῶν λυπούντων ἐλθὼν εἰς ἑπίκλυσιν;

2.1.3. Τίς ἂν με θείη κατὰ μήνα ἐμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν,
ὁν μὲ ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλαξεν;
ὡς ὁτε ἦν γει ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μου,
οτε τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπορευόμην ἐν σκότει;
ὁτε ἡμη ἐπιβρίθον ὅδοις,
ὁτε ὁ κύριος ἑπισκοπήν ἑποιεῖτο τοῦ αὐκον μου;
ὁτε ἡμῆν ὑλώδης λίαι κύκλω δὲ μου οἱ παιδες;
ὁτε ἐχέοντο μου αἱ ὅδοι βουτύρω,
τά δὲ ὅρη μου ἐχεόντο γάλακτι;
ὁτε ἐπορευόμην ὅρθριος ἐν πόλει,
ἐν δὲ πλατείας ἐτύθετο μου ὁ δίφρος.

2.1.4. Οὐκόν εἰκότως κἀγὼ, μακαριώτατοι, σὺν Ἰωβ τῷ
πεντάθλῳ βοήσομαι τῶν πάλαι μου προσόντων καλῶν τῇ μνήμῃ
βαλλόμενοι: γαληνὸς ταῦτα βίος ἢ καὶ ζύχιος καὶ ταπεινότης
οὐδένα γινώσκουσα κλίῳνα.

τίς ἂν με θείη κατὰ μήνα ἐμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν,
ὁν μὲ ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλαττεν ἀθλιτον;
ὡς ὁτε ἦν γει ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μου
ἐρημιαίαν βιοίντος ζωῆν καὶ ἄκμαντον,
[414] ὁτε τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπορευόμην ἐν σκότει,
οτε τῆς θυσίας ἐτρύγων τοὺς βότρυνας,
ὁτε γαληνής ἐβριθομήν γενήσας,
ὁτε ἀταραξίας ἐτρύφων βλαστήμασιν,
ὁτε ἁμημηνίας ἡγαλλίων τὸις ἄνθεοι,
ὁτε ἀθροίᾳ ἐστεφανοῦμην τοῖς κάλυξιν,
ὁτε ἀπραγμοσύνην ἡστιώμην ταῖς χάρισιν,
say on seeing the change of fortunes and on approaching a flood of sorrowful events?\(^2\)

3. Who will bring me back to the month of former days,  
the days when God safeguarded me;  
as when his lamp shone over my head;  
when in darkness I walked by his light;  
when I was steadfast in my ways;  
when the Lord kept oversight of my house;  
when I was exceedingly prosperous,  
with my children circled around me;  
when my paths flowed with butter,  
and the mountains flowed for me with milk;  
when I went out early to the city  
and my seat was placed in the squares;  
on seeing me the young men retired,  
the old men rose to their feet;  
the leaders stopped talking, putting a finger on their lips,  
and my hearers deemed me blessed (Job 29: 2–10).

4. Surely, then, it is reasonable, O most blessed One, that I too should cry out with Job, winner of the pentathlon, since I am struck by the memory of the good things that once belonged to me. Life was calm with these things and tranquil, and my lowly position knew of no flood.

Who will bring me back to the month of former days,  
the days when God safeguarded me from oppression?  
As when his lamp shone over my head (Job 29: 2–3)  
when I was leading a peaceful and unbuffeted life,  
when in darkness I walked by his light (Job 29: 4),  
when I gathered the grape-clusters of tranquillity;  
when I was weighed down by the produce of calm weather;  
when I fared sumptuously on the fruits of serenity;  
when I delighted in the blossoms of freedom from care;  
when I was crowned with the buds of fearlessness;  
when I feasted on carefreeness with the graces;

ὅτε τῆς ἐπιγείου πενίας ἀπῆλαυν,
ὅτε τῆς ἀκωδόνου κοσμίας ἦρων τοὺς αὐλακας,
ὅτε τῆς ἀκμαμάτου πτωχείας τὴν βάλατταν ἐπλέον,
ὅτε τῆς χθαμαλῆς ἐστίας ἐγαννήμην τοῖς κάλλεσιν,
ὅτε τῆς χαματρόφου διαίτης μάνιν τὸ μελίρρυτον ἠσθιον·

ἀλλος τις Ἡρακλῆς καὶ αὐτὸς θεωρούμενος καὶ τρυφήν τρυφῶν
εἰρηνικῆς καὶ οὐράνιον ἀνευ γογγυσμοῦ καὶ γνώμης ἀγνώμονος.

2.1.5. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ταύτα καὶ τούτων πέρα, σοφώτατοι, εἰς ἐμὲ τὸν
τρισάθλιον ἀνάγκη μεγάλη καὶ βία θεοφιλῶν κληρικῶν καὶ εὐλαβῶν
μοναστών λαϊκῶν, τῶν πάντων πολιτῶν τῆς ἀγίας
taxής Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πόλεως, τῶν χειρός με βιασμαμένων καὶ
tυραννίδο δρασάντων, γεγέντα, οὐδὲ οὐδὲ οὐδὲ ἐπισταμαι
κρίμασιν, ἀξιῶ τοὺς πανέρους ὑμᾶς καὶ προτρέπομαι μή μόνον
εὐχαίρις καθαραίς ταῖς πρὸς κύριον ἐπικουρεῖν ἐμοὶ βιωτικῶς
βαλλεσάντοι ἑτα τε καὶ κυνδυνεύοντι καὶ οτιρίζειν 
με μικροψυχίας ὀκλάζομαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοπνευστοὶ διδάγμασιν ποδηγεῖν πρὸς
τὴν τῶν πρακτεῶν ἐγχειρήσιν, τοῦτο μὲν ὡς πατέρας καὶ φύσαντες,
tοῦτο δὲ ὡς ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ὑμαῖλοσ. δότη γα νῦν ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ πατρικὸς
tε καὶ ἀδελφικός τὰ αἰτήματα δίκαια τε τυγχάνοντα, κάγω ταῖς
ὑμετέραις ποδηγίαις ἐφέρομαι καὶ συμπλοκῆ την πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσομαι,
ἡν ἡ πίστις συνδεῖ τοὺς ἀμόφρονας καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς συναινοῦ
τοὺς εὐθύφρονας καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη συνδεσμοὶ τοὺς θεόφρονας· ὅπως τὸ
σχοινίον τὸ ἐντριμον καὶ τριμήν τοῦτον τῶν τείνων ἀρετῶν [416]
συμπλεκόμενον οὔτε λύσαν ἐπίστασιν, οὔτε ῥήξων ὑφίσταται οὔτε
χωρισμόν παραδέχεται, ἀλλ’ ἔσται ἀληθὸς ἀδιάρρηκτον εἰς μίν
συνάγων εὐδεβείαν τοὺς τὴν πλοκὴν αὐτὸν πλούτον τὴν
ἐνθεον.

2.1.6. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τις ἀποστολικὴ καὶ ἀρχαία παράδοσις ἐν ταῖς
κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμενήν ἁγίας <τοῦ θεοῦ> ἐκκλησίαις
κεκράτηκεν, ὡποὶ οἱ πρὸς ἱεραρχίαν ἁγόμενοι τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν τῶν
when I enjoyed earthly poverty;
when I tilled the furrows of the dung-heap without danger;
when I sailed the sea of penury unbeset by waves;
when I was happy with the adornments of a lowly hearth;
when I ate the manna, flowing with honey (Exod. 16), of the diet
which nourishes us below—
another Israel, as it were, myself both contemplating and faring
plentifully on peaceful and heavenly fare without murmuring (1 Pet.
4: 9) and unfeeling judgment?

5. These things, then, most wise One, and more besides have
come upon me, thrice afflicted by great necessity and by force on
the part of the God-loving clerics and devout monks and faithful
laity—all the citizens of this holy city of Christ our God—who
forced me by hand and used tyrannous methods, due to judg-
ments of a kind I do not know or understand. 3 I therefore beseech
and urge Your All-holy Self not only to come to my help by your
pure prayers to the Lord as I sail on life’s sea, and am hence also in
peril, and support me as I labour in weakness of spirit, but also to
guide me by God-inspired teachings to undertake deeds, doing the
one as father and begetter, the other as brother and kin by blood. 4
Do You therefore both paternally and fraternally grant me my
petitions, which are just ones, and I shall follow Your guidance
and so secure the bond with you, in which faith ties together
those of like mind, and hope brings into agreement those of right
mind, and love binds together those of godly mind (cf. 1 Cor.
13: 13). Their three-stranded cord, woven together from those
three divine virtues, neither knows undoing, nor admits of
rending, nor allows separation, but truly cannot be rent asunder,
leading together into one pious belief those who are enriched by
its divine weaving.

6. An apostolic and ancient tradition 5 has prevailed in the holy
churches of God throughout the whole world, whereby those
acceding to the hierarchy frankly refer in all respects to those who

1 This appears to be a modesty topos. See sec. 1.4.1, above.
4 The recurring contrast between father and brother, referring to two patriarchs,
belongs to the genre of the synodical letter. See sec. 1.5.1, above.
5 The origins of the custom are obscure. See sec. 1.5.1, above. On the implications
of the following passage for Sophronius’ stance with regard to Rome see sec. 1.2,
above. Sophronius implicitly proves his orthodoxy by comparing himself to Paul in
going to Jerusalem, sharing in apostolic teaching, and passing it on safe and sound.
ἐσφαλὼς παραδέδωκεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κενὸν τὰ δρομήματα τεύχοιεν, κενὸς γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἀπαίσι ὁ δρόμος ἔγινετο ἀδικουμένης κατὰ τὴν πίστευς. Ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὁ θεσπέσιος ὁ θεός φωνῶν ἀκροασάμενος καὶ οὐδενῶν αὐτοῦ ἔσχηξεν παιδευτήριοι καὶ παραδείσουθε νεώμενοι πρόωροι καὶ ἤμων ἐτέρους ἀρρήτως ἀνθρώπους πυθόμενος ἐδείχε καὶ ἔτρεμε καὶ, ὡς αὐτὸς φησιν, ἐπεφυγεῖτο μῆτες ἄλλους κηρύξας Χριστῷ τὸ σωτήριον κήρυγμα αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένηται, ὅθεν καὶ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμων ἀνήρχετο ὁ Χριστὸς μαθητὴς ἐπουρανίως καὶ τοῖς πρὸ αὐτοῦ θείοις μαθηταῖς ὑπεκλίνετο καὶ τὸ εἰσαγγελικὸν ὅπερ ἐκήρυξε διδάγμα τῶν τῶν ἄλλων δοκούσι προξένων ἐγνώριζε καὶ κοινωνίας αὐτοῦ ἐποιεῖτο τοῦ δόγματος τὸ ἁσφαλεῖς εκεῖνω μυστηρεύομενος καὶ τοῖς μετ’ αὐτὸν δεχομένωις αὐτοῦ τὰ διδάγματα τύποι ἀπαίσι σωτηρίας γενόμενοι ἀριστοὶ τοῖς ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτοῦ βουλομένοις τοῖς ἐκνεύσει τούτων τοιαύτων καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ ἐθεὶ δουλεύοντες καὶ νόμον ἠγούµενοι κάλλιστον πᾶν τὸ τοῖς πάλιν πρεσπόντως γενός αὐτοῦ ἀποστολικῖ αὐτοῦ κρατυνθήσεται ἐγχειρήματι, τὸ ὡς ἐχθεῖν περὶ πίστεως γράφομεν καὶ τοῖς θεοπάθοις υἱῶν πρὸς δοκήσαι ἀποστελλόμενος, ἵνα μὴ ὃριας μεταπεθεῖνοι αἰώνια, ἀπερ ἡμῶν οἱ πατερεὶς ἐθεῖντο, δόξωμεν, οὐ διακρίνων μοῦν εἴδοσιν ἀπὸ τῶν νόθων τὰ δόκιμα δόγματα, ἄλλα καὶ προσαναπληθοῦν τὰ λείποντα [418] διὰ τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ τελείαν ἀγάπην δυναμεῶν αἰκρίνως καὶ ἰσχύσας. ἔκεινα γοῦν λέξων ἔλευσαμεν, ἀπερ ἀπ' ἀρχής ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ καθολικῇ τεθείς καὶ τραφεῖς ἐκμεμάθηκα καὶ εἰς ἀπαλῶν φρονεῖν ὑμῶν παρείληφα καὶ κηρυττόντων ὑμῶν τῶν θεοπνεῦστων ἀκήκοα.
have administered the high-priesthood before them, as to how they should think and maintain the faith which the most wise Paul has handed on to them with the utmost safeguards, lest they run their course in vain (Gal. 2: 2), for their entire course becomes vain if the faith is harmed in any respect. For that prophetic man, who listened to God’s utterances and had heaven itself as his school, and became a beholder of paradise before his time, and heard things that could not be told (2 Cor. 12: 4) to other human beings, was in dread and trepidation, and, as he says himself, was thoroughly afraid lest, after announcing to others the saving message of Christ, he himself should be disqualified (1 Cor. 9: 27). Hence Christ’s heavenly disciple also went up to Jerusalem and submitted himself to the divine disciples who were before him, and made known the Gospel teaching which he preached to those who seemed to be superior to others, and made them party to his doctrine, ensuring a safeguard for himself and for those after him who receive his teachings, becoming an excellent model of salvation for all those who wished to follow in his footsteps. Accordingly we also observe this custom, and, because we deem an excellent law all that was done fittingly by older generations, especially when confirmed by apostolic practice, we write how it stands with us concerning the faith, and we send it to You, wise in the things of God, to be tested, lest we seem to have changed the ancient landmarks which our fathers positioned (Prov. 22: 28). You not only know how to distinguish acceptable teachings from spurious ones but also are able, through the perfect love of Christ, to supply what is lacking (2 Cor. 9: 12) accurately and firmly. It is those teachings, then, of which I shall discourse, teachings which I, having been born and reared in the holy catholic church, learned thoroughly from the beginning and received as the way to think from childhood, and heard You, who are inspired by God, preach.

---

5 On the position of Jerusalem vis-à-vis Rome and Constantinople at this time see Conte, Chiesa e primato, 126–7, n. 22.

7 Probably we are not to take the word ‘preaching’ as meaning that Sophronius was inspired by Sergius’ homilies. Rather, by claiming that his profession of faith has been influenced by Sergius, the patriarch of Jerusalem intends to demonstrate his oneness of belief with the patriarch of Constantinople.
2.2.1. Πιστεύω τούς, μακάριοι, καθάπερ ἀρχήθεν πεπίστευκα, εἰς ἑνα θεον πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ἀναρχον παντελώς καὶ αἵδιον, πάντων ὄρατων τε καὶ ἀναράτων ποιήτων, καὶ εἰς ἑνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ὑμῶν τὸν θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἁίδιον καὶ ἀπαθώς εἰς αὐτοῦ γεγονήτα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς καὶ οὐκ ἀλλὴ ἀρχὴν ἢ τὸν πατέρα γνώσκοντα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀλλοθεν ποθεν ἢ ἕκ τοῦ πατρὸς τῆν ὑπόστασιν ἔχοντα, φῶς ἐκ φωτός ὁμοούσιον, θεον ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ συναίδιον, καὶ εἰς ἐν πνεύμα ἀγίων τὸ αἵδιον ἕκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύομεν, τὸ φῶς καὶ θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸ γνωριζόμενον καὶ ὅν ἀληθῶς πατρί καὶ ὑιῷ συναίδιον, ὁμοούσιόν τε καὶ ὀμόφυλον καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας τε καὶ φύσεως, ὑσαύτως δὲ καὶ θεότητος.

2.2.2. Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὁμότιμον καὶ ὁμόθρονον, συμφυά καὶ συγγενή καὶ ὁμόφυλον, εἰς μίαν συνεκεφαλαιομένην θεότητα καὶ εἰς μίαν συναγομενήν κοινήν κυριότητα ἀνει προσωπικής ἀναχώσεως καὶ ὑποστασικής ἐκτός συναίρεσεως, τριάδα γὰρ ἐν μονάδι πιστεύομεν καὶ μονάδα ἐν τριάδι δοξάζομεν, τριάδα μὲν ταῖς τρισὶν ὑποστάσεις, μονάδα δὲ τῷ μοναδικῷ τῆς θεότητος. ἦ τε γὰρ ἄγια τριάς ἀριθμητὴ ταις προσωπικαίς ἐστιν ὑποστάσεις, ἦ τε πανογία μονᾶς πάσης ἐκτός ἐστιν ἀριθμήσεως, καὶ ἦ μὲν ἄδιαφρετον ἔχει διαφέρειν καὶ αὐθύχυτον φέρει συνάφειαν, διαιρομένη γὰρ ταῖς ἀριθμητῆς ὑποστάσει καὶ ἀριθμομεμένη ταῖς προσωπικαῖς [420] ἔτεροτησι τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἦνοται καὶ τὸν πανελήμερον οὐ προσέταται, ἦ τε μονᾶς ἑναλὰ τῇ ἐστίν καὶ αὐθύχυς καὶ πάσαν φεύγει τὴν κατ᾽ οὐσίαν ἀριθμησιν, εἰς γὰρ θεὸς ἦμιν ἀφαρτά πιστεύεται, ὅτι καὶ θεότης μία διαπροσώπου
2.2. TRINITARIAN PROFESSION OF FAITH

1. I believe then, O blessed One, as I have believed from the beginning; in one God, Father almighty, entirely without beginning and eternal, maker of all things both seen and unseen; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten eternally and impassibly from the same God and Father, and acknowledging no other beginning than the Father, nor having his hypostasis from any other source than from the Father; consubstantial light from light, co-eternal true God from true God; and in one Holy Spirit, who issues eternally from the God and Father, the light that is itself recognized as being likewise God and is truly co-eternal with Father and Son, and both consubstantial and of the same stock, and of the same substance and nature and likewise also of Godhead.

2. [I believe] in a Trinity that is consubstantial, and of the same honour and of the same throne, sharing nature, sharing kinship, and of the same stock, in one consummate Godhead and in one united common lordship without confusion of persons, and with no contraction of hypostasis. For we believe in a Trinity in unity, and we glorify unity in trinity, a Trinity in the three hypostases and a unity in the singleness of the Godhead; for the holy Trinity has number in the hypostases of persons, whereas the all-holy unity is wholly without number, and has an indivisible division and sustains an unconfused conjunction. For while it is divided in its numerable hypostases and numbered in the differences of its persons, it is united in the identity of its essence and its nature, and does not admit of complete partition. The unity is both unitary and unaggregated and shuns all numeration according to substance. For we believe in one God unshakeably, because both one

---

8 For another trinitarian profession of faith in Sophronius see Homily on the Annunciation, PG 87, 3217B–3224B. Cf. von Schönborn, Sophron, 119–56.
9 The Greek ἀπαρχή indicates that the Father is identified as the one who has no principle, no source, no cause, himself being the principle, the source, and the cause of the Son and the Spirit.
10 A philosophical term, hypostasis was used particularly in Chalcedonian christological discourse in the sense of concrete reality, as opposed to nature (physis). By anti-Chalcedonians it was seen as the equivalent of nature and of person (prosopon). See further PGL s.n., 1459, B 2.
12 The foregoing is inspired largely by the creed of Nicaea. Cf. Tanner, i. *5.
κηρύττεται, καὶ τριάδι προσώπων γινώσκεται καὶ εἰς κύριος ἡμῶν ἀναγγέλλεται, ὅτι καὶ κυρίότης μία βεβαιῶς διέγνωσται, καὶ τρισὶν ὑποστάσει δείκνυται.

2.2.3. Οὖτε καθὸ εἰς θεός ὁ θεός καὶ μία θεότης, ἐστὶ διαφόρομενος καὶ εἰς τρεῖς θεόν καὶ εἰς τρεῖς θεότητας έκφερόμενος· οὔτε καθὸ εἰς κύριοι, ὅ εἰς κύριοι διωστάμενος καὶ εἰς κύριοις τρεῖς εὐρύχωρος ἡ κυρίοτητα τρεῖς πλατυχωρός. Αρειάνων τὸ δυσσεβήμα εἰς ἀνίσους θεόν τὸν ἑνα κατατέμνων θεόν καὶ εἰς ἀνομοίους θεότητας τὴν μίαν μερίζον θεότητα καὶ εἰς ἐτερογενεῖς τρεῖς κυριότητας τὴν μιᾶν διωστὸν κυριότητα· οὔτε καθὸ τριάς ὁ εἰς θεός ἐστι καὶ γνωρίζεται καὶ ὑποστάσεις τρεῖς καταγγέλλεται καὶ τρία προσβεβείται πρόσωπα, καὶ παθήρ καὶ νόδος καὶ πνεῦμα ἁγίον, λέγεται συστελλόμενος ἡ συντιθέμενος ἡ συγχεόμενος, καὶ εἰς μιᾶν ἑαυτῶν συναλείφων ὑπόστασιν καὶ εἰς ἐν συγκρίνου ὁὐκ ἀριθμοῦμενον πρόσωπον. Σαββατιανῶν τὸ ἀνόμημα εἰς μίαν τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις συγχέων ὑπόστασιν καὶ εἰς ἐν τὰ τρία συμβοῦν πρόσωπα πρόσωπον. οὐ γὰρ τριάς, ὁ δυσσεβέστατος, τοῦ πρὸς ἐν καθ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ τριάς συναχθῆσεται πρόσωπον καὶ πρὸς μίαν δράμοις συγκεχυμένην ὑπόστασιν; ἡ ποῦ μοῦν, ὁ μανικώστατος, εἰ πρὸς ὑπὸς πρὸς τρεῖς ἡ μοῦν ἑξαχθῆσεται καὶ πρὸς φύσεις πρὸς τρεῖς πλατυθησεῖται καὶ πρὸς θεότητας τρεῖς πληθυνθῆσεται; ἀνεβάς γὰρ παρ’ ὀρθοδόξοις ἐκάτερον καὶ πάντῃ τῆς εὐσεβείας εξώκειλε τὸ τῆς μοναδικῶν καθ’ ὑπόστασιν τὸ τε τριαδικῶν ἐν ταῖς φύσεσι. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς Ἰονδαίῳμον εὐθὺς ἀποφέρεται καὶ ἑαυτῷ συναποφέρει τὸν λέγοντα, τὸ δὲ πρὸς Ἑλληνικὸν[422]μον ἐκκυλύεται καὶ ἑαυτῷ συνεκκυλώνει τὸν φάσκοντα· καὶ ἡ πάντως Ἑλληνίζει ὁ τούτο μανικῶς.
Godhead is manifestly proclaimed, although it is acknowledged in a trinity of persons, and one Lord is announced to us, because one lordship too is firmly discerned, although it is shown forth in three hypostases.

3. Neither is God as one God and one Godhead divided and partitioned into three gods or drawn out into three godheads; nor is the Lord as one Lord separated and extended into three lords or widened into three lordships.14 (The Arians' impiety divides the one God into unequal gods and partitions the one Godhead into dissimilar godheads, and separates the one lordship into three heterogeneous lordships.15) Nor as the one God is a Trinity and is recognized and proclaimed as three hypostases and worshipped as three persons, Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, is he said to be contracted or compounded or confused, that is, by coalescing himself into one hypostasis and combining [himself] into one person that cannot be numbered. (The unlawful view of the Sabellians confuses the three hypostases into one hypostasis and mixes up the three persons into one person.16) For where is the Trinity, you most impious people, if, according to you, the Trinity is assembled in one person and comes together into one confused hypostasis? Or where is the unity, you maddest of men,17 if the unity is drawn out into three essences and widened into three natures and multiplied into three godheads? For with the orthodox each of these is impious and drifts wholly astray from pious belief, whether unitarian in respect of hypostasis or triadic in the natures. The former is carried off directly into Judaism and carries off the speaker with it,18 the latter rolls aside towards paganism and rolls the exponent away with it.19 And either the one who

---

14 A similar argument is found in Gregory of Nazianzus, Or. 39. 11 (cf. CPG 3010); SC 358, 170–2.
13 This charge is based on an Arian position that Christ was a kind of demigod, not fully divine but created, and therefore not consubstantial with the Father.
15 Sabellius, an obscure theologian, probably of the early third century, gave his name to a doctrine whereby the unity of the Godhead was so stressed that it was viewed in terms of 'modes' rather than persons distinguishable in it. See EEC 2, 748–9.
17 The Arians are meant here.
18 By exaggeration the Sabellians are said to approach Judaic monotheism because of their emphasis on unity within the Trinity.
19 Also by exaggeration the Arians are described as approaching pagan polytheism because they assimilate the sophistications of late pagan philosophy by reckoning the Trinity in terms of neo-Platonic emanationism.
2.2.4. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καλῶς τοῖς θεολόγοις τεθέσπισται μονίδα μὲν ἡμᾶς φρονεῖν μᾶκα καὶ ἐναία θεότητι καὶ τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς οὐσίωδους τε καὶ φυσικῆς κυρίότητος, τρία δὲ ταῖς ἀσυνχώτοις τρισὶν ὑποστάσει καὶ τῷ διαφόρῳ τῆς τρισαρίθμου προσωπικῆς ἐπερήτητος, ἵνα μήτε τὸ ἐν μείνῳ Σαβέλλιῳ πάντη ἐν θεοροῦμεν καὶ πᾶσαν ὑποστατικὴν πληθὺν ἢκτρεπομένον, μήτε τὰ τρία σεμισίοι τὸν Ἀρεον τρία διαμπάξ προσονύμενα καὶ πᾶσαν μοναδικὴν φωνὴν διωβοῦμεν θεότητος καὶ οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως. ὡσπερ οὖν ἐνα θεόν φρονεῖν ἔδιδαχθημεν, οὕτω καὶ μίαν θεότητα καθομολογεῖν παρειλήφαμεν, καὶ ὡσπερ ὑποστάσεις τρεῖς πρεσβεύειν ἐμάθομεν, οὕτω καὶ πρόσωπα τρία δοξολογεῖν ἐπαλεεύθημεν, οὐκ ἄλλον τὸν ἐνα θεόν παρὰ τὰ τρία γενώσκοντες πρόσωπα, οὕτω τὰ τρία τῆς τριάδος ὄμουσια πρόσωπα, ἀπερ ἐστίν ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ ὅσιος, τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἄγιον, ἔτερα παρὰ τὸν ἐνα θεόν ἐπιστάμενοι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τὰ τρία ἐν ὁ ἡ θεότης κηρύττομεν καὶ τὰ τρία ἐν ὧν ἡ θεότης ἐστὶν ἐξαγγέλλομεν—ἡ τὸ γε ἀριθμόσεων ἐπισει καὶ σαφέστερον, ἢ ἡ θεότης ἐστὶ καὶ γινώσκεται. τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐν ἐστὶ καὶ τρία πιστεύεται καὶ τρία δοξάζεται καὶ ἐν ἀληθῶς ἀναγέλλεται καὶ οὕτω τὸ ἐν, ἢ ἐν ἐστὶ, τρία λαμβάνεται, οὕτω τὰ τρία, καθὸ τρία τυχάνει, ἐν ἐξακούστηται, ὁ καὶ παράδοξον καὶ πάσης ὄντως γέμων ἐκπλήξεως. τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ καὶ ἀριθμοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ διαφέυγει τὴν ἐξαρίθμησιν· ἀριθμοῦ μὲν ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ τροσυαίς ὑποστάσει, διαφεύγουν δὲ τὴν ἀρίθμησιν τῷ ἐνικῷ τῆς [424] θεότητος, τὸ γὰρ ἐνικὸν αὐτὸν τῆς οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ἀριθμεῖσθαι παντελῶς οὐκ ἀνέχεται, ἵνα μὴ καὶ διαφοράν εἰσούσι θεότητος καὶ λοιπὸν οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως καὶ πολυθεῖν τὴν μοναρχίαν ἐργάζοντο. πάς γὰρ ἀριθμὸς τὴν διαφοράν κέκτηται σύνοικον καὶ πᾶσα διαφορά καὶ διάκρισις τὸν ἀριθμόν ανεπάγεται σύμφωναν.
asserts the latter madly with Arius is a thoroughgoing pagan, or the
one who impiously accepts the former with Sabellius is a Judaizer.

4. On this account it has been well decreed by the theologians
that we should think of the unity in one, single Godhead and in
the identity of essential and natural lordship, but of the Trinity
in three unconfused hypostases and in the difference of the three-
fold distinction of persons, so that neither should the one await
Sabellius by being perceived as wholly one and shunning all
plurality of hypostasis, nor should the three make Arius vain by
being conceived through and through as three while repudiating
every unitarian expression of Godhead and essence and nature.
As, therefore, we have been taught to think of one God, so too
have we received the tradition of confessing one Godhead; and
just as we have learned to worship three hypostases, so too have
we been instructed to glorify three persons, not acknowledging the
one God apart from the three persons, nor understanding the
three consubstantial persons in the Trinity—that is, Father,
Son, Holy Spirit—as being distinct from the one God. This is why
we proclaim as one the three in whom the Godhead is, and we
announce as one the three of whom is the Godhead; or, to speak
more accurately and more clearly, the three whom the Godhead is
and as whom it is recognized. For the same thing is both one and
is believed in as three and is glorified as three and is announced in
truth as one. 20 And neither is the one, by virtue of being one, taken
to be three, nor are the three, inasmuch as they are three, under-
stood as one, which is both paradoxical and truly replete
with utter amazement. For the same thing is both numerable and
shuns numeration: it is numerable in its triple hypostases, but
shuns numeration in the singularity of the Godhead, in that the
singularity of its essence and nature is utterly intolerant of being
numbered, in order that one may neither introduce a difference
of Godhead and, further, of essence and nature, or render the
monarchy as a polytheism. 21 For all number possesses difference
das a corollary, and all difference and distinction brings with it an
associated number. 22

21 This is an allusion to the Arian and tritheist positions, which are made explicit in
what follows.
22 The same citation, which is transmitted anonymously, is found in Doctrina Patrum,
252, 2–4.
2.2.5. Ἀριθμεῖται γοῦν ἡ μακαρία τριάς οὐκ οὐσίας καὶ φύσεις καὶ διαφόρως θεότητος ἡ τρισαίς κυριότητα, ἀπαγε, ὡς Ἀρείου μαίνοντας καὶ οἵ τῆς νέας τριθείας λυπώσων ἢγούμενοι, οὐδεις τρεῖς καὶ φύσεις τρεῖς καὶ τρεῖς κυριότητοι καὶ τρεῖς ὀμοίας κενολογούντες θεότητας, ἀλλ' ὑποστάσει καὶ ἰδιότητι νοεραίς τελεῖαις καθ' ἑαυτὰς ὑφεστώσεις, ἀριθμὸς διαμεταίς καὶ οὗ διαμεταί τῇ θεότητι. διαβρείτας γὰρ ἀδιαβρετός ἡ παναγία τριὰς καὶ διηρημένῳ πάλιν συνάτηται τοῖς γὰρ προσώποις τῆν διαφέρειν ἤχουσα ἀδιαβρετος μένει καὶ ἀτμητος οὐσία καὶ φύσει, ὀσαύτως δὲ καὶ θεότητι. καὶ διὰ τούτο ὡστε τρεῖς θεοῦ λέγομεν ὡστε τρεῖς φύσεις ἐπὶ τῆς τριάδος δοξάζομεν ὡστε τρεῖς οὐσίας ἐπὶ αὐτῆς κηρύττομεν ὡστε τρεῖς ὀμολογοῦμεν θεότητας, οὐκ ὀμολογούμενοι, οὐκ ἔτερονοις, οὐκ ὀμοφόλοις, οὐκ ἔτεροφόλοις, οὐκ ὁςα μοναδικῶς ἐπὶ αὐτῆς προσκηρύττεται εἰς πλήθος ἐκφέρει ἀφείμεν ἢ τινα τὴν αὐτῆς διαβρείν συγχωροῦμεν ἐνότητα. ὡστε δὲ τρεῖς τινας θεοῦ ἐπιστάμεθα ἢ τρεῖς τινας φύσεις ἢ τρεῖς τινας οὐσίας ἢ τρεῖς τινας θεότητας οἴδαμεν, οὐκ ὀμογενεῖς οὐκ ἔτερογενεῖς, οὐκ ὀμοειδεῖς, οὐκ ἔτεροειδεῖς, ἀλλ' ὡστε ὅλος θεοῦ ἢ φύσεις ἢ οὐσίας ἢ θεότητος ἐγνωμεν ἢ γνώσκοντας οἴδαμεν, ἀλλα καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα ἢ φρονούντα ἢ γνώσκοντα τοῖς ἀναθέμασι βάλλομεν. ἡμεῖς γὰρ μίαν ἄρχην τῆς μᾶς ὡσμὴν θεότης[424]τος, μίαν βασιλείαν, μίαν ξοφικίαν, μίαν δύναμιν, μίαν ἐνέργειαν, μίαν βουλήσι, μίαν θελήσι, μίαν δοξολογίαν, μίαν κίνησιν—εἴτε τῶν μετ' αὐτῆς ὄστων ἀπάντων δημιουργικά, εἴτε προνοητικά εἴτε συντακτικά καὶ συνηρμητικά—μίαν κυριότητα, μίαν ἀδιαβρετή καὶ ὅσα ἂττα μοναδικὰ καὶ ἀπωθύμα τῆς μιᾶς οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ἐν τρισίν ἐστὶ προσωπικάς ὑποστάσεως, ὡστε τὰς ὑποστάσεις συγχέοντες καὶ εἴς μίαν αὐτὰς ὑπόστασιν ἁγιοῦτε, ὡστε τὴν οὐσίαν τὴν μίαν μερίζοντες καὶ εἰς οὖσίας τρεῖς αὐτὴν κατατέμνοντες καὶ τὴν μίαν διὰ τοῦτο διαμεταί τῇ θεότητα. ἀλλ' ἐστίν εἰς θέος, μία θεότης ἐν τρισίν ὑποστάσει λάμπουσα καὶ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις καὶ πρόσωπα ἐν θεότητι μία γνωριζόμενα. διὰ
5. Hence the blessed Trinity is not numbered in essences and natures and different godheads or triple lordships (heaven forbid!), as the Arians assert in their madness,\textsuperscript{23} and the leaders of the new tritheism maintain in their fury,\textsuperscript{24} when they babble about three essences and three natures and three lordships and likewise three godheads, but [it is numbered] in hypostases and perfect intellectual properties, subsisting by themselves, divisible in number and indivisible in Godhead. This is because the all-holy Trinity is divided indivisibly and is joined together again dividedly.\textsuperscript{25} Although it possesses divisibility in its persons, it remains indivisible and unsevered in essence and in nature and likewise also in Godhead. Because of this we neither speak of three gods, nor do we glorify three natures in the Trinity, nor do we proclaim three essences in it, nor do we confess three godheads, whether consubstantial or of another substance, whether of the same kind or of another kind, nor do we permit what is proclaimed in regard to it as a unity to be drawn out into a multiplicity, or allow anyone to divide its unity. Nor do we understand any kind of three gods or know any three natures or any three essences or any three godheads, whether homogeneous or heterogeneous, whether of the same stock or of another stock; but neither have we at all recognized gods or natures or essences or godheads or know those who recognize them,\textsuperscript{26} but rather strike with anathemas the one who accepts or thinks or recognizes such. For we know one principle of one Godhead, one kingship, one authority, one power, one activity, one intent, one will, one dominion, one movement—whether creating all that exists after it, be it providing or sustaining or preserving— one lordship, one eternity, and whatever else of the one essence and nature in three personal hypostases is unitary and unaggregate. Neither do we confuse the hypostases and reduce them to one hypostasis, nor do we portion the one essence and separate it into three essences and so divide the one Godhead. But there is one God, one Godhead shining forth in

\textsuperscript{23} There are numerous examples in the \textit{Synodical Letter} of the commonplace that heretics are mad or frenzied. Cf. N. Brox, ‘Härsie’, \textit{Realllexikon für Antike und Christentum}, 13 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1986), 283, on polemical rhetoric against heretics, and see further the heresiologies at 2.6 below.

\textsuperscript{24} By this are meant Peter of Callinicum and his followers. See further sec. 1.1, above.


\textsuperscript{26} Peter of Callinicum and his followers are again meant here.
τούτο τέλειος θεός ὁ πατὴρ, τέλειος θεός οὐδός, τέλειος θεός τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν, ἐπειδὴ τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ μίαν ἐκαστὸν πρόσωπον ἀμερίστῳ καὶ ἀνελλιπῆ καὶ τελείων ἐχει θεότητα· καὶ ὥς μὲν θεός τὸ αὐτὸ καθέστηκεν ἐκαστὸν καὶ ἐαυτὸ θεωρούμενον τοῖς νοις χωρίζοντος τὰ ἀχώριστα· ὡς δὲ πατὴρ καὶ νῦσα καὶ πνεῦμα πανάγιον ἐτεροῦν καὶ ἑτεροῦν λέγεται, καὶ τετεύθην τούτα τοῖς θεολόγητοις κηρύσσεται θεός καὶ θεός καὶ θεός, ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ τρία θεός—οὐ γάρ ἄλλοις θεός ὁ πατὴρ, οὐδὲ ἄλλος θεός ὁ νῦσα, οὐδὲ ἄλλος πάλιν θεός τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν, ἐπεὶ μηδ' ἄλλη φύσις ὁ πατὴρ, μηδ' ἄλλη φύσις οὐδός, μηδ' ἄλλη πάλιν φύσις τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν· τούτῳ γάρ καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ διαφόροις θεοῖς ἐκτεχνάζεται καὶ ταῖς πολλάς καὶ διαφόροις ἐκτίκτει θεότητας· ἀλλ' θεός μὲν ὁ πατὴρ, θεός δὲ καὶ οὐδός, ὁμοίως δὲ θεός καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν, ὡς μίας ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀνελλιπῶς τὰ τρία πρόσωπα πληροῦσθαι θεότητος καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῳ οὐσίας ὀλοτελώς καὶ ὀλικώς θεότης γὰρ μερισμῶν οὐχ υφίσταται καὶ ἐν τοῖς τρισὶ προσώποις πληρωστικῶς καὶ ἐντελῶς, οὐ μεριστῶς ἐγένετο ἐκ μέρους πληροῦσα τὰ πρόσωπα, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκάστῳ πληρεστάτως ὑπάρχουσα καὶ μία γε μένουσα, καὶ εἰ ἐν προσώποις τρισὶ διαφαίνοιτο, καὶ πρὸς θεοτήτων πληθυσμὸν οὐκ ἐκτρέχουσα, καὶ εἰ ἐν τρισὶ ἐστίν ὑποστά[428]σεiν, ἢ μὴ σωματικῆς τινα πάθος διαφέρειν ἢ ὄντως ἀπαθῆς καὶ ἀσώματος καὶ πάσχειν οὐκ εἰδούς τὰ κτίσεως ἑδία.

2.2.6. Ἕστων οὖν μετὰ τὸ εἶναι θεός πατὴρ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ οὐτέ νῦσα οὐτέ πνεῦμα ἁγιόν, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ὁ νῦσα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἡσύρεται καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν τὸ πνεῦμα νυκτίζει τὸ ἁγιόν καὶ ἐστὶ μετὰ τὸ εἶναι θεός νῦσα ὁ νῦσα καὶ οὐτε πατὴρ οὐτέ πνεῦμα πανάγιον, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ὁ πατὴρ κατὰ φύσιν κηρύσσεται καὶ ὁ κατ' οὐσίαν τὸ πνεῦμα καθορᾶται τὸ ἁγιόν, καὶ ἐστι μετὰ τὸ εἶναι θεός πνεῦμα ἁγιον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν καὶ οὐτε πατὴρ θεωρούμενον οὐτε νῦσα λαμβανόμενον, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ὁ πατὴρ κατ' οὐσίαν πιστεύεται καὶ ὅπερ ὁ νῦσα κατὰ φύσιν
three hypostases, and three hypostases and persons revealed in one Godhead. Because of this the Father is perfect God, the Son is perfect God, the Holy Spirit is perfect God, since each person has one and the same unportioned and unfailing and perfect Godhead. And as God each exists itself, contemplated individually when the mind separates the inseparable, but as Father and Son and all-holy Spirit each is given a different name, and hence these components are proclaimed by divines as being individually God, and yet the three are proclaimed to be a single God, for the Father is not one God, nor the Son another God, nor the Holy Spirit yet another God, since neither is the Father one nature, nor the Son another nature, nor the Holy Spirit yet another nature. For this [doctrine] both invents many different gods and spawns many different godheads, but the Father is God, the Son too is God, and likewise the Holy Spirit too is God, since one Godhead fills the three persons without division or deficiency and is in each wholly perfectly and completely. For the Godhead does not admit partition, and is fully and perfectly in the three persons, that is, not partially or by filling persons in part, but subsists in each person most fully while remaining one, even if it is manifested in three persons although not indeed proceeding into a multiplicity of godheads, and even if it is in three hypostases, so that what is truly free of passion and without corporeal unity and unacquainted with suffering, which are qualities of the created world, should not suffer any corporeal division.

6. Besides being God,²⁸ therefore, the Father is Father and not Son or Holy Spirit, but that which the Son is according to essence and what the Holy Spirit is according to nature. And besides being God, the Son is Son and not Father or all-holy Spirit, but that which the Father is proclaimed to be according to nature, and the Holy Spirit discerned to be according to essence. And besides being God, the Holy Spirit is Holy Spirit and is neither contemplated as Father nor apprehended as Son, but that which the Father is believed to be according to essence and the Son

²⁷ Sophronius is referring here to the Arian and tritheist positions.
²⁸ This passage is conceptually very difficult. Although the phrase μετὰ τὸ εἶναι would normally be translated ‘after being God’, this would suggest a temporal sequence in the godhead that has Arian overtones. Consequently, I have translated ‘besides being God’.
άγγελλεται, τὸ μὲν διὰ τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα καὶ τὸ συγγενεῖς τῆς ὑπάρξεως, τὸ δὲ διὰ τὰς ἐτεροίας τῶν τριῶν ἴδιότητος καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱσυγχύτως ἐκαστον πρόσωπον χαρακτηριζόμενων ἰδιωμάτων ἀνόμωιον. ὡσπερ γὰρ τὸ <εἶναι> θεός ἐκαστὸν ἀμετάπτωτον κέκτηται, οὕτω καὶ τὴν τοῦ προσώπου χαρακτηριστικὴν ἴδιότητα ἀμετάβλητον καὶ ἀκίνητον λέξας τὴν αὐτῷ καὶ μόνῳ προσώπῳ καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν προσώπων αὐτῷ διακρίνουσαν καὶ τὴν ὑμοφυὰ καὶ ὑμότιμον, ὑμουσιόν τε καὶ ὑμόθρονον τριάδα τηροῦσαν ἀσύγχυτον. τριὰς οὖν ἤ τριάς, οὐ τελεία μόνον τῇ τῆς μᾶς θεότητος τελειότητι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερτελῆς καὶ ὑπέρθεος ἡ ὁδεγὴ καὶ ἱδιότητή καὶ βασιλεία, μὴ μεριζομένη μηδὲ ἀπαλλοτριουμένη, οὔτε οὖν κτιστῷ τι ἢ δούλῳ εἰς τῇ τριάδι οὔτε ἐπείσακτον, ὡς πρόσερεν μὲν οὐχ ὑπάρχον, ύστερον δὲ ἐπεισελθόν, οὔτε οὖν ἐνέλειψε πατρὶ υἱός οὔτε υἱῷ πνεύμα, ἀλλ᾽ ἀτρεπτοῖς καὶ ἀναλλοίωτοι ἡ αὐτῆ τριάς ἀεὶ·

2.2.7. [430] Καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ὠμοσύνου, αἰδίου τε καὶ ἁρχικῆς καὶ πάντων ὁμοουργοῦ καὶ βασιλικῶς τριάδος τὸ ὅπως φρονῶ καὶ δοξάζω καὶ σέβομαι ὡς ἐν βραχέσιν εἰπεῖν δήλον υμῖν καὶ σαφὲς διατεθείκα—οὐ γὰρ τι πλέον συνεχώρει τοῦτον φάναι τῶν συνοδικῶν συλλαβῶν τὸ ἐπίτομον, ὅπως τε καὶ περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἐνός τῆς αὐτῆς παντεύτου τριάδος θεοῦ λόγου καὶ νοῦ φυλαθρώπου τε καὶ παραδόξου σαρκώσεως, ταυτῶν δὲ εἰπεῖν ὑπερτάτης κενώσεως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιγείους ἡμᾶς θείκης καὶ θεοποιοῦ καταβάσεως ἔχω καὶ φρονῶ καὶ κρατεῖν ἐκ πατέρων ἁγίων καὶ τῶν καθ ἡμᾶς θεοπευστῶν παρέλαβον, ὡς ἔτι τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς τῆς ἐφορώσης τὰ σύμπαντα γράμμα τουτί τὸ συνοδικὸν γράφων ἐκτίθημι καὶ πρὸς τήν υμῶν ἐκπέμπω τῶν πανσέβων ἀκρόασιν.

2.3.1. Πιστεύω καὶ περὶ ταύτης, θεωτάτως, ὡς ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆς νός, ὁ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων καὶ χρόνων ἀπαθῶς ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν γεννηθεὶς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς οἴκτον λαβὼν καὶ
announced to be according to nature. The one is the case because of the nature and the identity of essence and the kinship of existence, the other because of the differing properties of the three and the dissimilarity of the particularities which characterize each person without confusion. For just as each one possesses being God unchangeably, so too he has obtained immutably and unmoveably the property characteristic of the person which belongs to it and to it alone and distinguishes it from the other persons, and preserves unconfused the Trinity which is both of the same nature and of the same honour, both of the same substance and of the same throne. Therefore the Trinity is a trinity not only perfect in the perfection of the one Godhead, but also supremely perfect and supremely divine 'in glory and eternity and kingship, neither partitioned nor alienated. Neither, therefore, is there anything created or servile in the Trinity, nor introduced, as if previously it did not exist, but subsequently accruing. Neither is the Son inferior to the Father nor the Spirit to the Son, but it is the same Trinity always, unchangeable and unalterable'.

7. I have expounded to you clearly and plainly, speaking in a few words, how I think of, glorify, and revere the Trinity, holy of the same substance, both eternal and primary and creator of all and royal. The concise form of the synodical letter has not permitted me to say more than this. And, as if in the presence of that truth itself which oversees all, I expound by writing this synodical letter, and I dispatch to your all-wise ears what I hold and what I think and have received as prevailing from the holy Fathers—those who according to you are inspired by God—the benevolent and astounding incarnation of one of the same, all-revered Trinity, God the Word and Son; that is to say the immeasurable emptying and the divine and defying descent to us on earth.

2.3. Christological Profession of Faith

1. I believe also concerning this, most holy One, that God the Word, the only-begotten Son of the Father, the one who before all ages and times was begotten impassibly from the same God and

---

29 Cf. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Confession of Faith (CPF 1764); ACO III, 3, 10–13.
10 This is the first of several references by Sophronius to the dimensions of the synodical letter, which he certainly exceeds.
31 On Sophronius’ christology see further Cosma, De ‘oeconomia’ incarnationis, 81–151; von Schönborn, Sophrone, 157–224.
Φιλάνθρωπον ἔλεον τοῦ ἄνθρωπινος ἡμῶν ὀλισθήματος, ἑκουσίως θελήματι καὶ θεοῦ βουλήσει τοῦ φύσαντος καὶ συνευδοκία θεία τοῦ πνεύματος κόλπων οὐ χωρίσθεις τοῦ γεννήσαντος πρὸς τοὺς ταπεινοὺς ἡμᾶς καταβέβηκεν. Ἡστι γὰρ, ἐστιν ὡσπερ τῆς αὐτῆς βουλής τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, οὕτω καὶ οὐσίας ἀπείρου καὶ φύσεως περιγραφῆς ὀυδαμῶς ἀνεχόμενος ἡ τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς τοπικής μεταβάσεως, κατὰ φύσιν δράν εἰδὼς θείκην τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ μήτραν εἰσόδος ἀπειρόγαμον παρθενίας ἁγιαζομένην ἀγνώτητι Μαρίας τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἁγιάσας καὶ θεόφρονος καὶ παντὸς ἐλευθέρας μολύσματος τοῦ τέκνα σώμα καὶ ψυχή καὶ διάνοιας σαρκοῦστα ὁ ἀσαρκός, καὶ μορφοῦται τὸ ἡμῶν ὁ κατ’ οὐσίαν τὴν θείαν ὅσον εἰς σχήμα καὶ εἴδος ἁμόρφως, καὶ [432] σωματοῦται καθ’ ἡμᾶς ὁ ἁσώματος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γίνεται ὁ ἄει θεὸς γνωριζόμενος, καὶ μητρικῆς κοιλίας ἐγγάστριος ὁ τοῦ αἰώνιου πατρὸς ἐγκόλπιος δείκνυται, καὶ ὁ ἄρχων ἄρχην χρονικήν καταδέχεται, οὔτε φαντασίᾳ ταύτα γνώμενος ἀπαίτω, καθ’ ἰδιαίτερος καὶ Οὐαλεντίνος δοκεῖ τοῖς παράβους, ἀλλ’ ἀληθεία καὶ πράγματι ὁλον ἐαυτὸν κενωσάς πατρικῷ καὶ οἰκείῳ θελήματι καὶ ὅλον προσλαβὼν τὸ ἡμέτερον φύραμα, σάρκα φησὶ τὴν ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον καὶ ψυχὴν λογικὴν, τὴν ψυχαί τοῖς ἡμετέραις ὁμόφυλοι, καὶ νοῦν τῷ νῷ τῷ ἡμῶν παραπλήσιον. ταῦτα γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἐστι καὶ γνωσκεται, καὶ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέγονεν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀκρας τῆς ἐν παρθένῳ τῇ παναγίᾳ συλλήψεως. ἄνθρωπος γὰρ χρηματίζειν ἔβούλετο, ἓνα τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἀνακαθάριζο τὸ ὁμοῖον καὶ τῷ συγγενεῖ τὸ συγγενεῖς ἀνασώσθηται καὶ τῷ συμφυεῖ τὸ συμφυεῖς ἐκλαμπρώνει.
Father, having compassion and benevolent pity for our human fall, with free will and by the intent of the Father who begat him and with the joint and divine consent of the Spirit, although not separated from the bosom of the one who begat him, descended to us wretched ones. Indeed, just as he is of the same intent as the Father and the Spirit, so too is he of infinite essence. Admitting in no way of a circumscribed nature or, as we do, of a change of place, knowing how to effect divine activity\(^{32}\) in accordance with his nature, he enters a womb innocent of marriage, radiant with the purity of virginity, that is, of Mary, holy and bright and of godly mind and free of every taint, whether in body or soul or thought. The fleshless one becomes flesh; the one who in conformity with the divine essence is without shape as far as form and frame are concerned takes on our shape; and the bodiless one is embodied as we are; and the one revealed as always God in truth becomes a human being; and the one who is in the bosom of the eternal Father is disclosed in the womb of his mother’s belly; and the timeless one receives a beginning in time. He became all of these things not in illusion, as it seems to the frenzied Manichaeans and Valentinians;\(^{33}\) but in truth and in fact, having emptied himself completely, by a will that was both his Father’s and his own, he assumed our human substance\(^{34}\) completely, I mean flesh consubstantial with ours and an intellectual soul of the same stock as our souls, and a mind comparable to our mind.\(^{35}\) In these things he is and is recognized as a human being, and he became in truth a human being from the very point of his conception in the all-holy Virgin. He wished to be reckoned as a human being, so that he might cleanse like with like and rescue kin by kin, and illuminate the cognate by cognate. This is why the holy

\(^{32}\) Here we have Sophronius’ first use in the Synodical Letter of the word ‘activity’ (\textit{energeia}) in a christological framework.

\(^{33}\) Both the Valentinians, a Gnostic group, and the Manichaeans were believed to have taught that Christ was neither truly human nor truly divine, although Sophronius is suggesting that they were docetists, i.e. that they believed that Christ’s humanity was apparent, not real. This was more commonly alleged of Apollinaris, Eutyches, and Dioscorus, as in the Synodical Letter itself, below, secs. 2.3.5 and 2.5.1.

\(^{34}\) The Greek word \textit{phthora} means literally ‘mixture’, ‘dough’, or ‘paste’.

\(^{35}\) The emphasis here on the true humanity of Christ and on his rational soul is a tacit rebuttal of the doctrine of Apollinaris of Laodicea, who taught that the Logos took the place of the human mind in Christ.
διὰ τοῦτο παρθένος ἁγία λαμβάνεται καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἁγιάζεται καὶ οὕτως ὑποργεῖ τῇ σαρκώσει τοῦ κτίσαντος ὡς καθαρὰ καὶ ἁγνή καὶ ἀμόλυντος.

2.3.2. Σαρκοῦται γοῦν ὁ λόγος καὶ θεὸς τὸ ἡμέτερον, οὐ προπλασθείς σαρκὶ συναπτόμενος ἢ προμορφωθέντι καὶ καθ᾽ αὐτὸ προϋποστάντα ποτὲ προσπλεκόμενος σῶματι ἡ προϋποστάσις ψυχῆς συντιθέμενος, ἀλλὰ τότε τούτοις παραγενομένοις πρὸς ὑπαρξίν, ὅτε αὐτοῖς ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς καὶ θεὸς φυσικῶς συνετίθετο σύγχρονον ἔχοντα τῇ ὑπάρξει τὴν ἐκωσιν καὶ οὐ πρὸ τῆς πρὸς τὸν λόγον ἀληθεστάτης συμβάςεως καθ᾽ ἑαυτὰ γενόμενα πώποτε ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἔτερον τὸ παράπαν ὑπάρχειντα, ἀλλὰ σύνδρομον ἔχοντα τῇ φυσικῇ τοῦ λόγου συμβάσει τὴν ὑπαρξίν καὶ οὐκ ἑκείνης οὐδὲ ὡς ἐν φθαλμῷ μιᾷ ταυτὴν προτερεύουσιν ἔχοντα, ὡς Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεύς βομβεῖ καὶ Νεστόριος. ἂμα γὰρ ἁμάργαρ, ἀμα θεοῦ λόγου σάρξ, ἀμα σάρξ ἐμφύσιος λογική, ἀμα θεοῦ λόγου σάρξ ἐμφύσιος λογική. ἐν αὐτῷ [434] γὰρ καὶ οὐ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὴν ἔσχε τὴν ὑπαρξίν, ἀμα γὰρ τῇ συλλήψει τοῦ λόγου ταῦτα παρῆκθη πρὸς σύστασιν καὶ ἡμόθη αὐτῷ καθ᾽ ὑπόστασιν, ἀμα τῷ πρὸς σύστασιν ἀγεσθαι τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθῆς καὶ ἀμέριστον, τῆς μήτε διάφοροι πάσχοις μήτε τροπὴν εἰσδεχομένην καὶ σύγχυσιν, ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ παραγόμενα καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ συνιστάμενα καὶ αὐτῷ συντιθέμεναι καὶ χρόνον οὐδένα τὸ σύνολον τῆς αἰκείας συστάσεως προτερεύοντα, φέροντα τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀσυγχύτου τε καὶ ἀτμήτου συνιστάσεως.
Virgin was taken and sanctified in both body and soul, and thus assisted in the incarnation of the Creator because she was pure and undefiled and without taint.

2. Hence the Word and God became flesh with our flesh, not being conjoined to flesh that had been moulded or formed previously, or knitted with a body which at some time subsisted previously by itself, or joined to a soul which subsisted previously, but these elements came into existence at the time when the Word himself and God was joined to them by nature, possessing the union simultaneously with the existence. These things never came into existence in themselves before their most true coming together with the Word, or have any existence as part of some human being different from our species, but they had their existence concurrently with the natural coming together of the Word, and did not have it even, as it were, in a twinkling of an eye (1 Cor. 15: 52) sooner than that coming together, as Paul of Samosata and Nestorius babble: 'at the one time there is flesh, at the one time there is flesh of God the Word; at the one time there is flesh endowed with an intellectual soul, at the one time there is flesh of the God-Word endowed with a rational soul.' For in him and not on its own account did the flesh have its existence. For at the same time as the conception of the Word these elements were brought into consistence and united to him in hypostasis; at the same time there was brought into existence that which is genuinely true and without partition, neither suffering division nor admitting change and confusion. They were brought in by him and were formed in him and were joined to him, and for no time at all did they exist in their own entirety prior to their composition in him, which is both unconfused and unsevered.

16 This is an anacolouthon in Greek.
17 Cf. Ps. Athanasius, Letter to Emperor Jovinian (CPG 2259); PG 28, 532A; also cited by Cyrus of Alexandria, Annunciation, ch. 7 (CPG 7613); ACO ser. sec. II, 2, 600, 3–4; document 3 in the monocentrist dossier, Part 3. This text is much used in christological debate: see Anastasius of Sinai, Hodegos II.5; ed. Uthemann, 13–14; apparatus fontium, 51. Paul of Samosata and Nestorius were accused of maintaining that in the incarnation the Word was united with an already existing body.
18 Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, ACO II, 1, 2, 129, 30–1; trans. Tanner, i, *86.
19 ‘Unconfused’ is a rejection of the supposed position of Eutyches, ‘unsevered’, of that of Nestorius. Here I have amended Riedinger’s punctuation.
2.3.3. Ἐκ τῶν οὖν ἀχράντων καὶ παρθενικῶν αἰμάτων τῆς παναγίας καὶ ἀχράντου παρθένου Μαρίας ὁ λόγος σαρκωθεῖς κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέγονε καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἀνθρωποῦ καὶ τῇ παρθενικῇ γαστρὶ κυψεροῦμενος καὶ τὸν χρόνον πεπληρωκὼς τῆς ἐννόμου κυήσεως· ὥς ἐν πάσι τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ ἀμαρτιαῖς οὐ φέρονσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἡμῖν ὁμοιοῦμενος καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν οὐκ ἀπαξίων ἐμπαθετάτην εὐτελείαν τίκτεται θεός ἀνθρωπεῖω τῷ σώματι, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῷ σχήματι ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ ἀσώματον ἔχοντι, ὅπερ αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ οὐκ ἔτερος λογικῷ ἐνεψύχωσε πνεύματι καὶ παρθένου τηρεὶ τὴν γεννήσασαν καὶ θεοτόκον αὐτὴν κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀναδείκνυσι, κἀν Νεστόριος ὁ παράφορος ῥήσεται καὶ τούτῳ τὸ θεομάχον στρατόπεδον δακρύει καὶ θρηνεῖ καὶ δούρεται καὶ σὺν ἐκείνῳ πάλιν σπαράττηται.

2.3.4. Θεὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ ἐκ παρθένου τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου Μαρίας τικτόμενος καὶ δευτέραν δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ χρονικὴν προσαρχόμενος γέννησε μετὰ τὴν πρώτην αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτῶν τὴν ἐκ πατρὸς φυσικήν καὶ ἀνέκφραστον γέννησαν, καὶ σεσαρκωμένος ἐτίκτετο διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς τούς σαρκικοὺς ὁμοιότητα, ὢν θεός ἀνυμνοῦμενος, ὢς οὐτὸς προσφαιρόμενος ἀνθρωποῖς, τελεῖος θεός ὁ αὐτὸς γινωσκόμενος καὶ τελεῖος ἀνθρωποῦ ὁ αὐτὸς γνωριζόμενος. ἐκ δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἔσχε τὴν ἑνώσας θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ ἐν δύο τελείαις ἐγνωρίζετο φύσει, θεότητι τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι. οὔτε γὰρ τῇ ἑνώσει τροπῆ τῆς ή φυσικῆς ἐμείστευσεν, οὔτε τῇ διαφορᾷ καὶ δυνάμει τῶν μορφῶν ἦτοι τῶν οὐσίων μετὰ τὴν ἑνώσας διαίρεσις τῆς ἡ τομὴ εἰσεκρίνετο, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν λυτῇ τὸν μεμηρώτα Νεστόριον, ἐκεῖνο δὲ [436] τῇ γῇ Εὐνυχῆ τὸν κακόφρονα· τὰ γὰρ καθ’ ὑπόστα-

Éléments sous droits d'auteur
3. And so from the undefiled and virgin blood of the all-holy and undefiled Virgin Mary the Word became truly flesh and truly a human being, even being carried in the virginal womb and fulfilling the nine months' period of gestation. Just as in all natural respects which do not involve sin, he was like us human beings, and not despising our mean estate, so subject to passion. God was born in a human body, so too he was in a frame that possessed an intellectual and incorporeal soul, a frame which he himself, in himself and no other, animated with an intellectual spirit. And he preserved his mother as a virgin and showed that she was properly and in truth Theotokos, even if the frenzied Nestorius is shattered [by this] and his army which fights God is in tears, and laments and mourns and is torn to pieces again with him.

4. I say this because it was God who was born of a virgin, the holy Theotokos Mary, and accepted on our account a second birth in time after his first eternal birth, which was a natural and ineffable birth from the Father; even though he was born in the flesh, on account of his likeness to us fleshly beings. Whole is the God who is hymned, whole is the same who appeared as a human being; perfect is the same God who is acknowledged and perfect is the same human being who is revealed. For from two natures he possessed the union of Godhead and humanity, and was recognized in two perfect natures, Godhead and humanity. Neither did any change or mingling intervene in the union, nor was any division or severing admitted into the difference and duality of the forms or essences after the union, even if this latter troubles the mad Nestorius, and the former causes the perversive Eutyches to waste away. For the elements that are united hypostatically to

40 By 'passion' (πάθος) or 'passions' (πάθη) are meant normal human feelings and emotions. See further below, sec. 2.3.13.
41 Cf. n. 35, above.
44 The passage from here down to 'pit of division' a few lines further on is found as a citation in Nicephorus I of Constantinople, Against Eusebius, in J. B. Pitra (ed.), Spicilegium Soterius, complectensSanctorum Patrum scripturamque ecclesiasticorum anecdota hactenus opera (Paris: Firmin–Didot, 1852), 486.
2.3.5. Ημείς δὲ ὄρωμαλέω φρονήματι τὴν ἐκατέρω τούτων δούλην παρελάσαντες ἄνοιαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐστώτες ἀνείμαντοι καὶ τὴν καθ’ ὑπόστασιν τοῦ λόγου πρὸς σάρκα τὴν εἷς ἡμῶν τὴν ἔννοιαν καὶ ἐμψυχον κηρύσσομεν σύμβασιν, καὶ ἐνα Χριστόν καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν σαρκωθέντα λόγον προσεδέχόμεν, καὶ μίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν λέγομεν σύνθετον, καὶ ἐν δύοις αὐτὸν ἀγοράσμας φύσεα, καὶ δύο τού τούτων θεοῦ λόγου γενήσεσ εἰσπετεύμενοι—μίαν μὲν τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς, ἄν καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ ἄξιαν σώσαν, καὶ δευτέραν τὴν ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου μητρός, ἄν καὶ πρόσφορον καὶ χρονικὴν ἐπιστάμεθα—καὶ, μίαν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φύσιν ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ ἑσαρκωμένην δοξάζωμεν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὡς Ἀπολλώνιος καὶ Ἐνυχής καὶ Διόσκορος λέγουσιν, ἀλλ’ ὡς ὁ σοφός ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε Κύριλλος, καὶ τὰ τῶν φύσεων σύζευγαν φάσκομεν ίδια καὶ τὴν τῶν ἰδωμένων διαφόρων ἀπαγγέλλομεν τὴν ὡς ἐν φυσικῇ μὲν λεγομένῃ καὶ οὖσαι ποιητῇ, ἐν οὐσιώδει δὲ νοομένῃ καὶ οὖσαι
each other do not admit change or recognize division, or know the properties of confusion, or learn the marks of severance. This, it seems, Eutyches was ignorant of, and Nestorius too, and they did not know the power of the hypostatic union, in accordance with which the Word became flesh without change, and the flesh, endowed with soul and mind, was divinized without undergoing change.\textsuperscript{45} The former is hurled into the sea of confusion, while the latter is borne down into the pit of division. This is why the former avoids confessing the duality of the natures, while the latter holds back from proclaiming the incarnate nature of God the Word as one, or shrinks from speaking of his composite hypostasis as one. The runaway slaves are \textit{fearful with a fear where no fear is indicated} (Ps. 13: 5).

5. Having passed by with robust mind the servile folly of each of these men, and standing dauntless on the rock (cf. Matt. 16: 18) of pious belief, we both proclaim the coming together of the Word hypostatically with the flesh from us which has both mind and soul; and we worship one Christ and Son, the incarnate Word; and we speak of his one, composite hypostasis, and declare him in two natures, and we believe in two births of the same God the Word\textsuperscript{46}—the one from God the Father, which we know is both timeless and eternal, and the second from his mother, the Theotokos, which we know is both recent and temporal—and we glorify ‘one nature of God the Word’ in him, ‘made flesh’.\textsuperscript{47} But we do not talk like Apollinaris and Eutyches and Dioscorus,\textsuperscript{48} but as the wise Cyril has imparted to us, and we maintain that the properties of the natures are preserved, and we declare the difference of the united elements which is spoken of and is, in relation to the natural quality,\textsuperscript{49} but which is conceived of and is in

\textsuperscript{45} Both Eutyches and Nestorius are portrayed here as having underestimated the hypostatic union in different ways.

\textsuperscript{46} Cf. sec. 2.3.4. above.

\textsuperscript{47} This is the famous expression of Cyril of Alexandria, on which see McGuckin, \textit{Saint Cyril of Alexandria}, 207–12.

\textsuperscript{48} I.e. as the three classic representatives of the docetic school, who are portrayed as maintaining that the union of the two natures in Christ resulted in a merger, a third substance.

\textsuperscript{49} ‘Natural quality’ (\textit{πριγνή φύσις}) was a Cyrillian term, used also by anti-Chalcedonians like Severus of Antioch. See Lebon, ‘La Christologie du monophysisme sévérien’, 528–9.
ποσότητι καὶ οὕτε [438] τὴν Νεστοριανὴν τομὴν δεδιττόμεθα, οὕτε τὴν Εὐθυχιανὴν τροπὴν εὐλαβοῦμεθα, ἐπεὶ μὴτε ὦς ὁ ματαιόφρων Νεστώριος σχετικὴν τὴν ἐνωσιν λέγομεν ἢ ἰσοτιμάν καὶ ταυτοβουλίαιν, καὶ θελμάτων ῥοπῆ καὶ ταυτότητι παραληροῦμεν τὴν σύμβασιν, μὴτε ὦς Εὐθυχῆς ὁ θεόλατος κατὰ σύγχυσιν τῖνα καὶ ἀλλαώσων θεοῦ λόγου καὶ σαρκὸς ἐμφυχωμένης νοερῶς ἤτοι τῶν φύσεων καὶ οὐσιῶν καὶ μορφῶν φλημαφοῦμεν τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν ἐξ ὑν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ ἡ θαυμασία γεγένηται σύμβασις.

2.3.6. Ὅθεν τὴν βασιλικὴν ὁδὸν καὶ μέσην ὁδεύοντες καὶ ἀποστυγοῦμεν τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ τὴν τομὴν μυσάττόμεθα, μόνην δὲ κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀσπαζόμεθα τὴν ἀσύγχυτον ὁμοία καὶ ἀμεριστὸν θεότητος τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος ἐνωσιν, ἦν μόνην γνωρίζειν ἐπίσταται ἡ φυσικὴ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν σύνθεσις ταύτην γὰρ ἀλλήλως ἐνούμεναι θεότητι τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι ἐσχήκασιν, ἵνα μήτε τροπὴν ὑπομεύνοιεν μήτε διαίρεσιν πάθοις. ὁ γὰρ τῆς ἐνώσεως λόγος, τῆς φυσικῆς, φημὶ, καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν—οὕτε γὰρ ἔτεραν ἐνωσιν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ παρὰ ταὐτὴν ἐπίσταμαι—οὐκ ἄγνοει μὲν τὴν διαφοράν, ἐξίσταται δὲ διαμπάξ τῇ διαίρεσιν καὶ τηρεῖ τὰ συνδραμόντα πρὸς ἐνωσιν ἀτρεπτά, καὶ τῶν ἴσων μέρων μερισμὸν οὐκ εἰσδέχεται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων τὸν Χριστὸν ὀνομάζοντες καὶ θεον τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνθρωπον καὶ διφυαὶ καὶ διπλῶν κατὰ τὰς φύσεις κηρύττομεν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν θεότητι τέλειον καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιστάμεθα τέλειον· διὸ καὶ ἐν οὕσιν αὐτὸν δογ-
the essential quantity.\textsuperscript{50} Neither do we fear Nestorius' 'severing' nor do we pay any court to Eutyches' 'change'.\textsuperscript{51} This is because we neither say, like the empty-headed Nestorius, that the union is incidental or one of equal honour and of a convergence of will, and rave that the coming together is by the inclination and convergence of wills;\textsuperscript{52} nor do we blabber, like the God-pursued Eutyches, in terms of some sort of confusion and alteration of God the Word and of his intellectually ensouled flesh, or of the synthesis of the natures, essences, and forms from which the wondrous coming together in Christ occurred.

6. For this reason, travelling the royal road and keeping to the centre (cf. Num. 20: 17),\textsuperscript{53} we both abhor the confusion and feel disgust at the severing, and embrace with our soul only the unconfused and at the same time indivisible union of Godhead and humanity, which only the natural and hypostatic union is capable of making known. Once united to each other, Godhead and humanity possessed this [sc. indivisible union], so that they should neither undergo change nor suffer division. The principle of the union, I mean the natural and hypostatic union (for I do not recognize a union in Christ other than this one\textsuperscript{54}), is not ignorant of difference, but eliminates division totally, and preserves unchanged the elements which converge in the union, and does not admit the partition of what is united. Because of this, while designating Christ as being from Godhead and humanity and from two natures, we proclaim also the same one as God and as a human being, and as having two natures and being twofold in respect of natures. Likewise we know the same one to be both perfect in Godhead and perfect in humanity.\textsuperscript{55} This is why we

\textsuperscript{50} 'Essential quantity' (ποσότης ουσιώδης) reinforces the two-nature christology of Chalcedon.

\textsuperscript{51} Once again Sophronius, like Justinian, is at pains to dissociate himself from the extreme christological positions of both Nestorius and Eutyches.

\textsuperscript{52} These are Nestorian terms for expressing the union in Christ.

\textsuperscript{53} This biblical image is much used in Patristic literature. See Uthemann, *Hodogos* VIII. 5, 99–100, 132.

\textsuperscript{54} That is, Sophronius rejects both a union by conjunction, as Nestorians would accept, and a union of merger, such as was attributed to Eutyches.

\textsuperscript{55} Here begins a series of citations in Nicephorus I of Constantinople, ed. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solsmens*, 330, which runs as far as 'duality of natures' in sec. 2.3.15.

ματιζομενοι фόσει, καὶ δομουσιον ὡς θεόν τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναγράφουσιν καὶ δομούσιον τῇ μητρὶ καὶ ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν ὡς ἀνθρωπον φάσκομεν, ὃ δει τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνθρωπον, κτιστὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ὡς αὐτὸν καὶ ἀκτιστόν, σῶμα τὸν αὐτόν καὶ ἀσώματον, [440] ἀπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνεπαφον, περιγράπτον τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπερίγραπτον, ἐπίγειον τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ οὐράνιον, σάρκα τὸν αὐτὸν ἐμφυσωμένην λογικῶς καὶ θεότητα πρόσφατον τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ αἰωνίον, ταπεινόν τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπέρτατον, καὶ ὡς δικτὴν ἀμερίστως εὐρίσκεται φόσεως, καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑπήρχεν ἄει, ὡς φόσιν ἔχων αἰωνίον, τὰ δὲ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐν χρόνοις ἐσχάτως ἀτρέπτως ἐγένετο, ὡς φύσιν προσφέρον τὴν ἀνθρώπειον.

2.3.7. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἑνώσις ἀτρέπτως ἰν καὶ ἀμερίστως, ὅσπερ καὶ ἀτρέπτῶς ἐστὶ καὶ ἀμερίστως μένει, καὶ τὰ δύο δύο ἀναλοώτως διαφορὰ σημαινόμενα καὶ ἀμερίστως ἐπερύθητι λάμποντα, φύσεις ταύτα καὶ οὐσίαι καὶ μορφαὶ καθεστήκασιν, ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἀπόρρητος γέγονεν ἑνώσις, καὶ ἐν αἷς εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Χριστὸς κατοπτεύεται, μένει καὶ τὸ ἐν ἐν, τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν γεγονός ἀποτέλεσμα, μηκέτι δίχα διαμορφώμενον, καὶ τὰ ἔξ ὃν ἔστιν ἄνευ τομῆς καὶ τροπῆς ἐνεκτυμένων ὑπόστασις τούτῳ τυγχάνει καὶ πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου ἐξ ἀναγχύτου συστάν ἀνακράσεως καὶ μερισμών οὐκ εἰδοπλάσεως καὶ τὸ εἰναι ἐν καὶ μένειν ἐν λαχῶν ἀδιαφρέτως, καὶ οὕτε δύο καθὸ ἐν ὑπάρχει γινόμενον οὕτε συγχέον καὶ πρὸς μίαν ἀγάν ἑνότητα καὶ φυσικὴ καὶ οὐσιώδης ταυτότητα τὰ ἐξ ὧν φυσικῶς συνεισήκει τοιαύτα ἀλλ’ ἔστιν ἐν καὶ δύο τὸ αὐτὸ γνωριζόμενον, ἐν μὲν κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὸ ἐν πρὸς ὑπόσως, δύο δὲ κατὰ τὰς φύσεις αὐτὰς καὶ τὰς φυσικὰς αὐτῶν ἑνότητας, ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὸ εἰναι ἐν διεκλήρωσι καὶ τὸ μένειν τῇ φύσει διπλούς διεφύλαξεν. Ὅθεν ὁ αὐτός μένων εἰς Χριστὸς καὶ υἱός καὶ μονογενὴς ἀδιάτμητος ἐν ἑκατέρας καθορ-ἀται τὰς φύσεις καὶ τὰ ἑκατέρας φυσικὰς οὐσιάς εἰργάζετο κατὰ τὴν ἑκατέρα προσοῤῥοαν οὐσιώδη ποιότητα ἡ καὶ φυσικὴν ἑνότητα.
both teach that he is in two natures, and describe the same as God, consubstantial with the Father, and speak of the same as a human being, consubstantial with his mother and with us. We maintain that the same one is visible and invisible, that the same one is likewise created and uncreated, that the same one is corporeal and incorporeal, that the same one is tangible and untouchable, that the same one is circumscribed and uncircumscribed, that the same one is earthly and heavenly, that the same one is flesh endowed with an intellectual soul, and Godhead, that the same one is lately appeared and eternal, that the same one is lowly and sublime; and whatever is found [to be] inseparably of dual nature, even though some parts exist forever because he has an eternal nature, yet others on our account came into being without change in the last times (Heb. 1: 2) when he assumed human nature.

7. For if the union was unchanging and unpartitioned, as indeed it abides unchanging and remains indivisible, and the two are indicated as two by an unaltered difference and are conspicuous by an unpartitioned otherness, these were established as natures and essences and forms from which the mysterious union came about and in which one and the same Christ is perceived. The one indeed remains one, what is produced from them is no longer divided in two, and those elements from which it is composed are demonstrated to be without severance and change. This is the hypostasis and the composite person, which is composed from an unconfused blending and does not know a segmentation of coming together, and it obtains an undivided existence that is one and remains one, neither becoming two in so far as it exists as one, nor confusing and leading to one unity and an identity of nature and essence those elements from which it is naturally constituted. The same thing is acknowledged to be both one and two, one according to both the hypostasis and the person, but two according to the natures themselves and their natural properties, from which it was allotted the state of being one and preserved the state of remaining dual in nature. Hence the same one, remaining one Christ and Son and only-begotten, is discerned not severed in each nature, and performs the acts of each essence naturally, according to the essential quality belonging to each or to its natural property. If he had a single and simple nature, as in his

57 Here begins the French translation of von Schönborn, Sophrone, 201–9.
διπερ εἰ τὴν φύσιν έσχε μοναδικήν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον καθὰ καὶ τὴν ὕπόστασιν τε [442] καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, οὗτ ἂν διεπράξατο καὶ οὔκ ἂν ὁ εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς νῦς καὶ Χριστὸς τὰ ἐκατέρας ἐντελῶς κατειργάζετο φύσεως. πότε γὰρ θεότης ἀμέτοχος σώματος ἔργα φυσικῶς κατειργάζατο σώματος, ἡ πότε σῶμα χρεείον θεότητος πράξεως ἐνήργησεν οὐσιωδῶς γνωριζομένας θεότητος;

2.3.8. Ὁ δὲ Ἑμμανουὴλ, εἰς ὃν καὶ ἐν ταυτῷ τὰ ἐκάτερα, τουτόστι θεός τε καὶ ἀνθρώπος, τὰ ἐκατέρας ἔδρα κατὰ ἀλήθειαν φύσεως, κατ᾽ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο ἐνέργεια τὰ πραπτόμενα, καθὸ μὲν θεός ὁ αὐτὸς τὰ θεία, καθὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπος ὁ αὐτὸς τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, ἐαυτὸν τοὺς πᾶσι δείχαι βουλόμενος ὡς θεός ὁ αὐτὸς εἰς καὶ ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τούτο ὁ αὐτὸς τὰ τε θεία ποιεὶ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, ὁμοίως καὶ λέγει καὶ φθέγγεται, καὶ οὔκ ἄλλος μὲν τὰ θαύματα πέπραξεν, ἄλλος δὲ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τέτευχε καὶ τὰ παθήματα πέπονθεν, ὡς Νεστόριος βούλεται, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς μὲν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Χριστὸς καὶ νῦς, ὁ τὰ θεία δεδρακῶς καὶ ἀνθρώπινα κατ᾽ ἄλλο δὲ καὶ ἄλλο, ὡς ὁ θεός ἐπρέα- βευσε Κύριλλος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν ἀμφοτέρω εἴσχε τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἀσύγχυτον οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ ἀμέριστον, καθὸ μὲν γὰρ θεός ὁ αὐτὸς ὑπήρχεν αἴδιος ἔδρα τὰ θαύματα, καθὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐγνωρίζετο πρόσφατος ἐποίει τὰ ταπεινά καὶ ἀνθρώπινα. ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ ἐκατέρα φυλάττει φύσις ἀνελλιπῶς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἰδιότητα, οὕτω καὶ ἐνεργεῖ ἐκατέρας μορφή μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινονικῆς τοῦ δὲ ὁ ἐδωκεν ἐσχήκτης, τοῦ μὲν λόγου κατεγαζομένου τοῦ ὁπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου, μετὰ τῆς κοινονίας δηλονότα τοῦ σώματος, τοῦ δὲ σώματος ἐκτελοῦντος ὁ περ ἐστὶ τοῦ σώματος, κοινοοῦντος αὐτῷ δηλονότα τοῦ λόγου τῆς πράξεως, καὶ ταύτα ἐν ὑποστάσει μιᾷ γνωριζόμενα καὶ ἐν προσώπῳ ἔναν θεωρούμενα καὶ τὴν βδελυγματίμην τομήν διωθοῦμεν. οὕτε γὰρ διηρημένως ἐνήργησεν τὰ ἰδία, ἰδία καὶ μερισμὸν αὐτῶν ὑποπτεύσωμεν.
hypostasis and person, he would not have accomplished, and the one and the same Son and Christ would not have performed, the acts of each nature perfectly. For when did Godhead, having no share in a body, perform bodily acts naturally, or when did a body, devoid of Godhead, execute actions which are recognized essentially as those of Godhead?

8. Emmanuel, being one and both in the same [person], that is both God and human being, truly performed the acts of each nature, executing what was done according to one or the other: as God, the same one executes divine acts; as a human being, the same one executes human acts, wishing to show himself to all—that the same one is God and a human being, and consequently that the same one performs both divine and human acts, and likewise in talking and speaking. It was not that one worked the miracles and another wrought the human acts and suffered sufferings, as Nestorius wants,\(^{58}\) but one and the same Christ and Son, the one who did the divine and the human deeds according to the one or the other, as the divine Cyril advocated,\(^{59}\) since indeed in both he possessed the unconfused, not to say also unpartitioned, power. For in so far as the same one existed eternally as God, he worked the miracles; in so far as the same one was revealed as being of recent times a human being, he performed the lowly and human deeds. For just as in Christ each nature keeps its own property intact, so too does each form, with the participation of the other, effect what it possesses as its own: the Word achieves what is proper to the Word, obviously with the participation of the body, while the body accomplishes what is proper to the body, when of course the Word shares the act with it.\(^{60}\) And these things are revealed in one hypostasis, and are beheld in one person, and repudiate the abominable severing. For nor do they effect their own acts in a divided way either, so that we might suspect division in them.

\(^{58}\) Nestorius was commonly perceived to have apportioned Christ's actions either to the divine nature or to the human nature, depending on whether they were lofty or banal.

\(^{59}\) The Cyrillian term 'according to one or the other' is cited in Article of Faith VII of the Announcement drawn up by Cyrus of Alexandria; document 3 in the monoenergist dossier, Part 3 below.

\(^{60}\) Cf. Leo, Letter (Tome) to Flavian (=Letter 28); ACO II, 1, 1, 14, 27–9.
2.3.9. Μὴ σκιρτάτω διὰ τοῦτο Νεστόριος ἐαυτὸν βουκολῶν ὁ παράφορος, ὁτιπερ ἐκάτερα μορφὴ ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ Χριστῷ καὶ νῦν μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας τοῦ θ' ὁπερ [444] ἰδιον ἐσχῆκεν ἐπραττεν, οὔτε γὰρ τῆς θατέρας κατ' αὐτὸν διεστῶσα τούθ' ὁπερ ἰδιον ἐσχῆκεν ἐπραττεν. οὐ γὰρ δύο κατ' αὐτὸν Χριστοὺς καὶ νῦνς τοὺς ἐνεργοῦντας δοξάζομεν εἰνα μὲν κατὰ φύσιν νῦν καὶ Χριστὸν τὰ παράδοξα, δεύτερον δὲ κατὰ χάριν νῦν καὶ Χριστὸν τὰ πτωχότερα, κἂν εἴ δύο τὰς κοινωνίας ἐνεργούσας μορφὰς δοξατίζομεν ἐκάστην κατὰ τὴν ἐαυτὸς φυσικὴν ἰδιότητα, ἀλλ' ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν νῦν καὶ Χριστὸν τὸν τὰ υψηλὰ πανελάθησαν καὶ συγκεκριμένους κατὰ τὴν ἐνατίτης τῶν δυον αὐτῶν φύσεως φυσικῆς καὶ συγκεκριμένος οὐκ ἐστέρητο, κἂν ἐν ὑποστάσει μαὸ διεδείκνυτο, μὴ μάτην πιθάνωσαν Εὐστυχῆς καὶ Διόσκορος εἰ τὴς οὐκ οὐσίας ἀθέου συγχύσεως πρόβολον ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἐκάστης φύσις τὸ ἱδιον ἐπραττε καὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν φεύγουσα καὶ τὴν τροπὴν οὐ γνώσκουσα καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν πρὸς τὴν θατέραν φυλάττουσα καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν καὶ συνθέσεις ἀδιάλυτον καὶ άρραγη διασιμύζουσα. ἔνθεν εἰσαβοῦν εἰπὲ τὸν ὅρον τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἰστήμενοι ὡστε τὸν ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν καὶ νῦν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἐκάτερα λέγομεν, ἐπειδὴ θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς ὑπήρχε καὶ άνθρωπος καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐνθουμούμεθα σύγχυσιν, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἐκάτερα μορφὴν μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἱδια φάσκοντες, ἐπειδὴ ὁ δύο μορφαὶ καθεστήκασιν ἐν ἐν καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστῷ φυσικῶς ἐνεργοῦσαν τὰ ἱδικα, τινὰ τὸ παράπαν ἐνυποκύμην διαίρεσιν, ὡς ἐνταύθα μὲν Ἐυστυχῆς, ἐκέεισε δὲ συνοφαντεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐθέλει Νεστόριος, ἕξ ἐνατίτης ἀλλήλων ἰστήμενοι καὶ τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν τῶν ευόβιων δυσσόβια μερισάμενοι πόλεμον.
9. Let Nestorius not rejoice on this account, the frenzied man who cheats himself, seeing that each form in the one Christ and Son did what was proper to it with the participation of the other, for neither when separated from the other in him did it do what it possessed as its own.\textsuperscript{51} For we do not glorify two Christs and two sons in him, the one who is Son and Christ by nature performing the miracles, and the second who is Son and Christ by grace performing the lowlier actions. Although we teach as two the forms which operate in common, each one according to its own natural property, still we declare as one and the same Son and Christ the one who accomplishes both lofty and lowly acts in a natural way, according to the natural and essential quality of each of his two natures. For the\textsuperscript{62} natures remained unchanged and unconfused\textsuperscript{63} and were revealed clearly as two, and were united in an unconfused way. They were not deprived of these acts at all, although they were manifested in one hypostasis, lest Eutyches and Dioscorus leap in vain, the promoters of the godless confusion that does not exist. But each nature, with the participation of the other, did what was proper to it,\textsuperscript{64} and avoided division, and did not recognize change,\textsuperscript{65} and preserved the difference with respect to the other, and kept the participation and the composition undissolved and unbroken. We, therefore, believing piously and standing within the boundaries of orthodoxy (cf. Prov. 22:28), say that the one and the same Christ and Son performed both acts, since the same one existed as God and a human being, and we do not entertain the idea of any confusion. So, while maintaining that each form, with the participation with the other, performs what is proper to it, since two forms are constituted in one and the same Christ and effect naturally their proper acts, we do not think at all of a kind of division, as Eutyches in one place, and Nestorius in another, wanted us to misrepresent. They stand at opposite extremes from each other, and are separated in the impious war which they wage against us who are of pious belief.

\textsuperscript{51} This again is the language of Leo’s \textit{Tone}.

\textsuperscript{52} Here begins another citation from Nicæphorus I of Constantinople, \textit{Against Eusebius}, in Pitra, \textit{Spicilegium Solesmense}, 487, which runs to the phrase ‘in one hypostasis’ a few lines further.

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, \textit{ACO II}, 1, 2, 129, 31; trans. Tanner, i. *86.

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Leo, \textit{Letter to Flavian}, \textit{ACO II}, 1, 1, 14, 27–8; trans. Tanner, i. *79.

\textsuperscript{55} This is an echo of part of the Definition of Chalcedon, \textit{ACO II}, 1, 2, 129, 31; cf. Tanner, i. *86.
2.3.10. Ὅσις εἰς οὐδὲν λογιζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἐκατέρας φύσεως ἐκατέραν ἑσμεν ἐνέργειαν, τὴν οὐσιωδὴ λέγω καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ [446] κατάλληλον, ἀδιαμέτρως εἰς ἐκάστης προϊόσκας οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως κατὰ τὴν ἐμπεφυκώναι αὐτὴ φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιωδὴ ποιότητα καὶ τὴν ἀμέριστον ὁμοία καὶ ἀνυγχυτον τῆς θατέρας οὐσίας συνεπαγομένην συνέργειαν. τούτο γὰρ καὶ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ ποιεῖ τὸ διάφορον, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶναι τὰς φύσεις τῶν φύσεως οὐ παύτων γὰρ θεότης τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότης κατὰ τὴν φυσικῶς ἐκάστη προσοάσαν ποιότητα, καὶ εἰς ὑπόστασιν μᾶν ἀλλήλαις ἀφράστως συνεδραμον καὶ εἰς ἐν ἀρυχύτως συνετέθησαν πρόσωπον καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔνα Χριστὸν ἡμᾶς καὶ υἱὸν ἀπετέλησαν διὰ τῆς καθ’ ὑπόστασιν πρὸς ἀλλήλας συνδρομῆς καὶ συνθέσεως. ὦ τοι γὰρ θεός λόγος θεὸς λόγος ἐστί καὶ οὐ σάρξ, καὶ σάρκα λογικῶς ἐμφυχωμένην προσελήφθη καὶ ἐνώπιος ταυτὴν ἑαυτὴν φυσικὴν καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἔνωσεν, ὡ ταύτα σάρξ ἐστιν ἐμφυχωμένη λογικῶς καὶ οὐ λόγος, καὶ εἰ θεοῦ λόγον σάρξ κατοπτέυεται, καὶ διὰ τούτο οὔτε τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπαραλλάκτως ἀλλήλαις ἐνέργειαις μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν τὴν φυσικήν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον, τουτέστι τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἔχουσιν, οὐδὲ μᾶν καὶ μονὴν αὐτῶν τὴν ἐνέργειαν λέγομεν ἡ οὐσιωδὴ καὶ φυσικὴ καὶ παντελῶς ἀπαράλλακτον, ἡνα μὴ καὶ εἰς οὐσίαν μίαν καὶ φύσιν μίαν αὐτὰ συνελάσωμεν τὴν Ἀκεφάλων παιζομένην παις καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀναιδῶς προφερομένην τοῖς ῥήμασι σύνθετον.

2.3.11. Ὡσπερ οὖν τὴν ἐκατέρας οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως, εἰ δὲν ἡμῖν ἑσύγχυτος ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ γέγονεν ἐνώσις καὶ τὸν ἐνα Χριστοῦ καὶ υἱὸν ἀπετέλεσεν ὅλον θεόν, ὅλον τὸν αὐτὸν πιστευόμενον ἀνθρωπόν, ἐκατέραν φυσικὴν ὁμολογούμεν ἐνέργειάν, ἣν μὴ τὰς ἀσύγχυτως ἐνωθείσας φύσεις συγχέωμεν, εἴπερ ἐκ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν καὶ μόνων κατὰ τοὺς τοιαύτα δεινοῦσιν αἱ φύσεις γνωρίζονται καὶ τῶν οὐσιῶν οἱ καὶ τοῦ διάφορον ἐκ τοῦ διαφόρου τῶν ἐνεργειῶν καταλαμβάνονται, πέφυκεν, οὕτω καὶ πάσαν φωνὴν καὶ ἐνέργειαν, καὶ θεὸς τις
10. Counting these men as nothing, we know that each activity of each nature (I mean the essential and natural and corresponding activity) proceeds indivisibly from each essence and nature according to its innate natural and essential quality, and we know the inseparable and at the same time unconfused cooperation of the other essence brought in with it. For it is this which makes the difference also in the activities in Christ, just as too the existence of the natures makes the difference in the natures. For Godhead and humanity are not identical with regard to the quality which is naturally inherent in each, although they met together inexpressibly in one hypostasis and were composed without confusion into one person, and produced the one and the same Christ and Son for us through the mutual, hypostatic, combination and composition. For the Word is God the Word and not flesh, although he assumed flesh endowed with an intellectual soul, and united this to himself in a natural and hypostatic union; and the flesh is flesh endowed with an intellectual soul and is not the Word, even if the flesh is discerned as belonging to God the Word. And because of this they neither have the same activity indistinguishably from each other after the natural and unconfused union, that is, the true and hypostatic union, nor do we speak of their one, single activity, that is, one that is essential, natural, and completely indistinguishable, lest we herd them even into one essence and one nature, made sport of by the children of the Headless Ones, and shamefully put forward by them explicitly as composite.

11. We therefore confess each natural activity of each essence and nature from which the unconfused union in Christ came about for us and brought about the one Christ and Son, wholly God, the same believed to be wholly a human being. [We do this] in order not to confuse the natures which are united without confusion, if as is the fact the natures are revealed from the activities and only from them, according to those who are experts in such matters, and the difference of the essences is always understood from the difference of the activities. Even so we teach that every utterance and activity, whether divine and heavenly or human and earthly, proceeds from one and the same Christ and Son and his one,

66 Cf. sec. 2.3.5, above.
67 On the Headless Ones see sec. 1.4.4, n. 121.
η καὶ [448] οὐδόμος καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη τε καὶ ἐπίγειος, ἡ ἴνος καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προϊέναι Χριστοῦ καὶ υἱὸν δογματίζομεν καὶ τῆς μιᾶς αὐτοῦ ανθρώπου καὶ μοναδικῆς ὑποστάσεως, ὡς σεσαρκωμένος τὸν θεοῦ λόγον ἐτίθηκεν, ὦ καὶ ἐκατέραν ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀσηχώτως ἐνέργειαν καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖνος φύσεις ἔπειτ' ἀυτοῦ φύσιν, καὶ ἵνα καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὁμοόσιος, τῷ θείῳ καὶ ἀνέκφραστον, καὶ τῇ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης, ὥσπερ τὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἄρα τῷ εἰσὶν καὶ ἀνθρώπως ἦμιν ὁ ἀυτὸς ὁμοόσιος ἔμενεν, τῆς ἀνθρωπείας καὶ πρόσγειον, τῆς ἐκάστης φύσεις ὁλην καὶ πρόσφορον καὶ οὐκ ἔως τῶν ὠρών των τὰ σκανδαλίζεσθαι, ὡς καὶ ὁ θεός ὁ αὐτὸς εὗρεν καὶ ἀνθρωπος ὁ ταῦτα κακείνα φυσικῶς ἑργαζόμενος, διὰ μὲν τὸν τὸν αὐτόν ἤνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνέργειαν τὰ ἐκάτερα τῆς Νεστορίου μιαρὰν ἐμφάνιζον ἀπόρροιαν—οὕτε γὰρ δύο κατ' αὐτὸν Χριστὸς καὶ υἱός, ὥσπερ εἰρήκαμεν, τοὺς ἐνεργοῦσας ταύτα τε κακείνα προσβεβεβομεν—διὰ δὲ τοῦ δεικνύοντα τὰ ἐκάτερα θύμα φύσεως ἀνάγχυστα μετὰ τῆς ἐνώπιοι μένοντα καὶ ἐκατέραν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὠρών προφέρειν ἐνέργειαν τῷ φυσικῷ λόγῳ γνωρίζομεν τῶν φύσεων καὶ τῆς οἰκείας φύσιν φυσικῶς ἐρμηνεύονσαν, ἀφ' ἔτη ἀμερίστως καὶ φυσικῶς ἑπηγάζετο καὶ οὐσιώδος ἀνεβλυσταν, τῆς Ἐυστηκοῖς ἐκτεθρών φιλοσύγχυτον βλάστησαν.

2.3.12. Ἐνεπείθεν τόκον τεχθεῖς τῶν ἢμέτερον γαλακτοτροφεῖται καὶ αὔξεται καὶ τὰς σωματικὰς μεθηλικιώσεις διέρχεται, ἀρχὴς οὗ πρὸ τοῦ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἡλικίας ἀφίκετο τέλειον, καὶ πείναν τῆς ἢμῶν καὶ δύσαν προθέμεναι καὶ κόσμον καὶ ἡμᾶς τὸν εἴσοδομος ὑπέμενεν. ἐποιεῖτο γὰρ καὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν ἦμιν ὀρμῶν ἐνέργειαν, ἄρτι ἄνθρωποις ἐνεργούμενη καὶ κατ' οὕσιάν τῆς ἀνθρωπείαν
composite, and single hypostasis. He was the incarnate God the Word, who produced naturally from himself in an inseparable and unconfused manner each activity according to his own natures: according to his divine nature on the one hand, in accordance with which he was consubstantial with the Father; [he produced] his divine and unutterable activity; while according to his human nature on the other hand, in accordance with which the same one also remained consubstantial with us human beings, [he produced] his human and mundane activity, [each activity being] congenial to and befitting each nature. And he does not allow any of those who see him to be scandalized, on the grounds that the same one, who performs this and that naturally, is not God and a human being: By effecting both actions, the one and the same Christ and Son stops up the foul effluence of Nestorius. (For neither, as we have said, do we worship two Christs and Sons in him, as if it is they who effect this and that.) By showing, on the other hand, that what is proper to each nature remains unconfused after the union, and that the same one [sc. Christ] likewise produces each activity, revealed by the natural principle of the natures, and expressing its own nature naturally, from which it springs forth inseparably and naturally and gushes forth according to its essence, he burns to ashes the sprout of Eutyches, which loves confusion.

12. Hence, being born like us, he [sc. Christ] was fed with milk, and grew, and went through the bodily developments which the years bring, until he reached mature human stature (cf. Eph. 4: 13), and accepted our hunger (cf. Matt. 4: 2) and thirst (cf. John 4: 7, 19: 28) and incurred the fatigue of journeys like us (cf. John 4: 6). He likewise performed the activity of walking like us, accomplished in human fashion, and advancing in accord with human

---

58 Here the adverbs ‘indivisibly’ and ‘unconfusedly’ of the Chalcedonian definition are pressed into service to show the necessity of confessing two activities in Christ, who is in two natures.

59 That is, according to Nestorius, the human actions stem from the humanity, the divine actions from the divine nature.

70 Eutyches supposedly taught that the two natures of Christ merged into a third substance.
προβαίνουσα τῆς ἀνθρωπείας αὐτοῦ φύσεως ἔτυγχανεν ἐνδείξει.

οὖν καὶ τόπον ὃς ἦμεις ἐκ τόπου μετέβαινεν, ἔπει καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέγονεν ἀνθρωπός καὶ φύσιν [450] τὴν ἡμῶν ἔσχεν ἀμείωτον καὶ περιγραφῆς ἦν ἕσχετο σώματος, καὶ σχήμα τὸ ἡμῶν ἁμρόζων πεφόρηκε. σωματικὴ γὰρ, τουτέστι σώματος, καὶ ἡ μορφὴ τυγχάνει τοῦ σχῆματος, καὶ ἢ ἐν μήτρα συλληφθεῖς διεσπελάστο καὶ ἢ ἐσ ἄει διετήρησε καὶ ἐσ αἰώνα διατηρεῖ τὸν ἀπέραντον.

2.3.13. Διὰ τούτο πεινῶν διετρέφετο, διὰ τούτο διωγμὸν ἐποτίζετο καὶ ὡς ἀνθρωπός ἐπικε. διὰ τούτο παιδικῶς ἐβαστάζετο ἀγκάλαις παρθενικάς ἐποχούμενος καὶ κύπες μητρικοῦ ἀνακείμενος, διὰ τούτο κοπιῶν ἐκαθέζετο καὶ ὑπον χρήζουν ἐκάθευδεν, ἄλλα καὶ ἠλέηται τυπτομένοι καὶ μαστιχόμενος ἐπασχε καὶ πάνω υπέμεινε σώματος χείρας καὶ πόδας τῷ σταυρῷ περιούμενος. ἐδίδου γὰρ, ὅτε καὶ ἤθελε, φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ καυρῶν ἐνεργείς καὶ πάσχεις τὰ ἔδα, ἢν μὴ φαντασία τις καὶ θέα διάκενος ἡ αὐτοῦ περιώμυος κρίνοιτο σάρκωσις. οὐ γὰρ ἀκοσμίως ταῦτα ἢ ἀναγκαστῶς προσεδέχετο, καὶ φυσικὰς αὐτὰ καὶ ἀνθρωπινὰς προσέτετο καὶ ἀνθρωπινὰς κυνήσεις ἐποίει καὶ ἐποτετειν, ἀπαγε τῆς βδελυκτῆς ἐνθυμήσεως θεοῦ γὰρ ἢ τοῦ παέσχαν σαρκικὰς ἀνεχόμενος καὶ σώζων ἡμᾶς τοῖς οἰκείοις παθήμασι καὶ βραβεύσων ἡμῖν δι’ αὐτῶν τὴν ἅπαθειαν, ἀλλ’ ὅτε πάσχεις καὶ πρότετες καὶ ἐνεργείς ἀνθρωπινός ὁ αὐτὸς ἐβεβούλητο καὶ τοὺς ὀρῶντας ὀφελεῖν ἐπιφείζετο, δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέγονεν, καὶ οὐχ ὅτε αἱ φυσικὰ κυνήσεις καὶ σαρκικά κινεῖσαι φυσικῶς πρὸς ἐνέργειαν ἤθελον ἢ οἱ ἐπιβουλεύοντες ἄθεοι τὰς ἐπιβουλαὶς πληροὶ παντόλιμοι ἐγλύκνοντο. σῶμα γὰρ παυτοῦ καὶ θετοῦν καὶ φθαρτὸν ἐνεδύσατο καὶ τοὺς φυσικοὺς καὶ Δωδεκάτους ἡμῶν ὑποκείμενον πάθεσι, καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τῆς οἰκεία φύσει κατάλληλα πάσχεις καὶ δράν συνεχώρησε μέχρι [452] τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἐκείσε ἔγρα καὶ τὸ παθητὸν ἡμῶν καὶ θετοῦν καὶ φθαρτὸν καταλέλυκε καὶ τῆς ἐκ τούτων ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῖν ἐχαρέσατο.
essence, gave proof of his human nature. For this reason he also went from place to place as we do, since he had become truly a human being and possessed our nature without diminution and was restrained by bodily limitation, and bore an appearance corresponding to ours. The form of his appearance was bodily, that is, belonging to a body, in accordance with which he was conceived and moulded in the womb, and which he preserved for always and will preserve for endless ages.

13. This is why when he was hungry (Matt. 4: 2) he was fed, this is why when he was thirsty (cf. John 4: 7, 19: 28) he was given drink and drank as a human being, this is why as a child he was carried as he rested in the Virgin's arms and reposed on his mother’s bosom, this is why when he was tired he sat down (cf. John 4: 6), and when he needed sleep he slept (cf. Matt. 8: 24), even so he felt pain when hit (cf. John 18: 23), and when whipped (cf. Matt. 26: 27) he suffered, and underwent bodily pain when his hands and feet were pierced on the cross (cf. John 19: 12). For when he wished he gave his human nature the occasion to activate and suffer what was proper to it, lest his far-famed incarnation be judged some kind of illusion and a hollow spectacle. For he did not take these things upon himself against his will or under necessity, although he did submit to them in a natural and human manner, and did and performed them with human movements: perish the abominable idea! For it was God who endured suffering these things in the flesh and saved us with his own sufferings and through them awarded us freedom from passions. But sometimes the same one decided to suffer and operate and act in a human fashion, and resolved to help those who were watching, on whose account he had in truth become a human being, and not when natural and fleshly movements wished to be moved naturally to activity, or godless conspirators strove with consummate daring to accomplish their plots. For he put on a body that was passible and mortal and corruptible and subject to our natural and blameless passions, and he permitted it to suffer and do what corresponded to its own nature until his resurrection from the dead. There he brought our passibility and mortality and corruptibility to an end and bestowed on us freedom from them.

71 These are the natural, human emotions or affections which are in themselves innocent; their assumption by Christ does not negate his sinlessness.
2.3.14. Τὰ μὲν οὖν ταπεινὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα οὕτως ἐκουσίως ὅμως καὶ φυσικῶς μένων κἀν τούτοις θεὸς ἐπεδείκνυτο τιμᾶς γὰρ ἢν αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ παθῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ πράξεων, καὶ οὐ μόνον ταμίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρύτανις καὶ εἰ φύσιν παθητὴν φυσικῶς ἐσεσάρκωτο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἢν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπον αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, οὐκ ἐπειδήπερ ἢ φύσις ἢν οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ ἐπειδήπερ ἐκουσίως γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος. καὶ ἄνθρωπος γεγονὼς ἐκουσίως αὐτὰ προσεδέχετο καὶ οὐ τυραννικῶς ἢ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἔστω τι οὐκ ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀβουλήτως, ἀλλ’ ἡμίκα καὶ ὅσον ἢβούλετο, καὶ συγχωρεῖν αὐτὸς τοῖς τέτειλέν, τὰ πάθη προσφέρου τοῖς τε παθήμασιν αὐτοῖς κατὰ φύσιν ἐνεργούμενοις ἐπένευεσθε. τὰ δὲ θεῖα καὶ λαμπρὰ καὶ ὑπέρτατα καὶ νικώντα προδήλους ἡμῶν τὴν εὐτελείαν, ἀπερ ἢν θαυμαστά τε καὶ περάστια καὶ τῶν παραδόξων ἑργῶν ἡ πρόοδος, ὁποίαν αὐτὴν ἢν

ἡ ἀσπορος σύλληψις,
ἡ Ἰωάννου ἐγγάστριος σκίρτησις,
ὁ τόκος ὁ ἄθορος,
ἡ παρθενία ἢ ἀχραντος,
ἡ πρὸ τοῦ τόκου καὶ ἐν τῷ τόκῳ καὶ μετὰ τὸν τόκον ἀλώβητος,
ἡ τῶν ποιμένων οὐράνιους μήνισις,
ἡ τῶν μάγων ἀστροκίνητος ἐλκυσις; δωροφορία τε σὺν αὐτῇ καὶ προσκύνησις,
ἡ τῶν γραμμάτων ἀμαθήτευτος εἰδήσις—πῶς γὰρ οὗτος, φησίν,
οἶδε γραφήματα μὴ μεμαθηκῶς; μερικῶς ἀπελεύχουσα τῶν τῆς ἀγνοιας ἐρμοῦ τῶν κακοτροπον ἐρώτα—
ἡ ἐξ ὦδῶν οἰνόδης ἐμφόρησις,
tῶν ἀσθενῶν ἡ ἐπίρρωσις,
tῶν τυφλῶν ἡ ἀνάβλεψις,
tῶν κυλλών ἡ ἀνόρθωσις,
tῶν παραλύτων ἡ σύσφιγξις,
tῶν χωλῶν ἡ εὐθύδρομος κίνησις,
the conception without seed,
the leaping of John in the womb,
the uncryptive birth,
the undefiled virginity which was intact before the birth and
during the birth and after the birth,
the heavenly message given to the shepherds,
the drawing of the Magi moved by a star, and the bearing of gifts
which came with it and the adoration,
the knowledge of learning by one who had not studied (‘For how
is it’, they said, ‘that he has learning when he has not studied?’
(John 7: 15), [the knowledge] which in particular refuted the
pervasive love of the lovers of ignorance),
the changing of water into wine,
the invigoration of the sick,
the restoration of sight to the blind,
the straightening out of the deformed,
the bracing of the paralytics,
the straight course of the lame,

72 On the significance of the words ‘steward’ (ταμίας) and ‘governor’ (πρυτανεύ) here see Hovorun, Will, Action and Freedom, 138–41: they refer to the ‘ultimate source of the
energetai, from where and by which they are distributed and provided, as well as
directed and controlled, evaluated and judged’. 

14. Thus in this way he exhibited the humble and human things voluntarily and at the same time naturally, remaining God in the midst of them nonetheless. For he was his own steward of human passions and acts, and not merely steward but also governor of them, although according to nature he became incarnate with respect to a possible nature, and on account of this his human elements went beyond the human, not because his nature was not human, but because he became a human being voluntarily. And having become a human being, he submitted to these [human elements] voluntarily and not through tyranny or necessity, as sometimes happens to us even against our will, but at the precise time and to the extent that he wished, and he himself consented to yield both to those things which brought the sufferings and to the sufferings themselves, which were effected in accordance with nature. [Contrast] the divine and luminous and loftiest actions, on the other hand, and those clearly surpassing our mean estate, namely the miraculous and the extraordinary and the emanation of wondrous deeds, such as:
τῶν λεπτῶν ἢ ύπέρλαμπρος κάθαρσις,
tῶν πεινώτων ἢ σχέδιος πλήρωσις,
tῶν διωκόντων ἢ πήρωσις,
tῶν ἀνέμων [454] ἢ κοίμησις,
tῆς θαλάττης ἢ γαληναία κατάστασις,
ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀδάτων ἐνώματος βάδισις,
ἡ τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πνευμάτων ἐκδίωξις,
ἡ τῶν στοιχείων αἰφνιδίως κύκησις,
ἡ τοῦ ἠλίου παγκόσμιος σκότωσις,
ἡ τῶν μνημείων αὐτόματος ἀνοίγις,
ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν τριήμερος ἔγερσις,
ἡ τῆς φθορᾶς οὐ τελευτῶσα κατάλυσις,
ἡ τοῦ θανάτου μὴ πανομένη καθαίρεσις,
ἡ ψυλλαττόμενη τῆς λίθου καὶ τάφου σφραγίδος ἀκώλυθος ἔξοδος,
ἡ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ἀκράτητος εἰσόδος,
ἡ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀπὸ γῆς πολυθαύμαστος καὶ ἐνσώματος ἀνοδος,

καὶ πάντα τὰ τούτων παρόμοια τὰ καὶ λόγον φύσιν καὶ φωνῆς ὑπερβαίνοντα δύναμιν καὶ πάσαν ἀνθρωπείαν ὑπερνικώντα δίᾶσιν, ἀπερ ἀπαντα ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην τελεύμενα τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου θείας οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ὁμολογομένως ὑπήρχε τεκμήρια, εἰ καὶ διὰ σαρκὸς ἐνηργεῖτο καὶ σῶματος καὶ οὐ δίχα σαρκὸς λογικῶς ἐμψυχωμένης ἐπράττετο.

2.3.15. Καὶ οὖ διὰ ταῦτα τῶν θεῶν λόγον τοπάσομεν ἀσαρκοῦν ἢ σῶματος αὐτῶν ἕκτος δογματίσομεν, ὅτισπερ ἐδρα τὰ σωμάτων ὑπέρτερα, καὶ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ὁ λόγος σεσάρκωτο καὶ ἀμφιθώριος σαρκωθεῖς σεσωμάτωτο, καὶ εἰς νῦν ἐγενώσκετο οἱ πᾶσαι εἰς ἑαυτοῦ προφέρων ἐνέργειαν, θείαν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπινην, ταπεινήν καὶ ὑπέργειον, χθαμαλήν καὶ οὐράνιον, σαρκικήν καὶ ἀσωμάτων, ὀρατήν καὶ ἀόρατον, περιγραπτήν καὶ ἀπερίγραπτον, ἀναλογοῦσαν αὐτοῦ τῇ δυνάτι τῶν φύσεων καὶ δι' ἑαυτῆς αὐτῆς ἀσιγνήτως κηρύττουσαν καὶ διαπροσώπως ἀγγέλουσαν. εἰς γὰρ ὄν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς
the resplendent cleansing of the lepers,
the prompt satisfying of the hungry,
the blinding of the persecutors,\textsuperscript{73}
the stilling of the winds,
the calm subduing of the sea,
the bodily walking on the waters,
the expulsion of the unclean spirits,
the sudden stirring up of the elements,
the darkening of the sun over all the world,
the spontaneous opening of the tombs,
the rising from the dead after three days,
the never-ending dissolution of corruption,
the unceasing destruction of death,
the unimpeded exit, under guard, from the stone and the sealed
tomb,
the unchecked entry through the locked doors,
the wholly astonishing ascension in the body from earth into
heaven,

and all deeds comparable to these which surpass the nature of
speech and the power of voice and are more than superior to all
human understanding (cf. Eph. 3: 20). All of these, accomplished
beyond human reason and nature, are confessedly signs of the
divine essence and nature of God the Word, even if they are
effected through the flesh and the body and are not achieved apart
from the flesh endowed with a rational soul.

15. We shall not as a consequence of these considerations con-
jecture that God the Word is fleshless, or teach that he is without a
body, because he performed deeds superior to the body. Indeed,
the Word truly became incarnate and, being made incarnate
without deceit, took a body and is acknowledged as one Son, he
who brings forth every activity from himself, both divine and
human, both humble and exceedingly great, earthly and heavenly,
fleshly and incorporeal, visible and invisible, circumscribed and
uncircumscribed, corresponding to his duality of natures, and
unfailingly proclaiming the duality through itself, and loudly
announcing it. For since the same Son, indivisible in regard to his

\textsuperscript{73} This is apparently a reference to the blinding of the persecutor Saul (Acts 9:
1–9), and thus quite out of chronological sequence.
καθ’ ὑπόστασιν οὐδ’ ἀδιαίρετος καὶ δύο φύσεις ὁ αὐτὸς γνωριζόμενος, κατ’ ἄλλην μὲν τὰς θεσμοθείας εἴργαξε, κατ’ ἄλλην δὲ τὰ ταπεινά παρεδέξατο, καὶ διὰ τούτο φασι οἱ θεόφρονες οἱ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοὺς ἄθλους στεφάμενοι καὶ τὸ φάσκειν θεόθεν δεξάμενοι τὰς θεωτάτας συνεσεῖς ἡμῶν ἐξυφαινόντες, ὡς ὅταν ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἐνὸς υἱοῦ τὰς ἐναντίας φωνὰς, καταλήλης μέριζε ταῖς φύσει τὰ λεγόμενα, ἂν μὲν τί μέγα καὶ θείων τῇ θείᾳ φύσει προσνέμουν, ἂν δὲ τί μικρὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπων τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ λογιζόμενος. οὕτω γὰρ [456] καὶ τὸ τῶν φωνῶν ἀσύμφωνον διαφεύξῃ ἐκάστης ἡ πέφυκεν ἓδει δεχομένης φύσεως καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἑνα καὶ πρὸ πάντων ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ πρόσφατον κατὰ τὰς ἁγίας γραφὰς ὁμολογήσεις. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς υἱοῦ φασί· πάσαν μὲν ἐνέργειαν ὅπι ἂν τις χωρίσει τῆς μιᾶς υἱότητος, τῆς δὲ φύσεως ἢ ἑστὶν οἰκεῖον τῷ γνώμενον τῷ λόγῳ γνωρίσειεν.

2.3.16. Οὐκοῦν κάλλιστα λίαν αὐτοῖς δεδογμάτισται τὸ ἑνα μὲν ὁμολογεῖν τὸν Ἐρμανουήλ, οὕτως γὰρ ὁ θεὸς λόγος σαρκωθεῖς ὁμομάζεται, καὶ τὸν ἄμαντον δράν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον τὰ τε ύψηλα καὶ ἑλάχιστα παντοῦς ἐκτὸς διαστάσεως, δι’ ὅν καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φύσεων ἀπίγχιστος ή διπλῆς γνωρίζεται καὶ εἰς ὑποστάσεις δύο καὶ πρόσωπα διαμιμήκει ὁ αὐτὸς οὐ μερίζεται, ἀλλ’ ἐστιν εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς υἱὸς καὶ Χριστὸς ἀδιάμετρος ἐν δυοῖν ἀδιαίρετος γνωριζόμενος φύσει καὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα τοῦ ἐνὸς υἱοῦ διαβεβαιώμεθα καὶ πάντα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς φωνὰς καὶ τὰς ἐνέργειας πιστεύσειμεν, καὶ αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἶσον θεοπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ οὕτω πάλιν ἀνθρωποπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ μέσην τινα τάξιν ἐπέχουσιν ὡς ἐχουσαί το θεοπρεπές ἐν ταυτῷ
hypostasis and the same one revealed as two natures, is one, he performed the miracles according to one [nature], and admitted the lowly acts according to the other. Because of this those who have godly thoughts, who have been crowned in the contests by Christ God and have received the gift of speaking from God, and have together woven for us most godly understanding, say: 'When you hear contrary expressions about the one Son, divide what is said correspondingly between the natures. If something is great and divine, assign it to the divine nature, but if something is small and human, reckon it to the human [nature].'\textsuperscript{74} 'For in this way you will both avoid discordant vocabulary, each nature receiving what is proper to it, and you will confess the one Son, both before all ages and lately appeared, in accordance with the holy scriptures.'\textsuperscript{75} But they also say the following about the one Son: 'One should not separate every activity from the one sonship, but should recognize the event by the principle of the nature to which it is proper.'\textsuperscript{75}

16. Surely, then, it has been exceedingly well taught that one should confess as one the Emmanuel (for so the incarnate God the Word is called), and that the same one, and not one and another, performed all activities, both the lofty and the least, without dispersion of any kind. Through these activities also the unconfused, twofold character of his natures is revealed, and the same one is not separated through and through into two hypostases and persons, but is one and the same unrent Son and Christ, revealed inseparably in two natures. And we confirm that all these things belong to this one Son, and we believe that the words and the activities all belong to him, although some of them befit the Godhead, while others again befit the humanity, while still others occupy a middle rank, inasmuch as they possess in the same activity what befits both God and the human,\textsuperscript{77} while we attribute to

\textsuperscript{74} Theodoret, \textit{Exposition of the Right Faith} (CPG 6218), ch. 11; \textit{PG} 6, 1225BC; ed. Otto, III, 1, 38–40.

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., ch. 10; \textit{PG} 6, 1225A; ed. Otto, III, 1, 36.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., ch. 12; \textit{PG} 6, 1232A; ed. Otto, III, 1, 48–50.

\textsuperscript{77} An almost verbatim quotation from Cyril's letter to Acacius of Melitene, ch. 16; see Wickham, \textit{Cyril of Alexandria}, 52, ll. 14–17. Cyril was himself simply paraphrasing the conclusion of the Formula of Reunion.
καὶ ἀνθρώπινον, ταύτης δὲ φαμεν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τῆς κατημὸν καὶ θεονομικῆς ἱερομοίρας ἐνέργειαν, οὐ μίαν ὑπάρχουσαν ἀλλὰ ἐπιτρεπχομενη καὶ διάφορον, ἢν ὁ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου Παῦλου τῆς θείως θείως ζωγραφίης θεογόνου διονυσίου ἐφησεν, ὡς τὸ θεοπρεπὲς ἐν ταιτῷ καὶ ἀνθρώπινον ἔχουσαν καὶ διὰ τῆς χαριστάτης τοῦ καὶ συνθέτου προσφήσεως τῆς ἐκάστης οὐδείς καὶ φύσεως ἐκάστην ἐντελῶς δηλοῦσαν ἐνέργειαν.

2.3.17. Προαιώνιον τοίνυν τὸν θεὸν λόγου δοξάζοντες καὶ τῷ πατρὶ συναίδιον χρονικῆς ὑπομείναι πρεσβεύομεν γέννησιν, ἢν ἐκ παρθένου τῆς κυρίως [480] καὶ ἀληθῶς θεοτόκου Μαρίας σαρκικῶς ἀπετίκτετο, καὶ διὰ τούτου δύο τάς γεννήσεις γεγεννηθῆναι πρὸς τῶν εὐσεβούντων εἰκότως πιστεύσαν καὶ τέλειος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν θεότητι τέλειος ἢν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, οὕτε τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν οὐσιῶν διαρκοῦν, οὕτε τῇ τῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ τοῦ προσώπου ταυτότητα τὰς φύσεις ἄγων πρὸς οὐσώδη ταυτότητα, ἀλλὰ ἢ δὲν καθ’ ὑπόστασιν πέφηνε φύσεως, ἐν αὐταὶς ἀδιάφρακτος ἦμεν, πάντα σοφός καὶ ἀληθώς ὑπελθὼν τὰ ἡμέτερα ἔργα καὶ πάθη, φυσικά καὶ ἀναβλήτησα πράγματα τὰ μόνον μακρὰ καὶ μολύσματος καὶ ἡ ὀικ. ἀμαρτιας ἰχνος τοῖς μη εὔρισκεται. ἀμαρτίαις γὰρ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ τις δόλος ἐν τῷ ἀστιματεί αὐτοῦ τὸ σύνολον εὑρήται. καὶ συνανταστραφεὶς ἀνθρωπότητι ἦμιν, ἅτε τέλειος γνωστικός ἀνθρωπος καὶ ἡ ἀνθρωπος ἐγκεκριμένη συμφωνίαν ἑξετάζεται καὶ συμμετοχήν τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσβλέπεται, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς δι’ ἀνθρωπίας σωτηρίαν ἐκκλησίας προσδοκεῖται καὶ δεσμεύεται καὶ κολαφίζεται καὶ ἐμπτύσεται καὶ μαστίζεται καὶ
this power the activity called ‘new and theandric’, which is not one but heterogeneous and differentiated. This was the term Dionysius the Areopagite, who spoke of God, expressed to the divine Paul when he had been divinely taken captive by him (cf. Acts 17: 34), since it holds both the God-befitting and the human in the same one, and because the term is both elegant and composite, demonstrating perfectly each activity of each essence and nature.

17. Therefore in glorifying God the Word who is before the ages and co-eternal with the Father, we profess that he underwent a birth in time, in respect of which he was born incarnate from the Virgin Mary, who is properly and truly Theotokos, and because of that he is rightly believed by those of pious belief to have had two births. And the same being perfect in Godhead was, the same, perfect in humanity, neither being divided by the difference of the essences, nor by the identity of the hypostasis and the person leading the natures to an identity of essence, but he remained undivided in the natures from which he appeared hypostatically, in wisdom and in truth undergoing all our works and passions—those natural and blameless matters which are far from censure and defilement and in which no trace of sin is found. For he did not commit sin nor could any guile be found in his mouth at all (1 Pet. 2: 22; cf. Isa. 53: 9). And he lived with us in human fashion, inasmuch as he was revealed as a perfect human being, although the same one was flawlessly God and performed miracles as was appropriate; for he was revealed as perfect God, although he was bound fast to a human flesh that was intellectually ensouled. He gave access to voluntary passion and was given up voluntarily to the Jews—or rather he gave himself up voluntarily to them because of the salvation of human beings, and he was bound, and slapped, and spat on, and whipped and scoffed and mocked, and

---


79 The same expression has already been used. See sec. 2.3.4, above.

80 Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, *ACO II*, 1, 2, 129, 27–9; trans. Tanner, i. *86.

81 Once again we have the echo of the Definition of Chalcedon: *ACO II*, 1, 2, 129, 24–5; trans. Tanner, i. *86.
ἐμπαίζεται καὶ χαλαμώδας πορφυράν ὡς βασιλεύων τῶν ὅλων ἐνδύεται καὶ κάλαμον ὡς σκήπτρον βασιλικὸν βασιλικῶς ἐγχειρίζεται καὶ Πιλάτου κατακρίνεται κρίνοντος καὶ τέλος ἰκρώ ἐρτήγωνται καὶ χείρας καὶ πόδας αἰμάζουσαι τῷ σωτηρίῳ σταυρῷ προσηλούμενος· καὶ λησταίς συνεπαίρεται καὶ ὄξος συνίζεται καὶ χολῆς ἀπογενέται καὶ μέγα βοήσεις τῷ πατρί τῇ ψυχῇ παραδίδωσι καὶ τῇ πλευρᾷ τῇ λόγχῃ τιτρώσκεται καὶ αἷμα καὶ ὠδωρ σωτηρίου μετὰ θάνατον προχεῖ καὶ νέκρωσιν καὶ νεκροῖς [460] τοῦ σταυροῦ καταφέρεται καὶ κηδεύεται καὶ συμπαύεται καὶ ταφὴν τριήμερον βάπτεται καὶ τριταῖς ἀναστάς τοῦ τάφου προέρχεται καὶ πάντας ἔνας τούς νεκροὺς συνανίστησιν ἐκ τάφου καὶ φθορᾶς πρὸς τὴν οὐ τελευτώσαν αὐτοὺς ζωῆν ἐπαγόμενος διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως· καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἐμφανίζεται καὶ πιστοποιεῖται βρόσις καὶ πόσει καὶ ἄφη χειρῶν ἀποστολικῶν τῆς οἰκείας σαρκὸς τῆς ἀνάστασιν καὶ πνεύμα τοῦτος παρέχει πανάγιον, ὡς συγγενεῖς αὐτῶ καὶ ὀμόφυλον, καὶ εἰς οὐρανοῦς ἀναφέρεται, μάλλον δὲ ὡς καὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν δεσπόζων ἀνέρχεται καὶ δεξιὸς τοῦ τεκόντος καθέζεται θώκων ἐξω τῶν πατρικῶν καὶ βασιλικῶν καὶ ὑπέρτατον· θεοὶ καὶ πάλιν ἐλεύσεται κρίσιν ζωτικῶν καὶ νεκρῶν ποιησόμενος καὶ ἀποδώσων ἐκάστως κατὰ τὰς πράξεις, ἀσπερ ἐκαστος πέπραξεν, εἶτε ἀγαθὸς τις πράξεις καὶ καλὰς, εἶτε φαύλας καὶ ψεκτὰς κατειργάσατο. ὦν σὺν πατρί τε καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ βασιλεὺς τῶν ὅλων πιστεύομεν βασιλεύως ἀληθῶς ἀπελευθητὸν καὶ τέλος οὗ δεχομένην καὶ πλήρωμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκων οἰκονομίας ταυτὸν δὲ φάναι παραδόξου τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σαρκώσεως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ταπεινοὺς ἡμᾶς ὑμνώσεως, ὡς λέγω καὶ φρονῶ διὰ βραχέων ἐγνώρισα.
was clad in a purple cloak (Math: 27: 28) like one who was king of all, and in kingly fashion a reed was put into his hand like a kingly sceptre, and was condemned by Pilate acting as judge, and finally he was fixed to the scaffold and his hands and feet were bloodied as he was nailed to the saving cross. And he was raised up with robbers and was given vinegar to drink and tasted gall, and with a great cry gave up his soul to the Father, and was pierced in the side with a lance, and poured forth saving blood and water (John 19: 34) after his dying and death. And when dead he was taken down from the cross and tended and embalmed and buried in a tomb for three days, and rising on the third day he went forth from the tomb, and with himself he raised up all the dead, through his own resurrection from the dead leading them from the tomb and corruption to the life which has no end. And when he had risen from the dead, he appeared to the disciples, and validated his resurrection by means of eating and drinking and the touching of the apostles' hands on his own flesh, and he bestowed on them the all-holy Spirit, because it was of the same kin and of the same stock as himself, and was taken up into the heavens—or rather he went up as lord of the heavens, and is seated at the right hand of the one who begat him, possessing the royal and sublime throne of his Father. From thence he will come again to make judgement of the living and the dead, and to repay each one according to the actions which each has performed, whether someone has effected good and beautiful deeds, or foul and blameworthy. We believe that he reigns over all with both the Father and the Holy Spirit, with a reign which is truly without end and does not accept finality and completion. But with regard to the dispensation of the flesh, that is to say of the wondrous incarnation of God the Word and his becoming like us lowly beings, I have briefly made known what I say and think.

181 Cf. Symbol of Constantinople I, *ACO II, 1, 2, 80; trans. Tanner, i. *24. The attribution of an endless reign to Christ together with the Father and Spirit, which was not articulated in the creed of Nicaea in 325, was necessitated by Marcellus of Ancyra's doctrine. According to this teaching, after his earthly life Christ was subsumed back into the divinity; thus there was no question of the Emmanuel reigning endlessly. This addition was included in the creed of Constantinople in 381.
184 Once again Sophronius claims to be brief. At this point von Schönborn's French translation ceases.
2.4.1. Περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ ὄρωμένου κόσμου γεγονότα συστάσεως καὶ συντελείας, ἢν οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ὑποδέξοιτο, ὀρμολογῶ, θεοτίμητοι, ὡς πάντα οὐ μόνον τὰ ὀρατὰ ἄλλα δὴ καὶ ἄορατα ὁ εἰς θεὸς ἐπεκτῆναι, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ οἶος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν, ἡ ἀναίδειος φύσις καὶ ἀναρχὸς, κάκ μὴ ὅτι καὶ τὰ πρότερον μιρία ἐκλεισθεῖσα καὶ ὁὶκεῖσθαι πρὸς τὰ πεντήκοντα συνεφημένως. Καὶ ὅταν πρῶτον ἐκεῖσθαι τὰ πεντήκοντα, ὡς θεὸς προϊστάμενος, ἀρχὴν τε τοῖς πάσι χρονικῆς ὥρας-ἀμένων, τὰ μὲν αἰσθητὰ τέλει χρονικῇ καθυπέβαλε, τὰ δὲ νοητὰ καὶ ἄορατα τοῦτον ἀξίας ἡξίσθηκα μεῖζονος. Καὶ θυνήσει μὲν οὐδαμῶς οὐδὲ θείρεται κατὰ τὸ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ῥευστῶν καὶ εὐπάροιστων,

2.4.2. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ, ἔπειπερ αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαὶ θεοῦ χάριτι τὴν φθορὰν ἀπεώσαντο τὴν πᾶσι κτιστοῖς φυσικῶς ἐμφωλεύσαν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸ σωμάτων αὐτὰς ὑποτεύσαμεν καὶ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ ὄρωμένου κόσμου παραγωγῆς καὶ συμπήξεως ἐν αἰδίῳ τυί ζωῆς τελείων εἰννόησομεν καὶ βίον ἐχειν οὐράνιον φήσαιμεν ἀσαρκὸν τε καὶ ἀσώματον ζώσας ζωῆς τὴν αἰδίῳ ὑπάρχοντι, ως Ὀριγένης ὁ παράφορος βούλεται καὶ οἱ τοῦτος συμμυῆται καὶ
2.4. PROFESSION OF FAITH IN CREATION

1. Concerning the coming into being of the visible world, its establishment at the beginning of time, and its consummation, which it may receive before long, I confess to you, honoured by God [sc. Sergius], that the one God framed everything, not only the visible but also the invisible—the one God, Father, Son, Holy Spirit, that is, the nature which is eternal and without beginning—and brought from non-existence into existence and created what previously was not, and wisely brought into being the myriad varieties of them. The Father made everything through the only-begotten Son in the Holy Spirit, [everything] which he holds in being through wise foresight, presiding as God over his own works, and establishing a beginning in time for everything, he subjected the perceptible to an end in time, while to the intellectual and unseen he awarded greater honour than to these: they will not die at all or corrupt in the way that perceptible things flux and easily dissipate, not that they are immortal by nature or have changed into an incorruptible essence, but he has granted them this grace which keeps them from corruption and death. Thus the souls of human beings remain incorruptible, thus the angels continue immortal, not that they are truly incorruptible in nature, as we have said, or in an essence which is properly immortal, but because they have been allotted a grace from God which bestows immortality and will grant them an incorrupt existence.

2. But it is not because the souls of human beings, by the grace of God, have thrust off the corruption lurking naturally in all created things that we shall suppose therefore [that they existed] before bodies, or that we shall think that they existed in some eternal life before the creation and the compacting of the visible world. Nor would we allege that they had a heavenly way of life, living a fleshless and incorporeal life eternally in a heaven which once did not exist, as the frenzied Origen would have it, and his confederates who are of like mind with him, Didymus and

85 Here I have adopted a punctuation different from Riedinger's.
σύμφρονες Δίδυμος καὶ Εὐάγγειλος καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς αὐτῶν μυθομέρμνος ὃμιλος, οἷς ὁ τούτῳ μόνῳ πεπλανημένῳ δοξάζουσιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐμφύρομενοι δόγμασι καὶ τὴν Χριστιανῶν καταρυπούντες εὐγένειαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν σωμάτων τούτων, ὥν νυνὶ περικείμεθα, ἀνοητῶς ἀναιροῦσιν ἀνάστασιν, μυρία δενὰ βατταρίζοντες τῆς δυσσεβοῦς αὐτῶν μυθοπλαστίας ἐπάξια, οἷς ἄρκει πρὸς ἐπιπληξίαν τὸ Παύλῳ πρὸς Κορινθίους λεγόμενον, ὡς εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται. καὶ λοιπὸν οὕτως αὐτοῖς τοῖς λογισμοῖς ματαιάζουσι τό· καὶ ἄρα μάταια ἡ πίστις ύμῶν προστεθήσεται. ἢ οὐ μέρος, ὡς οὖν, τῆς ἡμῶν σεπτῆς ὁμολογίας γεγένηται καὶ ταυτηθῇ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡ ἀνάστασις; καὶ ἑσπηκὼς γὰρ ἀνάστασιν ὁμολογεῖσθαι ἀπαιτούμεθα τῷ σωτηρίῳ προσιόντες βαπτίσματι. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καθὰ [464] τῶν τῶν σοφῶν τεθεωρηται καὶ πᾶσα τοῦ μονογενοῦς ή λαμπρὰ καὶ διάσμος οἰκονομία λαμπρῶς πεπραγματευται, ἣν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα σώσῃ καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀθανασίαν.

2.4.3. Οὐ τούτῳ δὲ μόνον οἱ παράφρονες σφάλλονται καὶ τῆς εὐθείας ὅδου παρακρούονται—ἡν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὡς ἐν συγκρίσει κακῶν καὶ φορητὸν τὸ δυσσεβήμα—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔτερα μυρία παρὰ τὴν
Evagrius and the rest of their crowd that pays heed to fables. In their error they do not only hold this belief, mixing it up with pagan teachings and sullying the noble race of Christians, but they also mindlessly do away with the resurrection of these bodies with which we are now invested, stammering myriads of terrible things worthy of their impious, fabulous invention. To confound them what was said by Paul to the Corinthians is sufficient: ‘If the dead are not raised, nor has Christ been raised’ (1 Cor. 15: 16–17). And finally, when in this way they loitered vainly in their reasoning, he added: ‘And indeed your faith is vain’ (1 Cor. 15: 17). Or is it, you people, that you have had no part in our sacred confession and the resurrection of the flesh in it?—for indeed the confession of the ‘resurrection of the flesh’ is required of us as we approach saving baptism. This is why, as it appeared to one of the sages, the entire resplendent and conspicuous dispensation of the only-begotten was put into effect so splendidly, ‘so that he might save the image (cf. Gen. 1: 27) and make the flesh immortal.’

3. But it is not only on this point that the deranged err and go astray from the straight road (such impiety would be tolerable in comparison with [their other] evils), but they also make myriads

---

86 Like many other writers, Sophronius seems to be inspired by the Origenist anathema of 553 in his condemnation of not only Origen but also of Didymus and Evagrius. On these see A. Guillaumont, Les ‘Kephalaia Gastrica’ d’Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les grecs et chez les syriens, Patristica Sorbonensia, 5 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1962), 136–40; B. E. Daley, The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology (Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 188–90. There are two sets of anathema, those nine contained in Justinian’s edict of 543 (ACO III, 189–214 at 213–14; amended edition by Amelotti and Zingale, Scrissi teologici, 67 119 at 116 18, with summary in Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 400), and the fuller set of fifteen from the council of 553 (ACO IV, 1, 248–9; English trans. in Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 404–5). On the juxtaposition of Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius in Sophronius see the heresiology below and Homily on the Annunciation, PG 87 (3), 3240B–3241A. On the ‘fabulous’ pre-existence of souls in Origenist doctrine see Anathema 1, ACO IV, 248, 3 4; trans. Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 404.

87 The charge that Origenist doctrine embodies pagan elements is commonly found in Greek writers after 553 and is no doubt inspired by Justinian’s writings, e.g. the edict of 543; ACO III, 191, 15 18; Amelotti and Zingale, 72, 5–9. This charge against Origen was first made by Porphyry, according to Eusebius, HE VI.19.7.


89 Cf. Symbol of Chalcedon, ACO II, 1, 2, 128, 1–12; trans. Tanner, i. *85.

90 Gregory of Nazianzus, Or. 38. 13; SC 358, 134, 37.
ἀποστολικῆν καὶ πατρίδαν ἡμῶν παράδοσιν λέγουσι, παραδείσου
φυτείαν ἐκβάλλουσε, ἐν σαρκὶ πεπλάσθαι τὸν Ἀδὰμ οὐ βουλόμενοι,
τὴν ἀπ’ αὐτὸν τῆς Ἐβδαίας διάπλασιν ψέγοντες, τὴν ἡχὴν ἀθετοῦντες
τοῦ ὁμοίου, τὰς τῶν οὐρανῶν ταγμάτων ταξιαρχίας (οὕτως µὲν
ἀρχήθην ἐκ θεοῦ κεκτήσθαι) κωλύοντες, ἐκ καταδίκης δὲ προ-
γενεστέρας καὶ παρατροπῆς αὐτάς φανταζόμενοι, ὡς ἐν ἐνάδι τε
νόων πάντα παρήχθαι τὰ λογικὰ ἀθέως ὁµοῦ καὶ µυθικῶς ὀνειροῦ-
τοντες, τῶν ὑπερουρανίων ὦδάτων τὴν κτίσιν κακίζοντες, τέλος
εἶναι κολάσεως θέλοντες, καὶ πάντων μὲν τῶν αἰσθητῶν παντελῆ
φθόραν παρεισφέροντες, πάντων δὲ τῶν λογικῶν, ἀγγέλων, ἀνθρω-
πῶν, δαιμόνων ἀποκατάστασιν φάσκοντες, καὶ πάλιν εἰς ἐνάδα
µυθικὴν τὰ τούτων διαφορὰς ἀναχέοντες, ὅτε καὶ µηδὲν ἡµῶν
diαφέρειν τὸν Χριστὸν, ὅν αὐτὸν λησσωδός δογματίζουσιν, οὐχ ὅν
ἡµεῖς εὐσεβῶς προσκρύψουµεν 'δύζη ἤ τυµή ἡ βασιλεία ἡ δεα-
poteía', δαιµονιώδως ἀναβράττουσι, καὶ µυρία ἀττα προφέροντες
πρὸς τοῦ διαβολικοῦ καὶ δυσσεβοῦς τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν θησαυρία-
µατος, ὃν µιᾶ µύον ἀνατροπὴ βολερᾷ, ἄλλα µυρίας τῶν πλησίων
ποτίζουσι καὶ ψυχάς ἀνθρώπων δονατοῦντες οἱ δείλαιοι, ὑπὲρ ὅν
Χριστὸς ἀποδέχατι κατηγίζοσα καὶ λύτρον αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷµα τὸ θεῖον
ἐξεῖς καὶ δόµου ὑπὲρ πάσαν ἀξίαν [466] θειότατον τὴν ἐαυτοῦ
ψυχὴν κατεβάλετο.
of other statements contrary to the tradition of the apostles and our Fathers. They throw out the planting of paradise, they do not want Adam fashioned in the flesh, they object to the moulding of Eve from him, they reject the utterance of the snake, they forbid the ranks of heavenly armies as they were created to be in the beginning by God, imagining that they resulted from a primordial condemnation and deviation. They dream up, both godlessly and mythically, that all rational things were produced in a henad of minds, and they abuse the creation of the waters above heaven, and want an end to punishment, and they introduce besides total corruptibility of all perceptible things, while alleging the restoration of all rational creatures, angels, human beings, demons, and again confounding their differences into one mythical unity, when Christ will be different from us in no respect, whom they preach in a foolish manner, not the one whom we proclaim in pious belief ‘in glory or honour or kingship or lordship’. They see the like demons and bring forth myriads of things from the diabolical and impious store of their heart, not with one soul perversion only but giving their neighbour myriads of draughts to drink (cf. Hab. 2: 15), and, wretches that they are, doing to death the souls of human beings for whom Christ deigned to die and poured out the ransom that was his divine blood and laid down his own life as a most divine gift exceeding all worth.

91 These aspects seem to be Sophronius’ interpretation of Origenist doctrine. However, the mention of Adam and Eve was probably inspired by Justinian’s Edict Against Origen, ACO III, 194, 18–33; Amelotti and Zingale, 78, 18–38.
93 Cf. ibid.
94 Nothing comparable to this charge is found in the anathemata, but Justinian in his Edict Against Origen denounces Origenist doctrine for its claim that the ‘waters above heaven’ are ensouled: Anathema 6, ACO III, 213, 27–3; Amelotti and Zingale, 116, 54–5.
95 Cf. Justinian, Anathema 9; ACO III, 214, 4–5; Amelotti and Zingale, 118, 4–6.
96 Cf. Anathema 11 of 553; ACO IV, 1, 249, 15–18; trans. Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 405.
97 This refers to the Origenist doctrine of restoration or apokatastasis at the end of time. See Anathema 9 of 543; ACO III, 214, 5–6; Amelotti and Zingale, 249, 15–18; and Anathema 1 of 553; ACO IV, 1, 248, 3–4; trans. Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 404.
98 Cf. Anathematia 10, 12, 13 and 14 in ACO IV, 1, 249; trans. Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 405.
99 This phrase is probably to be taken as part of a liturgical doxology which was familiar to both Sophronius and Sergius.
2.4.4. Ἡμεῖς δὲ πίστεως ὁρθῆς καὶ ἀμοιμήτου καὶ σώφρονος τὸ λογικὸν ποιηθέντες γάλα καὶ ἀδολον καὶ καλὸν θεὸν ῥήμα γενα-
άμενοι ἀπαντά τὰ ἐκείνων σκοτεινὰ διωσάμενοι δόγματα καὶ
tούτων ὄντες ἁπάντων τῶν ἀδέσμων αὐτῶν φληγάφων ἔλευθεροι
cαι τοῖς πατρώσις ἡμῶν ἐπιβαίνοντες ἔχουσι καὶ τοῦ παρόντος
cόσμου συντελείαν λέγομεν καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἐκείνην τὴν μέλλοναν
tὴν μετὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν διαισιωθένην πιστεύομεν καὶ τὴν κόλα-
σων ἀπελεύθησαν ἔχομεν, τὴν μὲν ἀλήκτως εὐφραίνουσαν τῶν
aristov ἔργων τούς πράκτορας, τὴν δὲ ἀπαύστως ἐλγυνοῦσαν, συ-
mην ἀλλὰ καὶ κολάζοναν τοὺς ἐνθάδε γεγονότας ἐραστὰ τῆς
caphlōtēs καὶ μετανοεῖν οὐθελήσαντας πρὸ τῆς ἐντεύθεν
ἐκδρομῆς καὶ ἐκβάσεως. ὃ γὰρ σκώλησ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτήσει, φησίν
Χριστὸς ὁ κριτής, ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ τὸ πῦρ αὐτῶν οὐ σβεβαθήσεται,
taupta frounein καὶ πιστεύειν, σοφώτατοι, ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καὶ
evagγελικῆς, ἐκ τῆς προφητικῆς καὶ νομικῆς, ἐκ τῆς πατριω
ci διδασκαλικῆς παρευθηθεὶς κηρύξεως καὶ δεδρακότες ὃμων τοῖς
πανοχθίων κατάδηλα καὶ μηδὲν ὑμᾶς ἀποκρύπταντες.

2.5.1. Ἀκόλουθον λοιπὸν ἔστι καὶ ἀρμόδιον καὶ τῇ παλαιᾷ παρα-
dósai κατάλληλον τὰς ἰερὰς συνόδους τῶν πατρικῶν ἡμῶν καὶ
πανέρων ἀδροίσεως δῆλας ποιεῖν ἐπὶ γράμματος, άς ὄς φωταγ-
ωγοὺς ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς περιέπομεν καὶ δὲ αὐτῶς ἐχεῖν
eιψάχμεθα, ὅπως αὐταίς καὶ τῆς μακαρίας ζωῆς κοινωνήσαιμεν ὡς
παιδες αὐτῶν εἰγενεῖς καὶ διάδοχοι. τέταρτα τοῖσ ἐπὶ τῶν
ἐνθέων τῆς ἐκκλησίας δογμάτων μεγάλας καὶ ἰερὰς καὶ ὀλικο-
μενικὰς συνόδους δεχόμεθα εὐαγγελικὰς φαιδρωμομένης λαμ-
πρότησι καὶ χαρακτήρων εὐαγγελικῶν ἀγλαίζωρενα ποιοτήτης.
toútων προτεύειν φαμέν τὸ ἐν Νικαίᾳ τῶν πραισὸσων δέκα καὶ
οκτὼ θεοφόρων πατέρων συνέδριον, ὁπερ ἐκ θείας ἀθροισθὲν
ἐπινεύσεως τῆς Ἀρείου λύττης καθαιρεῖ τὰ μιᾶσμα, μετ’ ἐκείνο
δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ, οὐ [468] δόξη καὶ χάριτι, συναθροίζεται δεύτερον
4. But we, because we have been given to drink the *rational and guileless milk* (1 Pet. 2: 2) of right and blameless and well-disciplined faith, and have tasted the good word of God, thrust away all their shadowy teachings. Being free of all their lawless babblings and walking in the footsteps of our Fathers, we both speak of the consummation of the present world and believe that that life which is to come after the present life will last forever; and we hold to unending punishment; the former will gladden unceasingly those who have performed excellent deeds, but the latter will bring pain without respite, and also indeed punishment, on those who became lovers of what was vile in this life and refused to repent before the end of their course and departure hence. For *‘their worm will not die’, says Christ the judge, who is *the truth* (John 8: 46), *‘and their fire will not be extinguished’* (Mark 9: 48). These things are what we think and believe, most wise One, because we have received them from the proclamation which is from apostles and evangelists, from prophets and the Law, from Fathers and teachers, and we have made them manifest to You, all-wise One, and have hidden nothing from You.

2.5 COUNCILS

1. Finally, it is consistent and both harmonious with and appropriate to ancient tradition that we make clear in writing the sacred synods of our Fathers and all-sacred assemblies, which we treat as bringing light to our souls and pray that we shall uphold forever, so that with them we may have communion in the blessed life, being their well-born children and successors. Accordingly, in regard to the inspired teachings of the church we accept four great and sacred and ecumenical synods, shining with evangelical splendour and radiant with a multitude of distinctive evangelical marks. We maintain as the first of these synods the council in Nicaea, with its 318 God-bearing Fathers, which, assembled by divine inspiration, condemned the pollution of Arius' frenzy. After that one in time, but not in repute and grace,

---

100 On synopses of councils in general see Munitiz, *Synoptic Greek Accounts*, 147–86.

101 On the significance of the number ‘four’ here see the conclusion to the analysis above.

102 The Council of Nicaea promulgated anathemata on Arian doctrine in 325. See Tanner, i. *5.*
ἀθροισμα τὸ ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι συνειλεγμένον τῶν πόλεων· πεντήκοντα δὲ καὶ ἑκατὸν θεόσοφοι πατέρες ἐτύχανον οἳ καὶ τὸν πληροῦν θεόθεν ἦμενοι τὸ ἀθροισμα, δὴ τὴν τρικέρανον Μακεδονίου, Ἀπολυναρίου τε καὶ Μάγνου σβεννύει δυσαεβείαν καὶ τῆς τοσαύτης χαλέπης πυρακτώσεως τῶν εὐσεβοῦντων τὰ συστήματα ῥύεσθαι. τρίτον μετὰ τούτο μόνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ δοξάζω συνεδριον τὸ ἐν Ἔφεσῳ τὸ πρότερον ἐκ θείας συνεδρεύσαν βουλήσεως· τὸ γὰρ Διοσκόρου λεγόμενον δεύτερον τῆς Ἐὐσεβίες ἄδοκίμου γνώμης πεφωράται σύστασιν· ὅπερ πρῶτον συνεδριον διακοσίων μὲν ἅγιων πατέρων ἐγνωρίζετο πλήρωμα, καταβάλλει δὲ τὸν ἀνθρωπολάτηρν Νεατόριον καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν χριστομάχον ἁσέβειαν. καὶ τέταρτον μετὰ τὰ τρία τῷ χρόνῳ μόνῳ θεόσοφον ἀθροίζεται σύνταγμα τῶν ἐξακοσίων ὁμοῦ καὶ τριάκοντα πανυμνήτων πατέρων καὶ δαδούχων τῆς πίστεως, ὅπερ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι μὲν τὴν θείαν θεόθεν ποιεῖται συνελεύσαν καὶ συναθλοῦσαν εἶχεν Ἐυφημίαν τὴν μάρτυρα τὴν καὶ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον προμαχοῦσαν αὐτῶν τοῦ ὅρου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν περιφήμου καὶ μεγίστης ἀθροίσεως λόγον πολῶν ποιοῦμένην καὶ ἀπαιτοῦν, κατασφάστει δὲ τὴν ἐνυφίδα τὴν βέβηλον, Ἐὐσεβία φημὶ καὶ Διόσκορον, καὶ τὴν τούτων ἀποφράττει θεομάχον κακόνοιαν ἐκ τῆς Ἀπολυναρίας ὡσπερ πηγής καταρρέουσαν καὶ πληροῦσαν πάντας τῆς ἁσεβείας τοὺς ῥώακας· ἐκβάλλει δὲ μετὰ τῆς
assembled the second assembly, convened in the queen of cities.  

One hundred and fifty Fathers, full of divine wisdom, were there, who, being led by God, made up the complement of this assembly too, which extinguished the impiety of Macedonius, Apollinaris, and Magnus with a triple thunderbolt and delivered the body of the pious believers from so severe an inflammation. After that I honour the third council, third only in time, the first council which by divine will sat together in Ephesus. (The second one, said to be Dioscorus', was discovered to be congruent with the discredited opinion of Eutyches.) This first council was revealed as the complement of 200 holy Fathers, and rejected Nestorius, the worshipper of a human being, and all his impiety that fights against Christ. And the fourth gathering, full of divine wisdom, after the three only in time, was assembled with 630 Fathers, worthy of all praise and torch-bearers of the faith. It held its godly convocation by God in Chalcedon and had the martyr Euphemia sharing its labours (the one who also up to the present fights on behalf of their definition of the faith and speaks unceasingly and mightily about their far-famed and very great assembly). It dispatched that unhallowed pair, I mean Eutyches and Dioscorus, and blocked up their malevolence, hostile to God, which flowed as if from the spring of Apollinaris and filled all the torrents of impiety, and through its orthodoxy addresses it also cast out

103 i.e. in Constantinople in 381. See sec. 2.5.4, below, for the same expression.
104 Greek πριγκάριων. The reading of one family of manuscripts, πριγκάριων or ‘triple-headed’, is perhaps preferable.
105 These three names are found in Justinian, On the Right Faith, 90, 3–6; trans. Wesche, 181. While the followers of Macedonius and Apollinaris were anathematized at the council, there was no mention of Magnus in the conciliar pronouncement. See Tanner, i. 31. Cf. sec. 2.6.1, below.
106 i.e. Ephesus I in 431, on which see Frend, Monophysite Movement, 19–21.
107 i.e. Ephesus II, the “Robber Council” of 449, where Dioscorus presided and Eutyches was rehabilitated. See Frend, Monophysite Movement, 36–43.
108 Because of his supposed division of Christ into two separate natures, united in a moral association not in a hypostatic union, Nestorius is said here to worship a human being and to fight against Christ.
109 The Council of Chalcedon deliberated in 451 in the basilica of the martyr Euphemia (see e.g. Evagrius, HE II.3), who thereafter became associated by Chalcedonians with the preservation of the council’s doctrine. On the mystique surrounding the martyr in the fifth and sixth centuries see H. Grégoire, ‘Sainie Euphémie et l’empereur Maurice’, Le Musée, 59 (1946), 295–302; A. M. Schneider, ‘Sankt Euphemia und das Konzil von Chalkedon’, in Grillmeier and Bacht, i. 291–302.
110 On the juxtaposition of Apollinaris, Eutyches, and Dioscorus see sec. 2.3.5, above.
τούτων ἀσεβεστάτης αἴρεσεως διὰ τῶν αὐτῆς ὀρθοδόξων προσφήσεων καὶ τὴν Νεστορίου τοῦ θεομάχου παμμάριον αἴρεσιν καὶ [470] κατὰ ταύτης γὰρ ὡς ἐτὶ τῇ ἀναίδειᾳ σπαρούσῃ ἡθοποιύ, ὥθεν καὶ τελείως αὐτὴν ἀπενέκρωσε καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν αὐλῶν ἐξωστράκισεν. ἔπὶ ταύτας δὲ ταῖς μεγάλαις καὶ οὐκουμενικαῖς, πανσέπτοις τε καὶ πανιέροις τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων ὑμοτίμων ἠθορίσει τετράσι καὶ πέμπτην ἁγίαν ἅλλην παρὰ ταύτας καὶ μετὰ ταύτας συστάσαν οἰκουμενικὴν δέχομαι σύνοδον τὴν ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι καὶ αὐτὴν γενομένην τῶν πόλεων Ἰουστινιανοῦ τότε τὰ σκῆπτρα τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς βασιλείας διέποντος, καὶ πάντα αὐτῆς τὰ λαμπρὰ διορίσματα, ἢτις κυρώσα μὲν τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι περιώνυμον ἡθορίσαι σύνοδον, ἀναιρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐκρίπτει πρὸς ὑλεθρὸν πρωτοτύπως μὲν Ὄριγγένη τὸν ἄφρονα καὶ πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ ὁνειρώδη κομβεύματα καὶ πολυειδοὺς ἀσεβείας πλήρη συγγράμματα, Ἕναγριόν τε σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ Διδύμου τὰ δόγματα καὶ πάντα αὐτῶν τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ καὶ τερατώδη, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ μυθώδη ληρήματα· μεθ’ οὗ τὸν Μομπουστίας ἐκτίλλει Θεόδωρον, τὸν Νεστορίου τοῦ θεομάχου διδάσκαλον, καὶ ὡς μισαρόν σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῦ βλασφήμως συντάγμασιν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκρίπτει ζιζάνιον, Θεοδωρίτου τε τὰ κακῶς κατὰ τοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας προμάχου Κυρίλλου καὶ δυσσεβῶς γεγονότα συγγράμματα καὶ ὡς κατὰ τοῦ δώδεκα τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεσπεσίου Κυρίλλου κεφαλαίων τῆς τε πρώτης ἁγίας ἐν Ἐφέσῳ συνόδου καὶ τῆς ὑπό ἡμῶν κατηγόρησε
with their most impious heresy the wholly abominable heresy of Nestorius, hostile to God. Indeed it assembled for this purpose, to oppose this heresy, which was still gasping in its shamelessness, as it were, which is why the council destroyed it completely and banished it from the halls of the church.\textsuperscript{111} In addition to these four great, ecumenical assemblies of the holy and blessed Fathers, which are all-hallowed and all-sacred and equal in honour, I accept another besides them, a fifth holy ecumenical Synod which came into existence after them and was also held in the queen of cities (Justinian was administering the sovereign\textsuperscript{112} Roman empire at the time), and all its luminous definitions, whilst the council indeed was assembled to confirm the far-famed Synod of Chalcedon.\textsuperscript{113} It condemned and threw out to destruction in the first instance the senseless Origen and all his dreamy pompositories, and his writings full of many kinds of impiety, and together with him the teachings of Evagrius and Didymus and all their pagan and monstrous, not to say fabulous, nonsense.\textsuperscript{114} After them the council plucked out Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius’ teacher and hostile to God, and threw him, like a loathsome weed,\textsuperscript{115} with his blasphemous compositions out of the catholic church.\textsuperscript{116} And it condemned those writings of Theodoret, which in base and impious fashion were composed against Cyril, the champion of pious belief, and all the charges against the Twelve Chapters of the same inspired Cyril and against the first holy synod of Ephesus and our right faith that had been brought by Theodoret,

\textsuperscript{111} Although it was not referred to by name, the supposed teaching of Nestorius was anathematized at Chalcedon, and Theodoret and Ibas were forced to anathematize Nestorius before the council rehabilitated them.

\textsuperscript{112} Lit. ‘administering the sceptre of . . . ’.

\textsuperscript{113} On the second council of Constantinople (553) and its reception see sec. 1.1, above. As a strict Chalcedonian Sophronius makes explicit the goal of the council: it assembled to confirm the doctrine of Chalcedon.

\textsuperscript{114} That is, the person and works of Origen were condemned, and the teachings of Evagrius and Didymus. On the ‘pagan’ and ‘fabulous’ nature of Origenist doctrine see 2.4.2, above, and cf. Anastasius of Sinai, \textit{Hodegos} V.68–77; ed. Uthemann, 92.

\textsuperscript{115} Weeds were a common analogy for heretics and heresy, the works of the devil (cf. Matt. 13: 25). See Brox, ‘Häresie’, 283.

\textsuperscript{116} As explained in sec. 1.1 above, in an attempt to defend Chalcedon from the charge of Nestorianism, both the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were condemned at the second Council of Constantinople in 553. See Tanner, i. \textsuperscript{*119–*120}. Theodore was perceived by anti-Chalcedonians as being a precursor of Nestorius.
πίστεως Νεστόριω τῷ δυσαεβεί χαριζόμενος κάκείνα ταύτης ποιοῦσα τῆς κατακρίσεως μέτοχα, ἀπερ καὶ ὑπὲρ Διοδώρου καὶ Θεοδώρου ἀπολογούμενος γέγραφε. μεθ’ ὄν καὶ τὴν Ἰβα λεγομένην ἐπιστολήν πρὸς τὸν Πέρσην γεγραμμένη Μάριν ἀπερρίφθησεν, ὡς οὖν μόνον ὅρθων δογμάτων ἀντίπαλον, [472] ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ἀσβεστίας ἀνάπλεων. ἐκείνη μὲν οὖν τὰς ἱερὰς καὶ μεγάλας καὶ οἰκουμενικὰς ἁγίας τέταρτα συνόδους ἀσπάζομαι καὶ φρονήματι εἰς περιπτόσσουμα· ἐπὶ ταύταις δὲ καὶ ταύτης πέμπτην τιμῶ καὶ γεραιῶ καὶ σέβομαι καὶ πάντα αὐτῶν ἁσμένων προσέμει, τά τε ἐν δόγμασιν καὶ διαφόροις διδάγμασι καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τῶν αἱρετιζόμενων ἀναθεματισμοῖς καὶ ὀρίσμοις. ὃθεν καὶ ἁσμενίζω καὶ δέχομαι οὐδὲν ἔδεξαντο καὶ ἠμένιαν, καὶ ἀναθεματίζω καὶ ἀποβάλλομαι ἄσως ἀναθέματι καθυπέβαλον καὶ ἀποβλήτους τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἁγίας ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας ἤγιόσαντο.

2.5.2. Ταύταις ταῖς ἁγίαις καὶ μακαρίαις πέντε συνόδους ἐπόμενος ἐνα καὶ μόνον ὅρον ἐπίσταμαι πίστεως καὶ μάθημα ἐν οἴδα καὶ σύμβολον, ὅπερ ἡ πάνισοφος καὶ μακαρία οἱ ἐν Νικαίᾳ τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὅκτω θεοφόρων πατέρων θεσπεσία πλῆθυς εἰς ἁγίῶν προσεβθέγχεστο πνεύματος, ὅ καὶ ἡ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τῶν ἐκατόν πεντήκοντα θεοπνευστῶν πατέρων ἐπεκύρωσεν ἁθροίσις, καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἐφεσῷ πρότη τῶν διακοσίων ἐνθέων πατέρων ἐρεβαίωσε σύνοδος, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν Χαλκηδόνῃ ἑσακοσίων τριάκοντα πανερέων πατέρων προσεδέξατο καὶ ἔκρατεν σύμβασις καὶ ἄπαρατρωτον καὶ ἀρραγες καὶ ἄσπαλεντον διαπροσίως ἐφι φυλάττεσθαι.

2.5.3. Δεχόμεθα δὲ καὶ ἁγιάλαις ταῖς αὐτάς ἁσμενίζουμεν καὶ πάντα τοῦ θεσπεσίου Κυρίλλου τὰ θεία τε καὶ θεόσοφα συγγράμματα, ὡς πάσης ὅρθοτητος γέμοντα καὶ πᾶσαν αἱρετικῶν καθαιρούντα δυσαεβειαν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τὰς πρὸς Νεστόριον τὸν θεοστυγή
who supported the impious Nestorius.\textsuperscript{117} And what Theodoret had written in defence of Diodore and Theodore the council also included in this condemnation.\textsuperscript{118} With these it pulled out by the roots too the so-called Letter of Ibas written to Mari the Persian, on the grounds that it was not only in opposition to right teachings, but was also full of every impiety.\textsuperscript{119} So I cleave to these four sacred and great and ecumenical synods and embrace them with a single mind. In addition to these I honour and venerate and revere this fifth one too,\textsuperscript{120} and gladly admit all of their proceedings, both with respect to teachings and different doctrines and with respect to anathemata and definitions against heretics. For this reason I receive gladly and I accept those whom they accepted and received gladly, and I anathematize and I reject whomever they subjected to anathema and considered rejected from our catholic and holy church.

2. In following these five holy and blessed synods I understand one, sole definition of faith and I know one teaching and symbol, about which the all-wise and blessed and inspired throng of the 318 God-bearing Fathers in Nicaea made public utterance through the Holy Spirit, which the assembly of the 150 divinely inspired Fathers in Constantinople also ratified, and the first synod of the 200 godly Fathers in Ephesus confirmed, and the fellowship of the 630 all-sacred Fathers in Chalcedon welcomed and corroborated and asserted clearly that it would preserve unimpaired and unbroken and unshaken.\textsuperscript{121}

3. We also accept and receive cordially with the same embrace all the godly writings, full of divine wisdom, of the inspired Cyril, in that they are full of all correctness and destroy every impiety of

\textsuperscript{117} On the anathema on the works of Theodoret see Tanner, i. \textsuperscript{*}121. Since one of the aims of the council of 553 was to emphasize the Cyrilian christological tradition, the works condemned were those which Theodoret had written against Cyril.

\textsuperscript{118} The works of Theodoret in defence of Theodore were explicitly condemned in 553 (trans. in Tanner, i. \textsuperscript{*}121); but his works in defence of Diodore were not mentioned by name on that occasion.


\textsuperscript{120} On the reception of Constantinople II see sec. 1.3.8, above.

\textsuperscript{121} The fact that there is no mention of the doctrinal significance of Constantinople II is to be noted. See above.
καὶ θεύλατον δύο συνοδικὰς ἐπιστολὰς, τὴν τε δευτέραν καὶ τὴν τρίτην, ἣ καὶ τὰ δυοκαΐδεκα συνήπται κεφάλαια, ἀπερ ἀπεσαν τὴν Νεστορίου κακόνοιαν ἀποστόλων ἀγίων ἱσαρίθμους κατέφλεξεν ἀνθραξὶ. σὺν ταῦταις δὲ δέχομαι καὶ τὴν πρὸς τούς τῆς ἐγὼς ἀγιωτάτους προέδρους συνοδικὴν γραφείσαν ἐπιστολὴν, ἐν ἣ καὶ ἰερὰς αὐτῶν τὰς φωνὰς ἀπεκάλεσε [474] καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰρήνην ἐκράτων, αἰς συναρίθμω καὶ ᾧ<διάλευκα>τα τῶν ἀνατολικῶν προέδρων τὰ γράμματα λέγομεν, ὡς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ Κυρίλλου τοῦ θείου δεχόμενα καὶ εἴναι πρὸς αὐτοῦ μαρτυροῦμενα φωναῖς ἀναμφίλεκτοι ὀρθόδοξα.

2.5.4. Τούτως ὁμοίως τοῖς ἱεροῖς Κυρίλλου τοῦ πανσόφου χαράγμασιν ὡς ἱερὰν καὶ ὁμότιμον δέχομαι καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὀρθόδοξίας γεννήτριαν καὶ τὴν θεόδωτον ἐπιστολὴν καὶ θεόπνευστον τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ λαμπροῦ καὶ θεόφρονος Λέοντος τοῦ τῆς Ρωμαίων ἀγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας, μάλλον δὲ τῆς ὑπ’ ἡλίῳ πάσης φωστήρος, ὃν
the heretics, especially the two synodical letters against Nestorius, hateful to God and pursued by God, both the second and third, to which were also attached the Twelve Chapters, which burnt up the entire perversity of Nestorius with the coals of the holy apostles of equal number. Together with these I accept also the synodical letter written to the most holy leaders of the East, in which he called their utterances sacred and confirmed peace with them. Counted in with these we assert that the letters of the eastern Fathers are indissoluble because they were accepted by the godly Cyril himself, and were attested by him in indisputable terms as orthodox.

4. Together with those sacred writings of the all-wise Cyril, I likewise accept as being sacred and of equal honour, and the mother of the same orthodoxy, also the God-given and divinely inspired letter of the great and illustrious Leo of godly mind, of the most holy church of the Romans, or rather of the luminary of all under the sun, which he wrote, clearly moved by the divine Spirit, to Flavian, the famous leader of the queen of cities, against the perverse Eutyches and Nestorius, hateful to God and

---

121 By the 'synodical letters of Cyril' the Chalcedonian definition had meant his Second Letter to Nestorius and his Letter to John of Antioch; it was only under Justinian that Chalcedon's phrase was reinterpreted to refer to the Second and Third Letters to Nestorius.

122 CPG 5302, 5303, and 5304. On the significance of these writings in the christological debate around Nestorius see Wickham, Cyril of Alexandria, pp. xxi–xxiii and xxxv–xxxiii.

124 In other words, because Cyril's writings were based on apostolic teaching they destroyed Nestorius' doctrine. For other typologies of the apostles see PGL s.v. ἀπόστολος F.5: J.

125 This is (Letter 39) To John (CPG 5339), which contains the Formula of Reunion. As McGuckin, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, 114, n. 196, remarks, this letter was 'canonised at Chalcedon as an authoritative expression of orthodox teaching'.

126 This refers to the letter to Cyril from John of Antioch containing the Formula of Reunion (ACO 1, 1, 4, pp. 7–9), accepted by Cyril in his Synodical Letter to John of Antioch. It is the same document as the 'epistle of the eastern leaders' in sec. 2.5, below.

127 On the superficial reconciliation of Cyril with the Antiochene party after the council of 431 see McGuckin, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, 114–16.

128 Most of the remainder of this section is discussed by von Schönborn, 'La Primauté romaine', 480–1. See sec. 1.2 above on Sophronius' relationship with Rome.

129 This is the contentious Letter or Tome to Flavian, regarded by anti-Chalcedonians as Nestorian, or at least as being open to a Nestorianizing interpretation.

130 On the use of this expression to designate Constantinople see sec. 2.5.1 (bis), above.
θείῳ σαφῶς ἐνεργοῦμενος πνεῦματι καὶ Ἑὐτυχοῦς τοῦ κακόφρονος καὶ Νεστορίου τοῦ θεοστυγοῦ καὶ παράφρονος πρὸς Φλαβιανὸν τὸν ἀοίδιμον τὴς βασιλίδος τῶν πόλεων πρόεδρον γέγραφεν, ὡ καὶ ἑστήλην ὀρθοδοξίας καὶ καὶ ὀρίζομαι τοῖς οὕτως αὐτὴν καλῶς ὀρισσαμένοις πατράσιν ἁγίοις ἐπόμενοι, ὡς πάσαν μὲν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἡμᾶς ἐκκενδιάσκουσαν, πάσαν δὲ κακοδοξίαν αἱρετικὴν ὀλοθρεύουσαν καὶ τῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἡμῶν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας θεοφρουρήτων αὐλῶν ἀπελαύνουσαν, μεθ' ὡς ἐνθέου συλλαβῆς καὶ χαράγματος καὶ πάσας αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς καὶ τὰ δόγματα ὡς ἐκ στόματος προϊόντα Πέτρου τοῦ κορυφαίου προσέμας καὶ καταφιλῶ καὶ ἀσπάζομαι καὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ περιπύσσομαι.

2.5.5. Ταύτα, καθὼς προείπον, δεχόμενος τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ θείᾳ πέντε τῶν μακαρίων πατέρων συνεδρία καὶ τὰ Κύριλλον πάντα τοῦ πανσόφου συγγράμματα καὶ μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ τῆς Νεστορίου μανίας γενόμενα καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνατολικῶν προεδρῶν συλλαβὴν τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν γραφεῖσαν τὸν θειότατον Κύριλλον καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ μορφωθεὶσαν ὀρθόδοξον. ὃσα τε Λέων ὁ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας νομεῖς ἁγιώτατος γέγραψε καὶ μάλιστα ἀ κατὰ τῆς Ἑυτυχιανῆς καὶ Νεστοριανῆς βδελυρίας συνέταξε, ταύτα μὲν ὡς Πέτρου, ἐκεῖνα δὲ ὡς Μάρκου γινώσκω ὀρίσματα, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ πάντα πάντων τῶν τῆς καθολικῆς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐκκρίτων μυσταγωγῶν θεόσοφα [476] διδάγματα, εἰτε ἐν λόγοις τε καὶ συγγράμμασι εἰτε ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς τοῖς περιείληπται, καὶ συλλήφθην εἰτευ, ἀπαντὰ δέχομαι καὶ ἀσπάζομαι, ὅσα περὶ ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησία προσίεται καὶ πάντα τοῦμπαλ αποστρέφομαι καὶ ἀναθεματίζω καὶ λογίζομαι βέβηλα, ὃσα καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ πανσόφως βεστίληται καὶ τῆς οἰκείας εὐθειαίας ἔχεται πολέμια, οὐ μονὸν βιβλίδια καὶ λογύδρια καὶ θεομάχα καὶ παρέγγραπτα δόγματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱρετικὰ καὶ κακόδοξα καὶ κακοδόξων αἱρέσεων ἡγησ-
deranged. Indeed I call and define this [letter] as ‘the pillar of orthodoxy’, following those holy Fathers who well defined it this way, as thoroughly teaching us every right belief, while destroying every heretical wrong belief, and driving it out of the halls of our holy catholic church, guarded by God. With this divinely conceived epistle and writing I also attach myself to all his letters and teachings as if they issued from the mouth of the chief Peter, and I kiss and cleave to them and embrace them with all my soul.

5. As I have said previously, I accept these five sacred and divine councils of the blessed Fathers and all the writings of the all-wise Cyril, and especially those composed against the madness of Nestorius, and the epistle of the eastern leaders which was written to the most godly Cyril himself and which he attested as orthodox. And [I accept] what Leo, the most holy shepherd of the most holy church of the Romans, wrote, and especially what he composed against the abomination of Eutyches and Nestorius. I recognize the latter as the definitions of Peter, the former those of Mark. Furthermore, [I accept] all the teachings, full of divine wisdom, of all the select spiritual teachers of our catholic church, whether they are contained in discourses and writings or in certain letters, and, to speak in sum, I accept and cleave to everything that our holy catholic church approves. Conversely, I reject and anathematize and account as detestable whatever the church in her consummate wisdom detests and considers at war with her own pious belief, not only booklets and pamphlets and teachings that are hostile to God and interpolated, but also those heretical and unorthodox persons who are leaders of unorthodox heresies. And for your

131 The Tome of Leo was described as a pillar in the Definition of Chalcedon (Tanner, i, 1, 85, 42). The third Council of Constantinople (680/1) claimed that the Italian synod of 680, held at Rome under Pope Agatho, also used the expression ‘pillar of orthodoxy’ of the Tome (Tanner, i, 1, 127, 10–11). In the extant proceedings of this synod, however (ed. Mansi XI, 185A 186D), this expression does not occur.

132 On the reasons behind the importance assigned here to the see of Rome by Sophronius cf. sec. 1.2, above.

133 Namely the Letter or Tome to Flavian.

134 For a parallel to Sophronius’ juxtaposition here of the see of Alexandria, traditionally associated with Mark the evangelist, and that of Rome with its Petrine associations, see Homily on the Birth of Christ, 170, 21 9.

135 With these derisory remarks the patriarch probably has in mind anti-Chalcedonian and monoenergist teachings, perhaps especially the Pact of Union of 633.
άμενα πρόσωπα. καί πρὸς πληροφορίαν ύμῶν ἀπαράλειπτον αὐτὰ
dιαρθροῦμαι τὰ πρόσωπα, ἀπερ ἀναθεματίζω καὶ ποιοῦμαι
κατάκριτα οὐ γλώττῃ μόνον καὶ στόματι, ἀλλὰ καὶ καρδίᾳ καὶ
πνεύματι, ἀς τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἡμῶν πίστεως ὑφθέντα διὰ
πάντων ἐπίβουλα.

2.6.1. Ἀνάθεμα τοῖν ἐἰς ἀεὶ καὶ κατάθεμα ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ
ὁμοουσίου καὶ προσκυνητῆς τριάδος, πατρὸς καὶ νόος καὶ ἁγίου
πνεύματος, ἔστωσαν πρῶτον μὲν Σίμων ὁ μάγος, ὁ πασίων πρῶτος
κακίστων κακίστως ἀρξας αἱρέσεων, ἐν Κλεόβιος, Μένανδρος,
Φίλητος, Έρμογένης, Ἀλέξανδρος ο Χαλκεύς, Δοσίθεος, Γόρθεος,
Σατορνίνος, Μασβόθεος, Αδριανός, Βασιλίδης, Ἰσίδωρος ὁ τούτου
νῦν καὶ τὴν μανιὰν ὑπὲρτερος, Ἐβίων, Καρποκράτης, Ἐπιφανῆς,
Πρόδικος, Κήρυθος τε καὶ Μήρινθος, Οὐαλεντῖνος, Φλωρίνος,
Βλάστος, Ἀρτέμων, Σεκούνδος, Κασιανός, Θεόδοτος, Ἡρακλέων,
Πτολεμαῖος, Μάρκος, Κολόρβασος, Ἀδεμίς ὁ Καρύστιος, Θεόδο-
τος ὁ Σκυτεύς, Θεόδωτος ἐτερος, Εὐφράτης ὁ Περατικός, Μονοῖμος
complete satisfaction, I shall make an inventory of the persons whom I anathematize, and make my condemnation not only by tongue and mouth but also in heart and spirit, since these have been seen to be utterly treacherous to our holy and catholic faith.

2.6. HERESIOLOGIES

1. Accordingly, by the holy and consubstantial and worshipful Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, let there be anathema and condemnation forever: first upon Simon Magus, who first made a most evil beginning to all evil heresies, after him Cleobius, Menander, Philetus, Hermogenes, Alexander the Coppersmith, Dositheus, Gortheos, Satorinus, Masbotheus, Hadrian, Basilides, Isidore his son and superior in madness, Ebion, Carpocrates, Epiphanes, Prodicus, Cerinthus and Merinthus, Valentinus, Florinus, Blastus, Artemon, Secundus, Cassian, Theodotus, Heracleon, Ptolemy, Mark, Colorbasus, Ademis the Carystian, Theodotus the Tanner, another Theodotus.

136 For notes on individual heretics and heretical groups in what follows the reader is referred to EEC, to Marjanen and Luomanen (eds.), Companion to Second-Century Christian ‘Heretics’, or to another appropriate reference work. The focus of the treatment of this section of the Synodical Letter will be on Sophronius’ sources for his heresiologies and how he used them, rather than on the individual ‘heretics’ or groups of ‘heretics’ themselves, except where they are contemporaries or nearly contemporaries of Sophronius.

137 On Simon Magus as the father or originator of heresies see Brox, ‘Häresie’, 284; the definitive work on Simon is now A. Ferreiro, Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval and Early Modern Traditions, Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, 125 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

138 The names of Philetus, Hermogenes (or Hymnæus in some versions of the New Testament), and Alexander the Coppersmith (cf. 2 Tim. 2: 16–18; 1 Tim. 1: 20, and 2 Tim. 3: 14 respectively) are derived from Theodoret, Compendium of Heretical Fables (CPG 6223), II, Preface; PG 83, 384C·388A.

139 The Gortheans are classed by Epiphanius as Samaritans, but by Theodoret as descendants of Simon Magus, who came from Samaria.

140 The name Hadrianistai is found in Theodoret I.1; PG 83, 345B, and Hadrian occurs in Theodoret II, Preface; PG 83, 388A, but the bishop of Cyrrhus seems to have misread Eusebius, HE IV.22.

141 Isidore is mentioned by Theodoret as the son of Basilides (I.4; PG 83, 348C–349C).

142 Florinus was a disciple of Valentinus. Blastus is mentioned together with him by Theodoret, I.23; PG 83, 372CD.

143 Cassian may also have been influenced by Valentinus. Theodoret in any case includes him with Valentinus’ school.

144 A Theodotus with no further epithet is named by both Theodoret II.5; PG 83, 392C, and Timothy of Constantinople, PG 86, 29D, as a disciple of Theodotus the Tanner.
ο Άραψ, Εμμογένης, Τατιανός, ο Σύρος, [478] Σευήρος, Άσκληπιοδότος, Βαρδησάνης, Άρμόνιος, ο τούτου υἱός καὶ τὴν πλάνην ἴσορροπος, Εμμόφιλος, Κέρδων, Σακέρδων, Μαρκίων ὁ Ποντικός, Απελλής, Απολλωνίδης, Πότις, Πρέπων, Πίθαν, Σινερός, Θεόδωτος ὁ Τραπεζίτης, Μοντανός, Προυκύλλα τε καὶ Μαξεμίλλα αἱ τοῦτον μανιάδεις μαθήτριαι, Νέπως, Ἐλκεσάιος, Ωριγένης, Ωριγένης ἔτερος ὁ καὶ Ἀδαμάντιος, Σαβέλλιος ὁ Λίβας, Ναυάτος, Παῦλος ὁ ἐκ Σαμοσάτων, Ἐπίγενος, Κλεομένης, Νόητος ὁ Σμυρναῖος, Μάνης ὁ τῆς ἄθεου μανίας ἔπωνυμος, Σαββάτιος, Ἅρειος, Μελέτιος, Λέγιος, Ἐυνόμιος, Ἀστέριος, Ἐυδόξιος, Δονάτος, Μακεδώνιος ὁ τῷ ἀγίῳ μαχητρίμενος πνεύματι καὶ πνευματομάχου προσηγοριαν ἀξίων δεξάμενος, Ἀπολλινάριος ὁ Λαοδίκειος καὶ ὁ τοῦτον υἱόν Ἀπολλινάριος, Μάγνος, Πολέμων, Πελάγιος, Κελέστιος, Τιολιανός, οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς μανίας ὑπέρμαχοι, Θεόδωρος ὁ Μομφουστίας καὶ Νεστώριος, οἱ τῆς μιαρᾶς ἀνθρωπολατρείας μιαρώτατοι κήρυκες, Κύρος τε καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ Κύκκες, οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς ἅθεων ἄθεωτάτων πρόβολοι, Ἐντυχῆς, Διόσκορος ὁ Ἐντυχής ὑπερασπιστὴς καὶ συνήγορος, Βαρσουμᾶς, Ζωφάς, Τιμόθεος
Euphrates the Peratic, Monoimus the Arab, Hermogenes, Tatian the Syrian, Severus, Asclepiodotus, Bardesan, Harmonius his son and well-matched in error; Hermophilus, Cerdo, Sacerdo, Marcion of Pontus, Apelles, Apollonides, Potitus, Prepon, Pithon, Synerus, Theodotus the Money-changer; Montanus, and Priscilla and Maximilla, his mad pupils; Nepos, Elkesai, Origen, another Origen also [called] Adamantius, Sabellius the Libyan, Navatus, Paul of Samosata, Epigonus, Cleomenes, Noetus of Smyrna, Manes who gave his name to the godless madness, Sabbatius, Arius, Meletius, Actius, Eunomius, Asterius, Eudoxius, Donatus, Maccodnius who fought against the Holy Spirit and received the just epithet 'Spirit-fighter'; Apollinaris of Laodicea and his son Apollinaris, Magnus, Polemo, Pelagius, Celestius, Julian, the defenders of the same madness; Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, the most polluted heralds of the polluted worship of a human being, both Cyrus and John the Cilicians, the most godless guardians of the

143 In Timothy of Constantinople, PG 86, 29D, he is also called Asclepiodotus.
144 In the Greek there is a pun between ‘Harmonius’ and ‘well-matched in error’.
145 The name of Sacerdo is unknown to us from elsewhere, and is probably the result of textual corruption. See sec. 154, above, on the heresologies.
146 Apollonides is mentioned by Theodoret II.5; PG 83, 392C, as a disciple of Theodotus the Tanner, on whom see above.
147 Poitius, Prepon, Pithon, and Synerus are mentioned simply by Theodoret I.25; PG 83, 376D–377A, as Marcionists, whose doctrines were refuted by Justin Martyr and other apologists.
148 The main character in a fourth-century anti-Gnostic writing, Adamantius took issue with heretics, and is named in the compendium to Theodoret as one of his sources (PG 83, 340A). Adamantius came to be erroneously identified with Origen, whose surname was Adamantius.
149 On Sabellius see n. 16, above.
150 Called by Sophronius ‘Epigenos’.
151 In the Greek there is a pun on the words Manes and madness (Greek mania).
152 It was, in fact, Apollinaris the younger (c.315–50) who by his writings pro- pounded a christology in which there was no human spirit or mind in Christ, but the divine Logos instead.
153 On Magnus see sec. 251, above.
154 Cyrus, bishop of Tyre, an influential member of the group around John of Antioch, was deposed, like John, by Cyril of Alexandria at Ephesus in 431. In Article VIII of the Announcement of Cyrus of Alexandria (document 3 in the monocanist dossier, Part 3 below), Cyrus of Tyre and John of Aigai are ana-mathematized, as well as ‘anyone else who in some way or other contradicted the twelve chapters of the most holy Cyril’. Murphy and Sherwood, Konstantinopel II und III, 184, mistakenly identify these two men with those who appear in Sophronius’ work In Praise of Saints Cyrus and John (CPG 7945). Both Cyrus and John of Antioch are said to be godless in that they are portrayed as followers of Nestorius, and therefore deny godliness in Christ.
ὁ λεγόμενος Ἀὐλουρος, Πέτρος ὁ Μογγός καὶ Ἀκάκιος οἱ τὸ Κενωτικὸν [480] τεκτοράμενοι Ζήνωνος, Λαμπέτιος ὁ τῆς δυσωμῆμον τῶν Μαρκιανιστῶν αἱρεσεως ἔξωρχος, Δίδυμος καὶ Εὐάγριος οἱ τῆς Ὄργιανίης τερθείας μυστηριάρχαι παμμιάροι, Πέτρος ὁ κναφεύς, ὁ τῷ τρισαγίῳ ὄμνω προσαρμόσαι σταυρόν θρασυνόμενος, Πέτρος ἔτερος τὸ Ἰβηρικὸν καὶ φρευδόμοραν μίαμα, Ἡσαίας ὁ τοῦ παρόντος Πέτρου συνόμιλος, οἱ ἄλλοι ἀκέφαλοι ἐν Ἀκεφάλοις καταδείξαντες αἱρεσεῖς μεθ' ὧν ἀπάντων καὶ πρὸ πάντων καὶ μετὰ πάντας καὶ κατὰ πάντας καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας ἔστω καὶ Σενήρος ἀνάθεμα, ὁ τούτων μαθητής ἐκμανέστατος καὶ πάντων χρηματίσσω Ἀκεφάλων τῶν νέων καὶ παλαιῶν ὠμότατος τύραννος καὶ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐχθρός διαμενέστατος καὶ τῆς Ἀντισχέων ἀγιοτάτης ἐκκλησίας μοιχὸς ἀνομώτατος καὶ φθορεύς βδελυγμένων, Θεοδόσιος τε ὁ Ἀλέξανδρεύς, ὁ Τραπεζούντων Ἀνθίμος, Ἰάκωβος ὁ Σύρος, Ἰουλιανός ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς, Φιλικήσιμος, Γαϊανὸς ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεύς, ἂφ' ὧν ἦ τῶν Γαϊανιστῶν ἡγοῦν ᾿Ιουλιανιστῶν ἐπιγέγονεν αἱρεσίας, Δαυρόθεος ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀθέως ὑπερμαχήσας αἱρεσεῖς, Παῦλος ὁ μελανός, οὐ μόνον ὃς λεγόμενος
same godlessness; Eutyches, Dioscorus, the protector and advocate of Eutyches; Barsumas, Zooras, Timothy called the Cat, Peter the Stammerer, and Acaci us who crafted the *Kenoticom* of Zeno;¹⁵⁷ Lampetius, the chief of the hateful heresy of the Marcianists;¹⁵⁸ Didymus and Evagrius, the all-polluted chief initiates of Origen's sophistry; Peter the Fuller, who dared to attach the cross to the Trisagion hymn; another Peter, the defilement from Iberia of barbarian mind,¹⁵⁹ who introduced another headless heresy among the Headless Ones, and Isaiah the associate of this Peter.¹⁶⁰ With all these, and before all and after all and according to all and on behalf of all, let Severus be anathema, their thoroughly mad disciple, who of all the Headless Ones, new and old, is called a most cruel tyrant and a most hostile enemy of the holy catholic church, and a most lawless adulterer of the most holy church of Antioch, and a most disgusting seducer;¹⁶¹ and Theodosius of Alexandria, Anthimus of Trebizond,¹⁶² Jacob the Syrian; Julian of Halicarnassus, Felicissimus and Gaianas of Alexandria, from whom the heresy of the Gaianites or Julianists was bred;¹⁶³ Dorotheus, who in godless fashion championed the same heresy; Paul the Black, who was not only called black but in

¹⁵⁷ Sophronius puns on the title *Kenoticom*, Zeno's document of unity, by calling it *Kenoticom*, an empty document or a purgative.

¹⁵⁸ Lampetius was in fact one of the principal representatives of the sect of the Euchites or Messalians (on whom see below). His mistaken inclusion here in a list of anti-Chalcedonians may have been caused by the fact that he is mentioned in a letter of Severus, patriarch of Antioch from 512 to 518. The notice concerning Lampetius here is confused and anachronistic, since the Marcianists here were a group of Messalians named after the sixth-century leader Marcian.

¹⁵⁹ A first-generation anti-Chalcedonian (d. 491), Peter was for a short time bishop of Gaza. On account of his Georgian ancestry he is called a barbarian.

¹⁶⁰ Isaiah of Seete was the teacher of the first-generation anti-Chalcedonian, Peter the Iberian, and a writer of ascetic works. His followers are included in Sophronius' second heresiology, but scarcely merit the opprobrium which they receive here.

¹⁶¹ The significance of Severus of Antioch for Chalcedonians like Sophronius can be seen from the fact that he is considered the leader of the anti-Chalcedonians (the Headless Ones), as well as from the invective heaped on him here.

¹⁶² Originally bishop of Trebizond, Anthimus became patriarch of Constantinople in the 520s, but was deposed because he communicated with Severus of Antioch.

¹⁶³ An apthartodocetist, Gaianas was elected by his party to be patriarch of Alexandria in opposition to Theodosius. The Gaianites continued to exist in Alexandria, and their seventh-century leader Menas is condemned by Sophronius in the *Synodical Letter* at the end of the heresiology.
άλλα καὶ γεγονός κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, Ἰωάννης ὁ γραμματικός, ὁ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν Φιλόσοφον, μᾶλλον δὲ ματαιόσοφον. Κόνων τε καὶ Εὐγένιος, οἱ τρεῖς τῆς τριθείας τρισκατάρατοι πρόμαχοι, θεμίστιος ὁ τῆς ἁγνοίας πατήρ καὶ γεννήτωρ καὶ σπορεῖς ἀθεαμοτατος, διὰ ἁγνοείν τὸν Χριστόν τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν ἡμῶν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐφιηνάφει τῆς κρίσεως, ἁγνοιόν ἀπερ αὐτὸς ὁ θείλατος ἐφασκε καὶ μὴ εἰδὼς ἀπερ ἀμφιγνοσίων ἀνεφθέγγετο. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἁγνότες τῶν οἰκείων λόγων τὴν ὀνομα, οὐκ ἂν τὴν ἀλέθριον ἁγνοιαν [482] τέτοκε καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἁγνοίας ἁγνοις θερμῶς ὑπερήπτηκεν, ἁγνοεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, οὐ καθὸ θεὸς ὑπήρχεν ἄδικος, ἀλλὰ καθὸ γέγονε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἀνθρώπος, τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς σωτηλείας καὶ κρίσεως εἰς ἀφρόνων φρενῶν ἐρευγόμενος καὶ ψιλὸν αὐτῶν ἐργαζόμενος ἀνθρώπων καὶ ταῦτα τερατειάν ἐπιφημίζων ἐαυτῷ τὴν ἀκέφαλον, καὶ φύσιν μίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ φανταζόμενος σύνθετον, ἔστω δὲ εἰν αὐτῷ καὶ Πέτρος ὁ Σύρος ἀνάθεμα καὶ Σέργιος ὁ Ἀρμένιος, οἱ τῆς μικρᾶς τριθείας ἁγνόμενοι, καὶ μηδὲ οὕτω πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς σύμφωναι ἰσοτετευχεῖν τὰ αὐτὰ παραπλησίως ἀλλήλους δοξάσαντες, Δαμιανὸς ὁ τούτων μὲν ὑπερβαλλόντως ἀντίπαλος, νέος δὲ φανεῖσ ἐν
truth became so;\(^{161}\) John the Grammarian, whose epithet is Philoponus, or rather Mataioponus,\(^{165}\) and Conon and Eugenius, the three thrice-accursed defenders of tritheism;\(^{166}\) Themistius, the father and the begetter and most lawless sower of ignorance, who babbled that Christ, our true God, did not know the day of judgement, statements which he himself, driven mad by God, made in ignorance, not knowing what he uttered in his mistaken thinking. For if he did not know the force of his own words, he would not have given birth to the destructive ignorance and hotly defended the pollution of ignorance, belching forth from his senseless brain the statement that, not in so far as he was God eternal but in so far as he had in truth become a human being, was Christ ignorant of the day of consummation and judgement, and making him a mere human being. And he called this headless monster after himself, and conjured up one composite nature of the same Christ our Saviour.\(^{167}\) Let there be anathema with him both Peter the Syrian\(^{168}\) and Sergius the Armenian,\(^{169}\) the leaders of minor tritheism, although they neither agreed so much with each other nor had the same ideas equally as each other (Damian opposed them exceedingly, but in our times was shown to be a

\(^{161}\) A controversial anti-Chalcedonian, as we have seen in sec. 1.1 above, Paul the Black spent more time out of his patriarchate of Antioch than in it, being anathematized by others in his party for communicating with Chalcedonians, among other things. This may explain Sophronius’ accusatory pun on Paul’s blackness.

\(^{165}\) That is, a worker in vain rather than a lover of work.

\(^{166}\) Conon, bishop of Tarsus, and Eugenius, bishop of Seleucia, were tritheists, and followers of John Philoponus. Conon subsequently rejected Philoponus’ teaching on the resurrection of the body. Again to be noted is Sophronius’ pun on the names of those he anathematizes, this time on ‘ thrice-accursed’ and ‘tritheism’.

\(^{167}\) For the Agnoeitai, the sixth-century anti-Chalcedonians who argued for ignorance in Christ, and their condemnation, see Van Roey and Allen, Monophysite Texts, 5–15.

\(^{168}\) For the doctrinal disagreement between Peter of Callinicum and Damian of Alexandria on the subject of how to deal with tritheism see sec. 1.1, above. Peter in fact wrote against tritheism, but was accused by Damian of being a tritheist. The fact that Sophronius disparagingly calls Peter a minor tritheist indicates how well acquainted he is with developments among anti-Chalcedonians.

\(^{169}\) Around 591 Sergius became anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Edessa. With his brother John he opposed the writings of Peter of Callinicum, according to Michael the Syrian, Chron. II, 372 3, and said that they should not be accepted. From this a schism resulted (sec. 1.1 above). Sophronius’ remarks show once again his familiarity with anti-Chalcedonian politics: Sergius and Peter must originally have been of like mind, but then had a falling out.
ημετέροις χρόνοις Σαβέλλιος, μεθ’ ἄν καὶ οἱ αὐτῶν τῆς ἀσθενείας
diάδοχοι ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν καὶ κατάθεμα Ἀθανάσιος τῆς Σύρου
cαὶ ὁ ἀποζυγαρίως Ἀναστάσιος καὶ οἱ τῆς τούτων ἀσύμβατων
σύμβασιν ἀσυμβάτως τε καὶ ἀμαθῶς προσελήνηκαὶ ἀλογίστων
dίκην κτηνῶν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν βουκολούμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους μὲν [φησὶ]
<ὡσεὶ> φιλικῶς συμφυρώμενοι, ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων δὲ τοῖς ἀναθεματισ-
μοῖς ἑχθρωδῶς τιτροσκόμενοι.

2.6.2. Ἐνδυέσθωσαν δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς καὶ περιβαλλέσθωσαν τὸ
ἀνάθεμα καὶ κατάθεμα καὶ Βενιαμῖν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρεὺς καὶ Ἰωάννης
καὶ Σέργιος καὶ Ὁμίας καὶ Σεβήρος οἱ Σύροι, οἱ ζῶντες ζωῆς
tὴν ἑπάρτον καὶ πολεμοῦντες ἑκμανῶς τὴν εὐσκέψειαν· κοινωνεῖτω
δὲ αὐτοῖς τῆς τῶν παρόντων ἀναθεματισμῶν κατακρίσεως καὶ
Μηνᾶς ὁ Ἀλέξανδρεὺς, ὁ τῆς τῶν Γαϊάνιτῶν προμαχῶν καὶ
προασπίζων αἱρέσεως καὶ πολεμῶν ἐμφανῶς τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ
new Sabellius\textsuperscript{170}; with them let their successors in impiety also be anathema and condemned: Athanasius the Syrian\textsuperscript{171} and Anastasius the unyoker, and those who stupidly attached themselves to their unagreed agreement bringing no agreement, and were cheated by them like irrational cattle.\textsuperscript{172} They mingled as if in a friendly way with each other, but were wounded in enemy fashion by the anathemata from each other.

2. With these let there be invested and covered with anathema and condemnation Benjamin of Alexandria and the Syrians John\textsuperscript{173} and Sergius\textsuperscript{174} and Thomas\textsuperscript{175} and Severus,\textsuperscript{176} who are still living their accursed life and warring madly against pious belief. Let there share with them the condemnation of the present anathemata Menas of Alexandria too, who championed and defended the heresy of the Gaianites and fought openly against the proclamation of the truth,\textsuperscript{177} and all those who are in

\textsuperscript{170} On Damian see sec. 1.1, above; for his Sabellianism see sec. 1.5.4, above.
\textsuperscript{171} On the incomplete outcome of the union between Athanasius the Camel-driver and Anastasius of Alexandria in 616 see sec. 1.3.1, above.
\textsuperscript{172} The primary meaning of βουκόλειον, which I have rendered here in its secondary meaning as 'cheat', is in fact to tend or graze cattle, a fact on which Sophronius puns.
\textsuperscript{173} The Syrian John seems to be John II, anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Cyrillus, who is mentioned by Michael the Syrian, \textit{Chron.} II. 412, as accompanying the patriarch Athanasius of Antioch to Mabbug for discussions with the emperor Heraclius. See sec. 1.3.1, above.
\textsuperscript{174} A bishop Sergius was signatory to the synodicon of union in 616, according to Michael the Syrian, \textit{Chron.} II.393. Michael also writes of Sergius, a bishop of Syria, who also accompanied Athanasius of Mabbug (II.412). These two Sergii are in all probability identical. See sec. 1.3.1, above.
\textsuperscript{175} Thomas of Heraclia, bishop of Mabbug, fled to Egypt during the anti-Chalcedonian persecutions conducted by Domitian of Melitone under the reign of the emperor Maurice (560–602); see Michael the Syrian, \textit{Chron.} II.381. Not only was he a signatory to the synodicon of union in 616 (II.393), but in addition he played an important part in the entire proceedings. Furthermore, he was in the entourage of Athanasius of Antioch when the patriarch of Antioch met Heraclius in Mabbug: Michael the Syrian, \textit{Chron.} II.412. See sec. 1.3.1, above.
\textsuperscript{176} Anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Samosata, Severus went to Egypt with his brother Athanasius of Antioch in 616. His name does not appear among the signatories of the synodicon of union. Severus also accompanied his brother to Mabbug for the talks with Heraclius. In Michael the Syrian he is portrayed in hagiographic terms. He died around 641: Michael the Syrian, \textit{Chron.} II.427–9. See 1. 2, above.
\textsuperscript{177} Unless the Gaianite Menas is to be identified as the brother of the anti-Chalcedonian Benjamin, this is the only testimony to him. Cosma, \textit{De \textit{teconomia} incarnations}, 35, makes the identification. Menas, the brother of Benjamin, was tortured by Chalcedonians for his beliefs.
κήρυγμα καὶ πάντες σὺν αὐτοῖς οἱ τούτων κοινοὶ καὶ ὁμόφυλοι καὶ τὴν ἀσέβειαν σύστοιχοι.

2.6.3. [484] Βαλλέσθωσαν δὲ τοῖς ἰσοὶς αὐτοῖς ἀναθέμασι καὶ πάσαι αἱ αἱρέσεις ἢ μετὰ τὴν Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν ἀκμᾶσασι καὶ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν πολεμεῖν ὑστατούμεναι, τούτοις ἡ Νικολαίτων, ἡ Ἑντυχιτῶν, ἡ Καϊνὸν, ἡ Ἀδαμιανὼν, ἡ Βαρβηλιωτῶν, ἡ Βορβοριανῶν, ἡ Ναασανῶν, ἡ Στρατιωτικῶν, ἡ <Ὁ>φιοντῶν, ἡ Σιθιανῶν, ἡ Σοφιανῶν, ἡ ὘ιτῶν, ἡ Καϊνῶν, ἡ Ἀντιτακτικῶν, ἡ Περατικῶν, ἡ Ὕδροπαραστατῶν, ἡ Ἔγκρατητῶν, ἡ Μαρκιανιστῶν, ἡ Φρυγῶν, ἡ Πεπουξιανῶν, ἡ Ἀρτοτυριτῶν, ἡ Τασκοῦργων, ἡ Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατητῶν, ἡ Ναζωραίων, ἡ Μελχισεδεκτῶν, ἡ Ἀντιδικομαριανιτῶν, ἡ Ψαθιανῶν, ἡ Κυρτιανῶν, ἡ Δουλιανῶν, ἡ Ἀνθρωπομορφιτῶν,
communion with them and are of the same stock and correspond to their impiety.

3. Let there be struck by the same anathema also all the heresies which blossomed after the coming of Christ and dared to fight the church of Christ: that is, the heresy of the Nicolaïtes, 178 Eutychites, 179 Cainists, 180 Adamites, Barbelioti, Baborians, Naassines, Stratiotici, 181 Ophionites, 182 Sethians, Sophians, 183 Ophites, Cainites, Antitacitites, Peratics, Hêdyparrastates, Enocrates, 184 Marcianists, Phrygians, 185 Pepouzians, 186 Artotyrites, 187 Tascodeoumites, 188 Quartodecimans, 189 Nazarites, 190 Melchisedecitites, Antidicomarianites, 191 Psathyrians, 192 Curtians, 193 Doulians, 194

179 According to Theodoret I.1; PG 83, 345B, the Eutychites were followers of Simon Magus.
180 Cainists and Cainites are recorded by Theodoret I.1; PG 83, 345B and 368BC.
181 According to Epiphanius, Panarion 26. 3; ed. Holl, L.279, 24–6, this was an Egyptian Gnostic sect.
182 Theodoret I.14; PG 83, 364C–368A, equates Ophionites with Ophites and Sethians.
183 This is the only attestation of a sect with this name, and it very likely arose from a textual corruption between Ophianites and Ophites, unless there was in fact a group which took its name from the Greek sophia (wisdom).
184 Since encrateism is a global term used to designate adherence to extreme asceticism, it is not tied specifically to a religion or a period. However, here may be meant the followers of Tatian.
185 By Phrygians are meant the adherents of Montanus.
186 Pepouzians is another name for Montanists. See Theodoret III.2; PG 83, 401D–404A.
187 A name composed of the Greek words for bread and cheese, this refers to a group who used those commodities in their sacrament.
188 Also known as Ascodoumites, this is an obscure group which may have been associated with Montanism.
189 This group of Christians claimed to be following the Johannine account of Christ’s passion and celebrated Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover or the fourteenth (quartodecimans) day of the month Nisan. They were not christologically aberrant.
190 This was an Aramaic-speaking Jewish-Christian sect, about which we know otherwise very little.
191 This group was held to deny Mary’s perpetual virginity, claiming she had other children by Joseph.
192 The Psathyrians were a short-lived Arian sect in the fourth century. See Socrates, HE V.29, and Sozomen, HE VII.17.
193 According to Theodoret IV.4; PG 83, 421C, this was the name of a group which separated from the Psathyrians.
194 Another Arian sect, the Doulians reputedly received their name from calling the Son the servant (doulos in Greek) of the Father. See Theodoret IV.4; PG 83, 421CD.
2.6.4. Ἀπαντασ τούν εἰς προαναφερομένους αἵρεσιάρχας καὶ 
tὰς μετὰ τούτους ὑνωμαθείας διοσοσεβεστάτας αἵρεσεις καὶ σχίσ-
ματα ἀναθεματίζω καὶ καταθεματίζω ψυχῆ καὶ [486] καρδία καὶ 
στόματι, ἐννοία τε καὶ λόγοι καὶ ῥήμασι, καὶ πάντα ἐπερ
cισιάρχην ὀλέθριον καὶ πᾶσαν ἐπέραν παμβέβηλον αἵρεσιν καὶ πᾶν 
ἐπερον σχήμαθαθείαν, ὀσουσπερ ἡ ἀγία καθολικὴ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησία 
ἀναθεματίζει, ἀναθεματίζω δὲ καὶ καταθεματίζω καὶ πάντα 
αὑτῶν τοὺς ὄμοφρονας τοὺς τὰς αὐτὰς αὐτοῖς ἀσεβείας ἱηλῶσαντο 
καὶ ἀμετανόητος εἰς αὐταῖς τελευτήσαντας καὶ τοὺς ἐτὶ καὶ 
νῦν εἰς αὐταῖς διαμένοντας καὶ πολεμοῦντας τῆς καθολικῆς ἡμῶν ἐκκλη-
σίας τὸ κήρυγμα, καὶ πίστιν ἡμῶν τῆς ὀρθῆς καὶ ἀμὼμητον 
βάλλοντας, καὶ ἀναθεματίζω πάλιν παραπλησίως καὶ πάντα αὐτῶν 
tὰ θεομάχα συγγράμματα, ἀ κατὰ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἡμῶν καθολικῆς 
ἐκκλησίας συνέταξαν καὶ κατὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς ἡμῶν καὶ ἀμωμητοῦ 
συνεγράφαντο πίστεως. ἀναθεματίζω τε σὺν αὐταῖς ταῖς βεβήλιας 
αἱρέσει καὶ πᾶσαν ἐπέραν θεοστυγή καὶ κακόδοξον αἵρεσιν, ἢν ἡ 
ἀγία καθολικὴ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησία ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ κατακρίνειν 
συνήθισται καὶ τοὺς ἔξαρχους αὐτῶν καὶ γεννήτορας καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν 
μυσαρὰ καὶ παμμίαρα λογύδρια τε καὶ βιβλίδια, μόνα τιμῶν καὶ
Anthropomorphites, Hieracites, Messalians, Eutycheans, Headless Ones, Bersoumouphites, Isaians, Agnoetai, Jacobites, tritheists, and besides those whatever other heresy, impious and pursued by God, has existed.

4. All the heresiarchs cited above, therefore, and the most impious heresies and schisms named after them; I anathematize and condemn with soul and heart and mouth, and in mind and speech and words, and every other destructive heresiarch and every other wholly profane heresy, and every other schism pursued by God, as many as our holy catholic church anathematizes. I also anathematize and condemn all who think like them, those who vie with them in the same impiety and have died unrepentant in them, and those who even at the present time still persist in them and fight the preaching of our catholic church and strike our right and blameless faith. And again I anathematize likewise all their writings, hostile to God, which they composed against our most holy catholic church and wrote against our right and blameless faith. With the same profane heresies I anathematize also every other heresy hateful to God and unorthodox, which our holy catholic church has been accustomed to anathematize and condemn, and their leaders and begetters, and their loathsome and utterly abominable pamphlets and booklets.

195 Being against the conception of a transcendent God, adherents of anthropomorphism imagined God in human form. As such they were not confined to a particular group or period in the Patristic era.

196 The Hieracites were the followers of the Egyptian ascetic Hieracas (end of third-beginning of fourth century), who was accused during his lifetime of holding Origenist views.

197 Messalians or Euchites (those who pray) were ascetic groups, especially of the fourth and fifth centuries, who were devoted to prayer and poverty to the extent that they rejected work and the necessity of providing for their daily needs.

198 The Bersoumouphites, or more commonly Barsanuphians, were an Egyptian anti-Chalcedonian group, named after the monk Barsanuphius, which separated from the anti-Chalcedonians at the end of the fifth century and remained in schism until the beginning of the ninth century.

199 The Isaians were followers of Isaiah of Scete (d. 491), who was a teacher of the famous first-generation anti-Chalcedonian Peter the Iberian. Whether these formed a special group of devotees of Isaiah’s influential spiritual work, the Asceticum, is uncertain.

200 The followers of Themistius, on whom see sec. 1.1 above.

201 This is probably to be taken as referring in the first instance to the anti-Chalcedonians.

202 On the same expression and its interpretation see sec. 2.5.5, above.
κρατῶν καὶ φρονῶν καὶ σεβόμενος τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας τὰ δόγματα, ἀπερ μερικῶς ύμιν καὶ διὰ βραχεῶν ἐκτέθειμα διὰ τὸ τῶν συνοδικῶν γραμμάτων, ὡς εἴπον, ἐπίτομον, μεθ’ ὧν καὶ ἀπαίρεω τῶν ἐντεύθεν προσεύχομαι, ὅτε θεὸς τοῦτο γενέσθαι προστάξειεν.

2.7.1. Ὁθεν καὶ τὴν ὑμῶν ἀξιῶν πατρικῆς ἁγιότητα ταῦτα πρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ταπεινοτῆτος θεσμὸς συνοδικῶ δεχομένη τὰ γράμματα πατρῴως θεωρήσαι τοῖς ὁμασὶ καὶ ἀδελφικοῖς κατανοῆσαι τοῖς βλέμμασι, καὶ εἰ τι διὰ ἄγνοια ἐπταυστα ἢ διὰ λήθην ἐλλείπται ἢ διὰ σπουδὴν παρεώραιται ἢ διὰ συντομίαν κεκώφωται καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐμνημονεύει τῇ ἡμέρᾳ [488] γλῶττης ἀκινησίαν σεανίγει ἢ διὰ βραδυλωστίαν καὶ φωνῆς μεγίστην ἱσχύσει ἢ διὰ λόγων ἀγρυκοτέρων ἀείθενεαν καὶ μὴ βουλομενῶν ἡμῶν σεωστήσας, προσθήκαις ἀναπληρώσαι καὶ φθέγμασιν ἐκ πατρικῆς προερχομένους πληρώσεσι καὶ διορθώσεσιν ἥδυναι καὶ ῥώσιν προσφυλεστάτην χαρᾶσσαι ἀδελφικῶς ἐνεργομενὴν σπουδᾶσαμασ καὶ πατρικαῖς ἐνομβρουμενὴν προθέεσαν, ὅνα μῆτε τὸ ἐλλείπες ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀτελεὶς εἰς ἀεὶ διαφάνειον, μὴτε τὸ ἀσθενές καὶ ἀγνοίᾳ πολλάκις σφαλλόμενον ἄρρωστοις εἰς ἀεὶ διαμένοι καὶ δὲ ὅλον τῷ βίῳ νοσηλευόμενον ὅπερ φιλικῶς ὕψῳ ὑμῶν καὶ γνησίως γνώμενον πλουτίσοι μὲν ἐμὲ καὶ λάνθησε, μαρτυρήσοι δὲ τοῖς μακαρίοις ὑμῖν τὸ συμπαθές καὶ φιλόστοργον, ταυτον δὲ εἰπεῖν τὸ φιλότεκνον τε καὶ φιλάδελφον, οὔτω δὲ πρὸς ὑμῶν ἔγρα πλουτιζόμενοι καὶ τὸ ἐλλειπές προσαναπληροῦμενος καὶ τὸ ἀσθενές ἀπενεργοῦμενος καὶ τὸ χωλὸν ἄνορθόμενος καὶ ῥώσει καὶ πλουτῶ πατρικῷ καὶ ἀδελφικῷ στεφανοῦμενος, τηλικῇ ἔχειν χάριν ὑμῶν καὶ χαρὰν σὺν αὐτῇ νομιαθήσομαι ἢ εὐφροσύνην τριγάνην καὶ ἱδονὴν τὴν ἀνωτάτω γνωσθήσομαι. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν εἰδείτ᾽ ἡμόν θεὸς, εἰδειτ᾽ ὑμῖν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, θεοτόκε, ὅ τὴν τοιαύτην κερδαίνων εὐπάθειαν καὶ τὴν λαμπρὰν εὐεργεσίαν δρεπόμενος, εἰδοίητε δὲ τάχα καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ
honouring and holding fast to and bearing in mind and revering only the teachings of our holy catholic and apostolic church, which I have expounded to you partially and in brief because, as I have said, of the summary form of the synodical letter.203 With these sentiments I pray that I shall depart hence when God ordains that this shall happen.

2.7 CONCLUSION

1. Accordingly, I request Your Paternal Holiness that, when by synodical ordinance You have received this letter from my lowliness, You scrutinize it with the eyes of a father and assess it with the gaze of a brother. If there has been any blunder through ignorance, or if anything has been omitted through forgetfulness, or overlooked through haste, or muted through brevity and has not been mentioned anywhere, or has been left unsaid because I could not express it, or through slowness of tongue and exceeding thinness of voice (cf. Exod. 4: 10) or through the weakness of rather boorish words has been passed over in silence, even if unintentionally, I request You to supplement it with additions and with expressions proceeding from [Your] fatherly plenitude, and straighten it with amendments and bestow encouragement with much affection, activated by brotherly zeal and showered by fatherly counsels. [I request this] so that neither what is deficient in it appear forever imperfect, nor what is weak and often mistaken through ignorance remain forever feeble and chronically ailing. When this is accomplished by You in a friendly and genuine manner, may it enrich and heal me, and testify to Your Blessedness my affinity with You and my affection, which is the same as saying the love of a child and of a brother. Thus when I am enriched by You, and when what I lacked is supplemented, and my weakness is healed and my limp corrected, and I am crowned by encouragement and by paternal and fraternal riches, I shall be considered as having such great favour with You and joy to accompany it, and be known as harvesting happiness and the highest pleasure. But may God alone know this, and may I myself know this too, O one honoured by God—when I have gained the advantage of so great a spiritual well-being and have harvested so bright a benefaction. May You too perhaps know this and learn it for Yourself, if You

203 Yet another reference by Sophronius to the supposed brevity of synodical letters.
μαθήσοις, εἰ καρδίας τῆς ἐμῆς τὸ θερμὸν εἰς εὐσέβειαν ἱδοτε καὶ
tῆς ψυχῆς τὸ πολὺ πρὸς ἀγάπην ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοῖς 
θεωρῆσοιτε. περὶ τούτων οὖν ἐπὶ πλέον ὑμᾶς αἰτεῖν τοῖς λόγοις ἄφέμενος, οἶδα
gάρ, ὅσ ταῦτα πάντως πληρώσοιτε καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἥμετέρων
ἐλαχίστων αἰτήσεων ἀδελφικῆς ἀγάπης πυρσῷ πυρακτοῦμενοι καὶ
πόθῳ πατρικῷ φλογίζομεν: ἐκεῖνο δυσωπῶ καὶ δυσωπῶν
οὐδέποτε παύσομαι, ὡς καὶ εὐχαίς πρὸς θεόν καὶ δεήσεων ἐμὲ
περιέπεν θερμότατα τὸν [490] δεδιότα καὶ τρέμοντα καὶ τὸ βάρος
βαστάζειν τοῦ προσπειτεθέντος μοι ζυγοῦ μὴ δυνάμενον.

2.7.2. Καὶ οὐ τούτο γε μόνον, ἀλλ’ ὅπως καὶ τὸ Χριστὸν μοι τοῦτο
συμβόσκοιτε ποίμνου, ὁπερ ποιμαίνει μὲν αὐτὸς ἐγκεχείρισαι
ἀδυνατῶ δὲ μὴ ἐπικουροῦντων ὑμῶν ἀντιλήψει ποιμαίνειν τοῦτο
καὶ τρέφειν ἐνθέους τισὶ καὶ ὠφελίμοις βλαστήσαι καὶ 
φιλάττειν 
ableres καὶ ἀπήμαντων. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρεσβεύω καὶ δέομαι, ἢν μὴ
ταῦτα βλάβην τὴν οἰκίαν υπομέιναντα παρὰ τῆν ἐμὴν ἀπειρίαν καὶ
ἀτεχνίαν καὶ οὐκ ἀρκοῦσαν πρὸς τὸ δεόντως νέμειν ἀδράνειαν, ὡς
ἀυτὸς αὐτοῖς λυμηνάμενος ἐν ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως κρίνωμαι καὶ τῶν
κλεπτῶντων καὶ σφατῶντων καὶ ἀπολλύσαντων θρητῶν Χριστοῦ τοῦ
θεοῦ τὰ πολύτιμα πρόβατα οὐ τελευτώσαν ὑποσχὼ τῇ 
κόλασιν
tὴν γὰρ τούτων σωτηρίαν τε καὶ ἐπαύξησιν καὶ τὴν πόσι ταῖς
ἀρισταῖς κορυφουμένην πιότητα οἶδα σαφῶς καὶ ἐπίσταμαι πρὸς
τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος 
Χριστοῦ εὐθυνηθήσομεν, ἀλλ’ εἰ τι, θεοτίμητοι,
δύνασθε θεοῦ χαριζομένου τὸ δύνασθαι βοηθεῖν ἡμῖν ἀγωνίσαθη,
ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ Χριστοῦ ταῦτα τιμῶτα πρόβατα
θηρίαλωτοί παρὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀδυναμίαν γενοῦμεθα.

2.7.3. Τὴν ἓσθον δὲ ὑμῖν πλουσίαν προσάγων παράκλησιν, ἢν
ἐκτενὴ ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἄπαυστον τὴν πρὸς θεοῦ ἱκετείαν καὶ 
δέχων ὑπὲρ τῶν φιλοχριστῶν καὶ γαληνωτάτων ἡμῶν βασιλέων τῶν
θεόθεν τῆς βασιλείας λαχότων τοὺς οἴκας, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ φιλοκυ-
τέρμων 
θεὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ δύναμιν ἔχων ἱσοθενὴ τῷ
βουλῆματι, ὑμετέρας θεοδεκτοὺς εὐχαίς μειλιττόμενος ἐτῶν μὲν
πληθὺν αὐτοῖς πολλὴν προσχαρίσθηται, νῖκας τε μεγίστας κατὰ
know the fervour of my heart towards pious belief, and observe with the eyes of the soul how much my soul is disposed towards love. Leaving aside, then, any further verbal pleas to You on these matters (for I know that You will fulfil these requests completely, since before our most lowly requests You are inflamed with the fire of fraternal love and burn with fatherly longing), I importune You and shall never cease to importune You on this point, that with prayers to God and supplications (Eph. 6: 18) You treat me most warmly, since I am in fear and trembling and unable to bear the weight of the yoke placed on me.

2. And [I importune You] not only on this account, but so that You may join me in feeding this flock of Christ, which I have been entrusted to shepherd. But if You do not succour me with Your support, I am incapable of shepherding it and nurturing it with some godly and beneficial blooms and safeguarding it unharmed and unhurt. And because of this I plead with You and beg You, lest, if the flock be subject to harm in this through my inexperience and lack of skill, and a weakness which is insufficient to pasture them as needed, I be judged on the day of judgement for having inflicted outrages on them myself, and suffer the eternal punishment of robbers who steal and slaughter and destroy the most precious flock of Christ God. I know clearly that they are both safe and growing and are well fed because of their excellent pastures, and I understand that I shall be called to account by Christ, the chief shepherd; but, O one honoured by God, if you are able to do something, God granting the possibility, exert Yourself to help us, lest both I myself and these most precious sheep of Christ be caught by wild beasts through my impotence.

3. I offer an equally profuse appeal to You, that You will make intense and unceasing plea and petition (cf. Eph. 6: 18) to God on behalf of our Christ-loving and most serene sovereigns,²⁰⁴ who received from God the rudders of the empire. My intention is that God himself, lover of mercy and lover of human beings, who has power equal in force to intention, when he has been appeased by Your prayers which are acceptable to God, will bestow on them a large number of years, and grant them both the greatest victories

²⁰⁴ i.e. the emperor Heraclius and empress Martina.
[492] βαρβάρων δούλη καὶ τρόπαια, καὶ παιδών παισῶν αὐτούς στε-
φανώσειε καὶ εἰρήνῃ βαίκῃ παρακώσιε, καὶ σκήπτρα παράσχοι
κραταία καὶ ἐνδύναμα βαρβάρων μὲν ἀπάντων, μάλιστα δὲ
Σαρακηνῶν, άφρυν καταθράττοντα, τῶν δὲ ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀδικ-
ήτως νῦν ἡμῶν ἐπαναστάτων καὶ πάντα λείκομεν τῶν ἡμῶν καὶ
ἐκμάθει φρονήματι καὶ δυσσεβεί καὶ ἀθέω τολμήματι. διὸ περ-
ισσῶς καὶ τοὺς μακαρίους ὑμᾶς ἱκετεύομεν ἐκτενεστάτας πρὸς
Χριστὸν τὰς δεήσεις ποιήσασθαι, ὅπως ταῦτα εὖμενὼς πρὸς ὑμῶν
προσήκαμενος καταβάλοι θάττον αὐτῶν τὰ μανίας πλήρη φρονάγ-
ματα καὶ εὐτελεῖς αὐτοὺς ὑποστῶν καθὰ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον τοῖς
θεοσκότοις ἡμῶν βασιλείου διωρίσατο, ἵνα εὐχερεύοι μὲν αὐτοὶ οἱ
τὸ ἐπὶ γῆς ἡμῶν βασίλειον ἔχοντες, πολεμικῶν θεορίας πανομή-
νοι, εὐχερεύοι δὲ καὶ ἂπαν ἀυτῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς τὸ πολέμεων σκῆ-
πτρος τοῖς αὐτῶν καρτεροῖς χαρακούμενοι καὶ εἰρηνικῆς διὰ αὐτῶν
καταστάσεως τοὺς εὐφροσύνης τοκέας δρεπόμενου βότρυνας.

2.7.4. Ἀντιβολῶ δὲ δικαίως ὑμῶν τὸ φιλάδελφον Λεόντιον τὸν
θεοσκέπασταν διάκονον τῆς ἁγίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
Ἄναστάσεως, καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν σεβρότου κοινηλάριον τὸ καὶ
πρωτοστάριον, καὶ τὸν εὐλαβεστατὸν ἡμῶν ἀδέλφον Πολύευκτον,
touς τοιοῦτος ἡμῶν τοῖς συνδικοῖς διακομομένους χαράγμασιν,
eὐμενέσι προσώποις θεάσασθαι καὶ συγκαταβάσει πρεπῶντι προσ-
δέξασθαι τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῶν καὶ τὸ ἰδιώτατον πέφυκε γνώρισμα, ὧν
touς θεατὰς ὑμῶν ἄεὶ καταπλήττετε ἐν ὑμείς μεγίστω τυχάνοντες
over the barbarians, and trophies, and crown them with children of their children and fortify them with divine peace, and provide them with strong and mighty authority over all barbarians but especially the Saracens, destroying their pride. Through our sins they [sc. the Saracens] have now unexpectedly risen up against us, and are carrying everything off as booty with cruel and savage intent and impious and godless daring. This is why we especially beg also Your blessed Self to make the most intense supplications to Christ, so that when he has graciously approved these from You he may immediately cast down their insolent acts, full of madness, and present them, paltry as they are, as a footstool to our God-given rulers, just as before, so that those who have the empire on our earth may themselves enjoy good days once they have ceased from the clamours of war, and with them their whole state, fortified by their puissant authority, when through their peaceful direction it has harvested the grapes that generate good cheer.

4. I rightly entreat You in fraternal love to look upon with kindly countenance and welcome with fitting condescension Leontius, the most reverent deacon of the [Church of the] Holy Resurrection of Christ our God, and steward (kankellarios) and first secretary (protonotarios) of our undefiled bureau, and our most devout brother Polyeuktos, the ministers of this, our Synodical Letter. (For this is Your most distinctive mark by which You always astonish our observers—that though You are in the loftiest position You are clad with the greatest humility.) So indeed, with

---

205 That the sins of Christians caused the Arab invasions is a recurring theme in Sophronius’ work. See e.g. Homily on the Birth of Christ, 169, 12–170, 20 and 175, 25–176, 7; Homily on Holy Baptism, 166, 13–167, 30.

206 On the basis of these remarks we may conclude that the Synodical Letter was composed at the beginning of 634, before the Arabs had consolidated their hold on the eastern empire. See von Schönborn, Sophrones, 89–91.

207 i.e. the patriarchal office or council: see ODB 3, 1866, s.v. Sekreton. In particular the patriarchal chanceller was concerned with calligraphy, and the signing and sealing of patriarchal documents. See J. Darrouzès, Recherches sur les ΟΦΙΚΙΑ de l’Église byzantine, Archives de l’Orient Chrétien, 11 (Paris: Institut Français d’Études Byzantines, 1970), 340–3. Since as protonotarios Leontius would have stood close to the patriarch and, among other duties, vetted letters before their dispatch (cf. ODB 3, 1746, s.v. Protonotarios), it is possible that he had a hand in the composition of the Synodical Letter. The copy of Sophronius’ letter which went to Honorius in Rome was entrusted to Stephen of Dor and others. See Conte, Chiesa e primato, 416.

208 Evidently a member of the Chalcedonian clergy of Jerusalem, Polyeuktos is not known to us from elsewhere.
καὶ μεγίστην ἐνδεδυμένην ταπείνωσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῶν τοῖς λαμπροῖς ἰδιώμασι πνευματικῷς καὶ ἱλαρῶς δεξιώσασθε καὶ ἐφόδια ψυχῆς πνευματικὰ καὶ λαμπρὰ προσχαρίσασθε [494] καὶ θάττων ὡς ἡμᾶς ἀντιπέμψατε γαννυμένους καὶ χαίροντας, ὅτι τοιούτων ἱστορεῖν Βυζαντίων ἦξίωσται πρόεδρον, χαροποιοῦντας τε καὶ ἡμῶν τὴν εὐτέλειαν ἔν τῷ δυναστεύαι κομψῶς ἡμῖν τὰ ὑμέτερα—ῥώσιν ψυχῆς θεοδώρητον καὶ ὑγείαν τοῦ σώματος θεόσδοτον—καὶ νέμειν ποθούμενα γράμματα τὰ πίστων ἡμῖν τὴν ὀρθὴν ἐκφαίδρυντα καὶ τὸ ἱθὸς τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκλευκαίνοντα καὶ τὴν ποιμαντικὴν ἡμᾶς ἐπιστήμην παιδεύοντα καὶ ταραλέους πρὸς τὸ ποιμάειν τὰ ἐνθάδε Χριστοῦ ποιούμενα ποίμνια.

2.7.5. Πάσαν τὴν σὺν τοῖς πανιέροις ἡμῖν θεοφιλή καὶ φαίδραν ἀδελφότητα πλείστα ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἐγὼ τε ὁ ταπεινὸς καὶ ἐλάχιστος καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ προσαγορεύομεν.

2.7.6. Ἐπρωμένος ἐν κυρίῳ ὑπερεύχων μου, ἴκνιώτατε ἀδελφὲ.
all Your luminous personal qualities greet them spiritually and cheerfully, and gratify them with spiritual and luminous provisions for the soul, and speedily send them back to us glad and joyful, because they have been judged worthy of observing such a patriarch of the Byzantines. They will both delight our meanness in elegantly telling me news of You, Your God-given strength of soul and God-gifted health of body, and will bestow the longed-for letter,²⁰⁹ which will illumine the right faith for us, and make shining white the habit of the soul, and teach us pastoral understanding, and make us confident in grazing the flocks of Christ here.

5. Both I, humble and least, and all the brothers with me, greet in Christ God all the brotherhood, dear to God and cheerful, who are with Your all-sacred Self.

6. Do You, strengthened in the Lord, pray for me, most holy brother.²¹⁰

²⁰⁹ i.e. Sergius' written acceptance of Sophronius' Synodical Letter.
²¹⁰ This formula is standard in correspondence between patriarchs.
PART 3
A MONOENERGIST DOSSIER
TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS
1. Cyri Alexandrini epistula ad Sergium Constantinopolitanum

Τῷ θεοτμῆτῳ <μου> δεσπότη, ἀγαθῷ ἀρχιποιμένι, πατρὶ πατέρων, οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ Σεργίῳ παρὰ Κύρου ἐλαχίστου ὑμετέρου.

Προθυμηθέντι μοι τὴν παροῦσαν ἀναφορὰν ἀνατεῖναι τῷ θεοτμήτῳ μου δεσπότῃ διάφοροι εἰσήγαγον λογισμοί καὶ δυσὶ γνώμαις τὴν ψυχὴν ἐμερίζομην. ἄρα γε, φησί, πεισθείην τῷ διδάσκοντι ὑψηλότερά σου μη ζήτει καὶ βαθύτερά σου μη ἐρεύνη καὶ κλείδρα ἐπιβαλὼν τοῖς χείλεσι σιγὴν ἀσκήσας ἢ ἀκούσαμε τοῦ λέγοντος: ζητῶν ζήτει καὶ παρ' ἐμοῦ μένε; εἰτὰ ἰκανὸς ἐμαυτὸν ἐν τούτῳ βασανίσας τότε καὶ γράφεις ἐπαρρησιαζόμην, ὅτε τὴν τῶν πρα-μακαρίστων ὑμῶν θεοπνευστοῦ διδασκαλίαν κατὰ νοῦν ἐλάμβανον, πεπεισμένος, ὅτι δυνὴν θάτερον ἢ καὶ ἐκάτερα ἐκ τούτου μοι περιγένηται: ἢ γάρ, φησίν, ἀποδειχθεῖν ἢ πάντως διορθωθεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναφερομένοις οὖσιν ἐν τούτοις ἀξιωθεῖς, θεοτήμητοι, τῶν πανευσεβῶν ἰχνῶν τοῦ θεοτημήκτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου.

Αμι δὲ καὶ τῆς θεομήτου αὐτοῦ συγκαταβάσεως τυχῶν παρα-ρησίας μετελάμβανον θεία κελεύσει τῆς αὐτῶν ἠμερότητος ἐνυχείν πρὸς Ἁρκάδιον τῶν ἀγιώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κύρρου κατὰ Παύλου τοῦ κεφαλαίωτος τῶν ἀνεπισκόπων μᾶλα θεοπρεπῶς συνταγείς, ὡς ἐπανετός καὶ θεофιλὴς ὡς [590] ἀληθῶς ἀτας ἡμὲν ὁ σκοπὸς εὐσεβεῖς τὴν ἁμώμητον ἡμῶν ὀρθοδοξίαν θρησκεύων, δόο δὲ ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἐνυχεῖν λέγεσθαι κωλύουσαν. αὐτὴν εὐρηκὼς ἀνένευν καὶ
Document 1

Cyrus, First Letter to Sergius
(CPG 7610 Suppl.)

To my Master, honoured by God, the good chief shepherd, the father of fathers, the ecumenical patriarch Sergius, from Your most humble Cyrus.

Contrary thoughts came into my mind as I was intending to extend the present report to my divinely honoured Master, and in my soul I was divided by two considerations. ‘Should I’, it asked, ‘obey the one who taught: Do not seek things too lofty for you and do not examine things too deep for you (Ecclus. 3: 21), and put bars on my lips and practise silence, or should I heed the one who says: If you are seeking, seek and abide with me (Isa. 21: 12)?’ Then, having sufficiently examined myself on this point, I summoned the courage to write, when I had taken to heart the inspired teaching of Your Thrice-blessedness, being persuaded that one of the two, or even both of them, would prevail with me. ‘For either’, it said, ‘I shall be accepted, or else I shall be completely corrected in what I report in this letter; being deemed worthy, O divinely honoured one, of the all-pious footsteps of our God-strengthened Master.’

At the same time, having also met His God-imitating Condescension,¹ I took the liberty of looking into the divine ordinance² of His Serenity to Arcadius, the most holy archbishop of Cyprus, against Paul, the highest head of the non-bishops,³ which was composed in a most God-befitting fashion, the entire scope of which is truly praiseworthy and dear to God, since it venerates with pious belief⁴ our blameless orthodoxy, but having discovered to my disapproval that it forbids the assertion of two

¹ Commentary on this dossier can be found in sec. 1.3.2.
² Text in ACO scr. II, 2, 588, 7-592, 4.
³ sc. the emperor Heraclius.
⁴ sc. the keleusis.
⁵ i.e. the anti-Chalcedonian bishop, Paul the One-eyed. See sec. 1.3.2, above.
⁶ In general the Greek ἐποιήσας, often rendered as ‘pious’, is translated in these documents as ‘of pious belief’ in order to convey the idea of orthodoxy which is repeatedly at stake in the monoenergist controversy as it is in late Patristic Greek.
προφέρειν ἐπειρόμην τοῦ μακαρίου Δέωντος τὴν πάντων ἐπι-
στολήν δύο ἐνεργείας μετὰ τῆς ἀλλήλων δηλαδή κοινωνίας, καθὼς
dιδάσκει ο παναγίως μου δεσπότης, ἀναφαντών βοῶσαν. ἐνθέντε
λυποῦν ἀριστέας ἡμῖν τῷ λόγῳ πάντων ἀναφοράν τῶν θεο-
πενύστων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν ἐνγερτεῖζον ἐκελεύθην, ἀντίγραφον
eιναι λεγομένην καὶ δοκοῦσαν τῆς ῥήματος εὐθειώδους κελεύθους,
μνήμην γάρ ἐπαίτετο ἐκείνου Παύλου τοῦ φαύλου, ἀλλὰ μήν καὶ
tῆς κελεύθους ἵνα καὶ τὸν ἐγγεγραμμένον αὐτῷ νοῦν ἀπεδέχετο.

Εἰκότως οὖν την καύσα ἡσυχίαν ἁγείν καὶ ἕκιστα ἀντιλέγειν
ἐπαθεινόμην, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ὑμετέραν θεόφραστον διδασκαλίαν
cαταφεύγειν ἔγονοι τιμῶν αὐτῆς κεραυνόν ἀξιωθῆναι δεόμενος
tηλαυγέστερον διασφάλιστον, ὅπως δὺ τὴν ἐνέργειας λέγειν μετὰ τὴν
ἔνωσιν παρατόμονοι εἰς μίαν ἡγοῦν ἐνυκῆ ἐνέργειαν δυνάμεθα ἐπὶ
πάσι τοῖς θεοῖς λογίσις συγκλειόν τὸ τε παθητὸν καὶ ἀπαθῆς τῆς
ἀρρήτου ἱκενομίας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὥστε τῆς
θεοφανοῦς παιδεύσεως τῶν θεοδίκων ὑμῶν φωταγωγηθὴν ἡμῶν
tὸ ἀπαιτοῦν ἵνα καὶ ἐν τούτῳ μιμήσθητι τὴν πίνακα καὶ εὐθαλῆ
gῆν καὶ τὸν καταβαλλόμενον τοῦ λόγου κόκκον ἀσμένως ὑποδεξ-
άμενον πρὸς εὐκαρπίαν διασώσῃ.

Τάς δὲ θεοπεθείς αὐτοῦ προσευχᾶς συνήθως ἐπιχορηγῆσαι τῇ
ἐμῇ βραχύτητι καὶ τοῖς συν ἕμοι ὁ ἄγαθός μου δεσπότης
καταξώσιε.

[592] Ἡ ὑπογραφή
Κύριος ἐλάχιστος ὑπερευχόμενος τῆς παντιμῶν εὐξώιας τοῦ
θεοπεθήτου μου δεσπότην ἀνήγαγον.

2. Sergii Constantinopolitani epistula ad Cyrum
episcopum Phasisidis (postea Alexandriae)

Ἐφάνη μὲν ἡμῖν καὶ ἀπὸ πρώτης εὐθείας πείρας τὸ πυκνὸν καὶ
ἐπιεικὲς τοῦ τρόπου τῆς θεοφυλίας ὑμῶν, πλέον δὲ νῦν διὰ τῶν παρ᾽
αὐτῆς γραφέντων τὸ φιλόσοφον αὐτῆς καὶ φιλομαθῆς κατεμάθομεν.
activities in our Master Jesus Christ after the union,\(^7\) I tried to adduce the all-honoured letter of the blessed Leo, which openly proclaims two activities with, of course, the cooperation of the other, as my all-holy Master teaches. From this our dialogue arose as a consequence; I was commanded to embark on reading the all-revered report of Your divinely inspired Self,\(^8\) which is said and is reputed to be a reply to the ordinance of pious belief just mentioned. It makes mention of that Paul the Fool,\(^9\) but also of the copy of the ordinance, and accepts the intent of what is written in it.

Hence I was properly instructed then to observe silence, and to contradict as little as possible. I have learned to take refuge in Your teaching, which speaks from God, even as I beg its precious and clearly instructive message to vouchsafe still brighter clarity, so that, if we refuse to assert two activities after the union, we shall be able in the case of all the divine utterances to include both the possible and the impassible within the one, single activity, belonging to the ineffable dispensation of our Saviour Jesus Christ. As a result, when our ignorance has been illuminated by Your God-taught Self, perhaps in this too we may imitate the fat and fertile land, and, joyfully receiving the seed of the word which has been sown, we may preserve it until it becomes fruitful (cf. John 12: 24).

My good Master will deign to supply habitually for my littleness and for those with me prayers which trust in God.

The Signature
I, humble Cyrus, praying for the all-esteemed well-being of my Master who is honoured by God, composed this.
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Sergius, First Letter to Cyrus
(CPG 7604 Suppl.)\(^{10}\)

There was revealed to us immediately, and, from the outset of our experience, the full and caring manner of Your Love-for-God, while now we have learnt still further, from what You have written, of Your love of work and love of learning.

---

\(^7\) Here I have diverged from Riedinger’s punctuation.
\(^8\) i.e. the anaphora or report composed by Sergius in 623.
\(^9\) There is a pun here on Paul’s name.
\(^{10}\) Text in ACO ser. sec. II, 2, 528, 1–530, 24.
Ἐνυχεῖν γὰρ σημάνασα τῇ πρὸς Άρκαδίων τὸν τῆς Κυμπρίων
νήσου θεοφίλη πρόεδρον γενομένη πανευσθεία τελεύσει παρὰ τοῦ
κρατίστου καὶ θεσσαλίκτου ἡμῶν βασιλέως κατὰ Παύλου τοῦ
κεφαλαιωτοῦ τῆς τῶν Άκεφαλῶν πονηρᾶς συμμορίας καὶ τὴν εἰρη-
μένην εὐσέβη κελεύσας εὑρεῖν δύο κωλύσαν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ
ἡμῶν λέγειν ἐνεργείας, ἥρωτησεν ἡμᾶς διὰ τῆς οἰκείας μηνύσεως,
pότερον χρὴ δύο προσβείεις ἐνεργείας ἢ μίαν τὸν κυρίον λέγειν ἐνε-
ρεγείαν. ὅθεν ἡμεῖς ἀπλῶν καὶ συντόμω πόλεμον λόγῳ κεχρήμεθα καὶ τὰ
τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐρούμεν εἰδῆςεως.

Ἐρούμεν τοῖς, ὡς ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἁγίαις μεγάλαις καὶ οἰκου-
μενικαῖς συνόδοις οὐδεμία περὶ τοῦτού κίνησις γέγονεν, οὐδὲ ἔστι
περὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ξητῆςεως ὅρων ἐξενεχθέντα τῶν οἰονοῦ παρὰ
τινῶν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων συνόδων εὑρεῖν. τῶν δὲ γε ἐκκρίτων πατέρων,
ἐνιόσ ἐπιστάμεθα καὶ κατ’ ἐξαίρετον τὸν ἁγιώτατον Κύριλλον τοῦ
τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείων ἀρχιεπίσκοπον ἐν τοι ὁχί τῶν ἰδίων συγγραμμάτων
μίαν ἑξωσοπὸν ἐνεργείαν Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
εἰρηκότα· ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ Μηνᾶς ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς
θεοφυλάκτου ταύτης καὶ βασιλίδος πόλεως λόγον συνέταξε
προσφωνηθέντα πρὸς Βιγίλλιον τὸν ἁγιώτατον τῆς πρεσβυτέρας
Ῥώμης γενόμενον πάπαν, ἐν ὧν τὸν ὁμοίου καὶ αὐτῶς τρόπον ἐν τοῦ
τοῦ ἑπίσκοπον θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Υσιοῦ> Χριστοῦ θέλημα καὶ
μίαν ἑξωσοπὸν ἐνεργείαν ἐδογμάτισε. καὶ ὡστε μὲν τὴν συνετωτ-
ἀτὴν ἡμῶν φιλοσοφίαν ἐντυγγάνουσαν τὴν ἐμπεριεχομένην αὐτῷ
dύναμιν γνῶναι, ἀναγκαίως τὸν εἰρημένον λόγον μεταγραφήναι
παρεσκευάζων ὑποκειμένων αὐτῷ καὶ χρῆσεως διαφόρων πρὸς
σύναστας τοῦ προκειμένου σκοποῦ, καὶ τούτον σὺν τοῖς ἡμετέροις
αὐτὴ σταλῆναι γράμμασιν ἐπέτρεψαμεν.

Ἔπειδὴ δὲ φησίν ἡ θεοφίλεια ἡμῶν τὸν ἁγιώτατον πάπαν τῆς
Ῥωμαίων Λέοντα διὰ τοῦ λέγειν ἑνεργεὶς <γὰρ> ἐκατέρα μορφή
μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας δύο ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ [530] Χριστοῦ τοῦ
<ἀληθινοῦ> θεοῦ ἡμῶν παραδιδόναι τε καὶ κηρύττειν, χρεών αὐτὴν
eidéna, ὡς—πολλῶν τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς κατὰ Σεβήρου τοῦ κατάρατον
τιμήματος τῶν ἄξιοι πρὸς τὰ τῆς εὕσεβείας δόγματα διαμαχομένων
cαι τῆς τοῦ εἰρημένου πανευθύμου πατρὸς καθυλακτησάντων ἐπι-
στολῆς, ἤτοι κοινή τῷ ὄντι τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας στήλης καθέστηκε—
For You indicated that You had read the ordinance, \footnote{sc. _keleusis._} full of pious belief, sent to Arcadius, the leader dear to God of the island of Cyprus, from our most powerful, God-strengthened emperor, against Paul, chief head of the evil party of the Headless Ones, and that You found the above-mentioned ordinance of pious belief forbade speaking of two activities in Christ our God. You asked us through Your own communication whether it was necessary to uphold two activities, or to speak of one activity of the Lord. Hence we use simple and brief language, and shall declare what we know.

We shall declare, then, that in the holy and great ecumenical synods this issue was not raised, nor is it possible to find any definition on this question in any of the orthodox councils. We know that several of the approved Fathers, and particularly the most holy Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria, spoke in some of their writings of one life-giving activity of Christ our true God. \footnote{On this aspect of Cyril’s christology see McGuckin, _Saint Cyril of Alexandria_, 187–8.} Moreover, Menas, too, [now] among the saints, archbishop of this God-protected and imperial city, composed a document addressed to Vigilius, who was then the most holy pope of Older Rome, in which he too in the same way defined that the will of our great God and Saviour (Titus 2: 13) Jesus Christ is one and also that there is one life-giving activity. And so that Your most astute Diligence may discover by reading it the meaning it contains, we have arranged for the said document to be transcribed, as was necessary, while attaching to it various testimonies in support of its stated purport, and we have given instructions that this be sent to You together with our letter.

Since Your Love-of-God says that the most holy pope of Rome, Leo, by his statement, ‘each form acts with the cooperation of the other’, \footnote{Tome to Flavian, _ACO_ II, 1, 1, 14, 27 8; trans. Tanner, i. *79._} handed on and proclaimed two activities in Christ our true God, it is necessary to know it, there being many of the impious schism of the accursed Severus who are always making war against the teachings of pious belief and barking against the letter of the aforesaid all-famous Father, which in fact was established as the common ‘pillar of orthodoxy’, \footnote{On the designation of Leo or his _Tome_ as the pillar of orthodoxy see sec. 2.5.4 with n. 131, above.} since several of
διάφορων τῶν ἐκκρίτων τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας διδασκάλων πρὸς
dικαίων καὶ ἀληθῆ συνηγορίαν τῆς λεγεμένης διανέστησαν
ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ οὐδένα ἠμέν ἐκείνων εἰπόντα ἐπὶ τοῦ προκειμένου
ῥήτου δύο ἐνεργείας τῶν ἐν ἀγίωσ εἰρηκέναι Λέοντα. ἀλλὰ ἦν μὴ
πάντας αὐτούς εἰς μέσον ἄγωντες τὸ γράμμα μηκύνωμεν, ἐνὸς
τούτων πολὺν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἀληθῶν δογμάτων διδασκαλία παρὰ
πάντων ἀπενεγκαμένου τοῦ ἔπαινου, φημὶ δὴ οὐν Ἐὐλογίου τοῦ τῆς
δόσις μνήμης τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἑγεμόνου ποιμένος, λόγον ὀλο-
κλήρον ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρημένης γεγραφότος ἐπιστολῆς χρῆσαι εἰς τὸ
προκειμένου φερομένην ῥήτον τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ μνημονευόντι λόγῳ
μετὰ τὰς πατρικὰς χρήσεις καθυποταγὴν παρεσκευάσαμεν.

Οὕτε οὖν οὕσπερ ἐπιστάμεθα τῆς πολλάκις λεχθείσης εὐσεβὴς
ὑπεραγωγισμένου ἐπιστολῆς, οὐτε ἄλλον τινα τῶν θεοπνεύστων
τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυσταγωγῶν ἄχρι καὶ σήμερον εὔρομεν δύο
ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰρηκότας· εἰ δὲ τις τῶν
ἀκριβεστέρων δεῖξαι δυνηθεὶς τινάς τῶν ἐκκρίτων καὶ θεοφόρων
ἡμῶν πατέρων, ὥστε δόγματα νόμος τῇ καθολικῇ καθέστηκεν
ἐκκλησίᾳ, δύο ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ λέγεων παραδιδόντας, δει
πάντως ἀκολουθήσαι· πάσα γὰρ ἀνάγκη μὴ μόνον κατ᾽ ἐννοιαν τοῖς
τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων ἐπεσθαί δόγμασιν, ἄλλα καὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς
ἐκείνοις κεχρήθαι φωναῖς καὶ μηδὲν τὸ παράσαν καινοτομεῖν.

Ἀ μὲν οὖν ἐπιστάμεθα τοῦ προκειμένου χάριν κεφαλάιον ταύτα
ἐστὶ.

Δεχομένη δὴ ἡ θεοφίλεια ὑμῶν καὶ καθεξῆς τοῖς σταλείσις αὐτῆς
παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἐντυγχάνουσα τὰ μὲν τῆς ὠφελείας τῶν τῶν γνώσεων
θεῶ καὶ τοὺς παράσας τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιγραφέτων λόγων καὶ
πονημάτων, δῶρον δὲ τῆς ἡμῶν ὑπερευκέσθω ταπεινώσεως καὶ τὰ
περὶ τούτων ἀντίγραφα διὰ τάχους ἡμῖν στειλάτω.
the approved teachers of the catholic church took up the just and true defence of the said letter. Of these we know none who say that in the letter before us Leo [now] among the saints spoke of two activities. But so that we do not have to produce all of them publicly, let us mention the letter of one of them, which has acquired high praise from everyone for its teaching of true doctrines. I mean, of course, the writing of Eulogius of holy memory, former shepherd of Alexandria, which was entirely devoted to the aforesaid letter written by Leo. We have arranged for the document, which bears testimony to the text we have mentioned, to be appended to the above-mentioned writing after the testimonies from the Fathers.

Hence we have found that neither those who we know contended against pious belief on behalf of the letter which we have mentioned many times, nor any other of the divinely inspired spiritual teachers of the church up to the present, speak of two activities in Christ our God. But if one of the more punctilious were able to show that some of our approved and God-bearing Fathers, whose teachings are established by the law in the catholic church, transmitted the affirmation of two activities in Christ, it would certainly be necessary to follow them. For there is every necessity not only of following the teachings of the holy Fathers according to their meaning, but also of using the same words as they do, and not to innovate at all in any respect.

This, then, is what we know with regard to the article of faith in question.

May Your God-loving Self receive [this], and subsequently, when You have read what we have sent You, ascribe what is edifying in it to the God of what is to be known and to the Fathers of such works and labours. As a gift may You pray for our lowness, and send us speedily the answer to this letter.
3. Satisfactio facta inter Cyrum et eos qui erant ex parte Theodosianorum

Τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ τῷ ἀληθινῷ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πάντων προδότον καὶ πάντας εἰς τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀληθινὴν αὐτοῦ πίστιν ἤθονετο καὶ εἰς μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἁγίαν αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν συγκαλοῦντος τὴν παρούσαν πληροφορίαν πεποιημέθα ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνώσει τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίων μην Παῦλον ἰδικτιώνος ἐκτης. Πληροφορία γενομένη παρὰ Κύρου ἐλέος θεοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὸν τόπον ἐπέχοντος κατὰ θεῖον βέσπισμα τῶν ἁγάθων καὶ καλλικών ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου ταύτης τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων φιλοχριστοῦ πόλεως.

[596] Κεφάλαιον α’
Εἰ τις οὖχ ὁμολογεῖ πατέρα καὶ γενομένη, τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, μίαν θεότητα ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεωι, ἀναθεμα ἑστω.

Κεφάλαιον β’
Εἰ τις οὖχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν ἑα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος τὸν θεὸν λόγου, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων ἁχρόνως γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, καὶ κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τῆς δεσποτίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ ἐνονθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ καὶ ἀποθανοῦντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, ἀναθεμα ἑστω.

Κεφάλαιον γ’
Εἰ τις οὖχ ὁμολογεῖ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἑνὸς κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ ἀληθινῷ θεοῦ τὰ τέ θαύματα, ἀλλ’ ἀλλοι καὶ ἀλλοι, ἀναθεμα ἑστω.
Document 3

Copy of the Announcement
which was agreed between Cyrus,
then Pope of Alexandria,
and those of the Theodosian Party
(CPG 7613 Suppl.)

Since Christ the Master, true God of us all, is shining forth and
directing everyone towards the saving and true faith in him,
and summoning them to one and the same church of his, we have
made the present announcement on the occasion of the union of
the holy churches of God, in the month of Pauni (June) in the
sixth indiction.

An announcement made by Cyrus, bishop by the mercy of
God, who, by the divine sanction of our good and victorious
Masters, holds the office of the apostolic throne of this Christ-
loving city of the Alexandrians.

Article of Faith I
If someone does not confess Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit,
consubstantial Trinity, one Godhead in three hypostases, let him
be anathema.

Article of Faith II
If someone does not confess that one of the Holy Trinity, God the
Word, before the ages was timelessly begotten of the Father, and
descended from heaven, and was made incarnate by the Holy
Spirit, and became human from our Lady, the holy, glorious
Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary, suffered in his own flesh, and
died and was buried, and rose on the third day according to the
Scriptures, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith III
If someone does not confess both the sufferings and miracles of
our same and one Lord, Jesus Christ, true God, but [says they are]
of one and of the other, let him be anathema.

Text in ACO ser. sec. II, 2, 594, 19–600, 20. There is a partial English translation
of this document in J. C. Ayer, A Source Book for Ancient Church History: From the Apostolic
Age to the Close of the Conciliar Period (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1913; repr. AMS
Κεφάλαιον ὁ'
Εἰ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ἐξ ἀυτῆς ἀκρας ἐνώσεως τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας ὑποστῆσαι εἰστὶ καθ’ ἐνατῆς σάρκας ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου τῆς ἠμῶν ὄμοσύσιον ἐμψυχωμένην ψυχὴν λογικὴν τε καὶ νοερᾶ ἐνώσει φυσικῆν τε καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν καὶ φύσις προελθεῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἕνα ὅντα, ἀσύγχυτον τε καὶ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀνάθεμα ἐστω.

Κεφάλαιον ε'
Εἰ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν ἁγίαν δέσποιναν ἠμῶν καὶ ἀειπάρθενον Μαρίαν κυρίως καὶ [598] κατὰ ἀλήθειαν θεοτόκον εἶναι, ὅσ τὸν θεὸν λόγον σεσαρκωμένων κυήσασαν καὶ τεκοῦσαν, ἀνάθεμα ἐστώ.

Κεφάλαιον ζ'
Εἰ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ἐκ δύο φύσεων, τούτοις θεότητος τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ἔνα Χριστόν, ἕνα νιόν, ὅμως τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἄγιοι Κύριλλον ἀσύγχυτως, ἀπρέπτως, ἀναλλοιώτως ἔγινεν μίαν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον, ὅπερ ἔστων αὐτός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ἔς ὀν τῆς ἁγίας ὁμοουσιόν τρίαδος', ὁ τοιούτος ἀνάθεμα ἐστώ.

Κεφάλαιον ζ'
Εἰ τις τὸν ἔνα κύριον ἠμῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστόν ἐν δύοι θεωρεῖται λόγων ταῖς φύσεωι οὐχ ἔνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ, τὸν ἄνθρωπον μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα θεοῦ λόγον, ἐν ἐσχάτοις δὲ τὸν αἰώνα καὶ ροῖς τὸν αὐτὸν σαρκωθέντα καὶ τεχθέντα ἐκ τῆς παναγίας καὶ ἀχράντου δεσποινῆς ἠμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ἀλλ’ ἐτερον τοῦτον οἴδε καὶ ἐτερον', καὶ οὐχ ἔνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν, κατὰ τὸν σοφότατον Κύριλλον ἐν θεότητι τελειοὶ καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τελειοὶ τὸν αὐτὸν', καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ μόνον ἐν δύο' θεοροῦμενον 'φύσει τὸν αὐτὸν πάσχοντα καὶ μὴ πάσχοντα κατ' ἀλλο καὶ ἄλλο', ὅς ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἁγίωσ ἐφησε Κύριλλος, πάσχουτα μὲν ἀνθρωπίνως σαρκὶ καθὸ ἀνθρωπος, μένοντα δὲ ὡς θεὸν ἀπαθῆ ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἱδίας σαρκὸς πάθει, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔνα Χριστὸν καὶ νιόν
Article of Faith IV
If someone does not confess that from the very moment of the union God the Word, in the womb of the holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary, hypostatized with himself through the union a flesh from the same holy Theotokos which is consubstantial with us, ensouled with a rational and intellectual soul, in a union that was both natural and hypostatic, and came forth from her being one, without confusion and without division, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith V
If someone does not confess that our holy Lady and ever-virgin Mary properly speaking and in truth is the Theotokos, in that she conceived and bore God the Word incarnate, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith VI
If someone does not confess one Christ, one Son, from two natures, that is, from both Godhead and humanity, 'one incarnate nature of God the Word', according to Cyril [now] among the saints,\(^{16}\) without confusion, without change, without alteration, or rather one composite hypostasis, which is our same Lord Jesus Christ, being one of the holy, consubstantial Trinity, let such a person be anathema.

Article of Faith VII
If someone, in saying that our one Lord, Jesus Christ, is discerned in two natures, does not confess that the same is one of the holy Trinity, God the Word begotten eternally from the Father, that in the last times of the age (cf. Heb. 1: 2) the same became incarnate, and was born of our Lady, the all-holy and undefiled and ever-virgin Mary, but knows him to be this one and another, and not as one and the same, according to the most wise Cyril,\(^{17}\) the same being perfect in Godhead and perfect in humanity, and in that respect and in that alone discerned in two natures, the same one suffering and not suffering in two distinct respects, as the same Cyril, [now] among the saints, said, suffering in human fashion in the flesh as a human being, but remaining impassible as God amidst the sufferings of his own flesh,\(^{18}\) and that one and the same Christ and Son performed things befitting God and things human.

\(^{16}\) On this terminology see McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, 207–12.

\(^{17}\) On the two realities in Christ see ibid. 185.

\(^{18}\) On 'impassible' suffering in Cyril see ibid. 185–6.
ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπὴ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα ἡμῶν θεορία 
μία θεαντρικῆ ἐνεργεία, κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωνίοις τὸν 
θεωρία μόνη διακρίνω τὰ ἔξ ὑπὸ ἡ 
ἐννοιας γέγονε, καὶ ταῦτα τῷ νῷ διασκοπῶν ἀστρεπτα καὶ 
ἀσύχωστα μετὰ τὴν αὐτῶν φυσικὴν καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἐνωσι 
μένων γέγονα, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀδιαίρετοι καὶ ἀσυνρήτως 
τὸν ἔνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν καὶ νῦν γνωρίζομεν, καθ’ 
δυνὸ τὰ ἀλλήλως ἀσυγχωτὸς συνηγερμένα καθορὰ 
τῷ νῷ, πραγματικῆς αὐτῶν [600] τὴν θεωρίαν 
ποιούμενος, ἀλλ’ <οὐ> φαντασία ψευδεῖ καὶ 
διακένοις νοῦ 
διαπλάσμασι, διιστῶσι δὲ οὐδαμῶς ὡς ἀνημερεύσῃς ἦ 
τὴν ἐς δύο 
διασταμῆς διὰ τὴν ἁφαραστὸν <καὶ ἀσύχωστον > καὶ 
ἀπεριότητον 
ἐνωσι, λέγων κατὰ τὸν ἁγιον Ἀθανάσιον, ἃμα γὰρ σάρξ, ἃμα 
θεοῦ 
λόγον σάρξ, ἃμα σάρξ ἐμφύσιος λογικὴ, ἃμα 
θεοῦ λόγον σάρξ 
ἐμφύσιος λογικὴ, ἀλλ’ ἕπι διαιρέσει τῇ ἀνὰ 

cέρος τὴν τοιαύτην 
ἐκλαμβάνει φωνῆ, ἀνάθεμα ἑστώ.

Κεφάλαιον η’
Εἰ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει Ἀρείον, Εὐνόμιον, Μακεδόνιον, Ἀπόλλον 
ἀριθμὸν τῶν αἰρετικῶν, Νεστύριον, Ἐντυχεῖ τὸν δυσόνυμον καὶ 
Κύριον καὶ Ἰωάννην 
τοὺς Ἀἰγεώτας καὶ πάντας 
τοὺς ἀντειρηκότας καθ’ 
οἷν δήποτε τρόπον τοὺς 
διάκεινα 
κεφαλαίως τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου 
Κυρίλλου καὶ μὴ 
μετανοήσαντας, ἀλλ’ ἐν 

cῇ τοιαύτῃ πλάνῃ 
ἀποβανόντας, καὶ τοὺς 
τὰ ὀμοια 
ἀυτῶν 
φρονήσαντας ἡ 
φρονοῦντας, 
ἀνάθεμα ἑστὼ.

Κεφάλαιον θ’
Εἰ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει τὰ 
συγγράμματα Θεοδωρίτου 
τα 
τῆς ὄρθις πίστεως τοῦ ἐν 
ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου, καὶ 
τὴν λεγομένην Ἡβα 
ἐπιστολὴν, καὶ Ἡθεδωρίων 
τὸν Μομψουστή 
καὶ τὰ 
συγγράμματα 
τοῦ 
ἀυτῶν, καὶ ἐι 
τοὺς οὕ 

dέχεται 
τὰ 
συγγράμματα τοῦ ἁγίου 
Κυρίλλου καὶ 
μάλιστα 
τα 
Θεοδώρου καὶ 
Θεοδωρίτου 
καὶ 
Ἀνθε 
καὶ 

cοπῶν 
ἡ 
φρονοῦντας, ἀνάθεμα ἑστὼ.
by one theandric activity, according to Dionysius [now] among the saints,\textsuperscript{18} distinguishing in contemplation alone the elements from which the union came about, and mentally considering these as remaining without change and without confusion after their natural and hypostatic union, and recognizing in these the one and the same Christ and Son without confusion and without separation, as he mentally considers the two to be brought together mutually without confusion, holding the contemplation of them as a matter of reality and not of lying illusion, but he does not separate them in any way, since the rending into two has already been undone because of the union which is ineffable and unconfused and inconceivable, saying according to holy Athanasius: ‘At the one time there is flesh, at the one time there is the flesh of God the Word; at the one time there is flesh ensouled and rational, at the one time there is the flesh of God the Word endowed with a rational soul;\textsuperscript{20} but takes such an expression as dividing into parts, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith VIII
If someone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris the heretic, Nestorius, Eutyches of ill-repute, and Cyrus and John of Aigiai,\textsuperscript{21} and all who, in whatever way, contradict the Twelve Chapters of the most holy Cyril, and do not repent, but die in such error, and those who thought or think like them, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith IX
If someone does not anathematize the writings of Theodoret which are contrary to the right faith of Cyril [now] among the saints, and the so-called Letter of Ibas, and Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings; and if someone does not accept the writings of holy Cyril, especially against Theodore, and Theodoret, and Andrew,\textsuperscript{22} and Nestorius, and those who have thought or think like them or one of them, let him be anathema.

\textsuperscript{18} In Letter IV to Gaius the Monk, \textit{PG} 3, 1072C; ed. Heil and Ritter, ii. 161, l. 9.
\textsuperscript{20} Ps. Athanasius, \textit{Letter to Emperor Jovian} (\textit{CPG} 2253), \textit{PG} 28, 532A. Cf. sec. 2.3-2, above.
\textsuperscript{21} On Cyrus and John cf. sec. 2.6.1 with n. 156, above.
\textsuperscript{22} On Andrew and his initial opposition to the union of 433 between John of Antioch and Cyril see M. Simonetti, \textit{EEC} I. 38, s.v. Andrew of Samosata.
4. Cyri Alexandrini epistula secunda ad Sergium
Constantinopolitanum

Τόδε δεσπότη τὰ πάντα θεοτιμήσω καὶ τρισμακαρίστω <ἀγαθῶ
ποιμένων ποιμενὶ>, πατρὶ πατέρων, οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ
Σεργίῳ Κύρος ἐλάχιστος ὑμέτερος.

Εὐθυρίας καὶ πάλιν πνευματικῆς διὰ τῶν εὐπροσδέκτων εἰχῶν
tῆς τοῦ θεοτιμήτου μου δεσπότου μακαρίστου γεωργιθείσης
tῇ διδαχῇ καὶ τοῖς πανευσθεῖσι χρόνοι τῶν θεοφρουρήτων καὶ
cata ἄλληθειαν φιλαρχίστων ἤμων δεσποτῶν συμβαίνουσας, καὶ νῦν
ἀξίούμαι τῷ τρισμακαρίστῳ μου δεσπότῃ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀναφέρειν.

Δὴ λογοχωρίωμεν, ὅπε ἀπαντήσει τοῦ δόγματος τῶν λεγομενῶν ᾽Εὐαγγελιστῶν κατὰ ταύτην τὴν Ὄλυμποτέρων φιλόχριστον
πόλιν κληρικόν, ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν αὐξίαις καὶ στρατείαις διαλάμπουσι,
ἔτει δὲ καὶ τοῖς εἰς δῆμον τελεύσιν εἰς χιλιάδας αυτεύοντες,
cata tēn τρίτην τοῦ Ὁσυνίου μνῆς ἐνοθέτενς tῇ καθ᾽ ἡμῶν
ἀγωτάτην τοῦ θεοῦ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν ἀγάπητων τοῦ θεοῦ σὺν
ἡμῶν μισθηρίων μετέλαβον, ὀδηγηθέντες πρὸς τοῦτο ἡγομενής
προδήλος τῆς τοῦ παντοδυνάμου θεοῦ εὐδοκίας τῇ χορηγηθείσῃ μοι
didachῆ παρά τε τῶν φιλαγώθων καὶ καλλινίκων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν,
pαρά τε τῆς τοῦ δεσπότου μου θεοπνεύστου παναγιστείας—ὡς
ἐντεῦθεν συστήναι κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς πυκνάζουσιν ἐορτῆν
μέχρι τῶν κεράτων τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, εἰ δὲ δεὶ ταληθέστερον
λέγειν, ὅποι ἐν τοῖς πυκνάζουσι μόνον ὅπου μέχρι τῶν κεράτων τοῦ
θυσιαστηρίου, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ὄλυμποτέρων φιλόχριστον
πόλιν καὶ τὰς ὑπ’ αὐτὴν ἐνορίας μέχρι τῶν νεφελῶν αὐτῶν καὶ
τούτων ἐπέκεινα τῶν ὑφανθῶν τάξεων τῇ τῶν ἀγωτάτων
ἐκκλησίων εἶρην καὶ τοῖς [594] πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπιστρεφομενῶν
ἐυφραυμομένων, ὅτως δὲ τὰ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνώσεως παρηκολο-
ουθησεὶ—λεπτομερῶς τολμήσας ἀνήγαγον ἐπὶ τὰς πανευσθεῖσι
ἀκοὰς τῶν ἀπήτητων καὶ γαληνωτάτων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν διὰ τοῦ
συνδούλου μου Ὁσυνίου τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου διακόνου πᾶσι τοῖς
καθεδρεύοντος, καὶ πέπεισμα, ὅτι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ
ἀποδέχεται τὸν ἐλάχιστον αὐτοῦ δούλον ὁ παναγίος μου δεσπότης.
Cyrus, Second Letter to Sergius
(CPG 7611 Suppl.)

To his own Master, honoured by God in all things, and thrice-blessed good shepherd of sheep, father of fathers, the ecumenical Patriarch, Sergius, Your most humble Cyrus [sends greetings].

Since again abundance and spiritual blessedness have been harvested through the acceptable prayers of my Master, who is honoured by God, and since they concur with the teaching and the most pious times of our Masters, who are guarded by God and truly dear to Christ; I now have the honour of offering the first-fruits (cf. Lev. 23: 10) to my thrice-blessed Master.

For this I make clear—that all the clergy belonging to the teaching of the so-called Theodosians in this Christ-loving city of Alexandria, together with those who are illustrious in public office and in the military, and in addition those, running into thousands, who pay public tax, on the third day of the month of June were united to our most holy, catholic church of God, and partook with us of the undefiled mysteries of God. The good-will of the all-powerful God clearly leading them, they were guided to this through the teaching I provided from our Masters who love good and are victorious, as well as from the all-holiness of my God-inspired Master, so as to celebrate the feast in this way, according to what is written: With those who deck with garlands at the feast, even to the horns of the altar (Ps. 117: 27). But if I should speak more truthfully, it was not only with those who deck with garlands, nor even to the horns of the altar, but throughout the entire Christ-loving city of Alexandria and its districts even to the very clouds, and to those ranks of heaven beyond, rejoicing in the peace of the most holy churches and in those who are returning to it. As the things pertaining to such a great union have followed, I presumed to report in detail to the all-pious ears of our unconquered and most serene Masters through the intermediary of my fellow servant John, the deacon most dear to God, who was present at all the proceedings. And I am confident that in this matter too my all-holy Master will receive his humblest servant.

24 i.e. the emperor Heraclius and empress Martina.
25 i.e. Sergius.
Δέομαι οὖν τοῦ τρισμακαρίστου μου δεσπότου, ὅπως ἐν εἰδήσει περὶ πάντων γενόμενος, εἴ τι μοι κατὰ τὴν τοιαύτην κίνησιν ὡς εἰκός καθυστέρηται ἢ κατ' ἀγνοίαν τοῦ δέντος διημάρτηται, διορθώσασθαι τὸν ἐλάχιστον αὐτοῦ δοῦλον ἔργον γὰρ τοῦτο τῶν θεοτιμήτων ὑμῶν πάσας ταῖς θείαις κεκοσμημένων γραφαῖς καὶ τετελειωμένων ταῖς ἀνωθεν ἀρεταῖς.

Ἡ ὑπογραφή
Κύριος ἐλάχιστος ἐπίσκοπος ὑπερευχόμενος τῆς θεοτιμήτου εὐξωμίας τοῦ τρισμακαρίστου μου δεσπότου ἀνήγαγον.

5. Sergii Constantinopolitani epistula secunda ad Cyrum Alexandrinum

Τὰς ἱερὰς συλλαβὰς τῆς ὑμετέρας θεοτιμήτου ὀσιότητος ἐδεξάμεθα, εὐαγγελιζόμενας ὡς τῇ τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος χάριτι καὶ θεαρέστω σπουδὴ τοῦ θεοφυλάκτου καὶ καλλινίκου ἡμῶν βασιλέως καὶ νοοθεσία ἐνθέω καὶ πάσης ὀρθοδοξίας πεπληρωμένη τῶν πανιέρων ὑμῶν γεγενήθησα κατὰ τὴν φιλόχριστον τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρεών μεγαλόπολιν καὶ πάσας τὰς αὐτῆς ἐνορίας τῶν πρὸς λεγομένων Θεοδοσιανῶν πρὸς τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ὀρθόδοξον ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἔνωσιν, ἐφ’ ός πνευματικῆς καὶ ἀνεκλα-λήτου χαράς ἐμπληθήνετε εὐχαριστηρίους ὑμνοὺς τῶν μεγάλων θεῶν καὶ σωτήρι ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξ ὅλης ψυχῆς ἀνεπέμψαμεν, ὅτι ὅψε ποτὲ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ συνεργεία τοῦ μεσοτοίχου τῆς διχονοίας έκ μέσου γυνομένου, δ’ οὗ πρῶτον ὁ κοῖνος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔχθρος ἀδελφοὺς διεστηκαν ἀδελφῶν σύσσωμοι καὶ συμμέτοχοι πεφήμασι καὶ γεγόναν οἱ πάντες ἐν χείλοις καὶ μία γλώσσα τῆς προσήκουσαν ἐξομολογήσατε τε καὶ δοξολογίαν, ὡς ἀρετοῖν ἔστι, τῇ δοξολο-γουμένῃ ζωρχικῇ τριάδι ποιούμενοι, καὶ κηρύσσεται παρὰ πάντων ὁμοφώνως εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα.

Τὰς γὰρ τῶν μεγάλων καὶ οἰκουμενικῶν ἁγίων συνόδων, τῶν τε χάριτι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος συνελθοῦσῶν καὶ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτῆν
I beg my thrice-holy Master, therefore, that, on taking cognizance of all these events, if anything fitting has been omitted by me in such a proceeding, or if through ignorance I have missed what was due, to correct his humblest servant. For this is the task of Your God-honoured Self, who are adorned with all the godly scriptures and are perfected in virtues from above.

The Signature

I, Cyrus, most humble bishop, praying for the well-being of my God-honoured and thrice-blessed Master, have reported [this].

Document 5

Copy of the Second Letter of Sergius,
former Bishop of Constantinople, written to Cyrus,
former Bishop of Alexandria

[CPG 7605 Suppl.] 26

We have received the sacred letter of Your God-honoured Holiness, proclaiming how, by the grace of the all-holy Spirit and the zeal pleasing to God of our God-protected and victorious emperor, and with the godly admonition, filled with all orthodoxy, of Your All-sacredness, a union has been effected throughout the Christ-loving great city of Alexandria and all her districts, of those formerly called Theodosians with the catholic and apostolic orthodox church. On account of this, we are filled with spiritual and ineffable joy (1 Pet. 1: 8), and have offered up wholeheartedly hymns of thanksgiving to our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ (Titus 2: 13), because late in the day, with the assistance of God, the dividing wall of discord (cf. Eph. 3: 6) has gone from our midst, through which the common enemy of human beings formerly divided brothers from brothers, and all have appeared and become fellows of the same body and fellow heirs (Eph. 3: 6). As one mouth and one tongue, they make both the fitting confession and the doxology, as is pleasing, to the glorified, life-giving Trinity, and one Lord, one faith, one baptism (Eph. 4: 4) is proclaimed by all with one voice.

For You have presented to them the utterances of the great and ecumenical holy synods, that is, those which assembled, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and defined one and the same orthodox

άρθροδοξον πίστιν ὅρισαμένον, τής τε ἐν Νικαίᾳ φημῆι καὶ τής ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει καὶ τῆς ἐν Ἕβεσω τὸ πρότερον καὶ τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι καὶ τῆς αδύνα ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐν χρόνοις Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας λήξεως ἀθροισθῆσες ἁγίας σέρπτης συνόδων, ῥήσεις αὐτοῖς παραθέμενοι καὶ πάν σκάνδαλον ἐκ μέσου δι' αὐτῶν ὄπερ τινὰς λίθους ἐκ τῶν ὀδῶν διαρρήθησαν, βατὴν καὶ λίων εὐκολῶν πρὸς τὴν θεοφιλή ἑνώσαν εὐσώδους ἐποιήσασθε, καὶ πολὺς ἐπὶ τούτων τῆς ψυμέρας ἢεροπρεπῶς τελείωτης παρὰ τε θεῷ ὁ μισθὸς καὶ παρὰ πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις ὁ ἐπαινός.

Ἔφητε γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς παρ' ὑμῶν γενομένοις κεφαλαίως ὁμολογεῖν (καλὸν γὰρ αὐταῖς ὑμῶν ταῖς ἑραίς χρήσασθαι φωναῖς), 'πατέρα καὶ νικάκι καὶ ἄγιον πνεύμα, τρίαδα ὁμοόσιον, μίαν θεότητα ἐν τρισί ὑποστάσεσιν', αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν ἐναὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος τὸ Θεόν λόγον, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνας ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, καὶ κατελθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ὑμανῶν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων, καὶ σαρκωθῆναι εκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τῆς δεσποινῆς ἡμῶν τῆς κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀληθεῖας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειμαρθένου Μαρίας', 'σάρκα λαβόντα εξ αὐτῆς τὴν ἡμῶν ὅμοοσιον, ἐφυρμέμενην ψυχὴν λογικὴ τε καὶ νοερὰ καὶ τάσπερε εξ αὐτῆς συλληφθείης ἐνώσας ἑαυτῷ ἑνώσει φυσικῆ τε καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, αὐτῷ τε γεννηθήναι εξ αὐτῆς ἑνα ὄντα, ἀσύγχυτον, ἀδιάρρετον, τέλειον ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι', 'τὸν αὐτὸν πάσχοντα καὶ μὴ πάσχοντα κατ' ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο', κατὰ τὸν θεοπάσιον Κύριλλον, 'πάσχοντα μὲν ἀνθρωπίνως σαρκὶ καθο ἀνθρωπίνως, μένοντα δὲ ἀπαθῆ τῶν αὐτοῦ ὅς θεὸν ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἱδίας σαρκὸς πάθεις, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν Χριστῷ ἐνεργείας τὰ θεοπρεπή καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιὰ ἐνεργεία, πάσα γὰρ θεία τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐνεργεία ἑξ ἐνός καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου θεοῦ λόγου προηρχέτο, κατὰ ταύτην τὴν εὐσεβὴ διάνοιαν καὶ Λέων ὁ τῆς ἁγίας μνήμης τῆς Ρωμαιῶν ἀρχιεπίσκοπος [138] ἐφρονήσει τε καὶ ἐδίδαξεν εἰπών, ἑνεργεία ἑκατέρα μορφὴ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας; οὖν καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων, τοιοῦτον ἐκ θεότητος τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ἐνα Χριστῷ προβεβεθεὶς ἢεροπρεπῶς ἐδιδάξατε, καὶ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις ὁμολογήσατε
faith. (I mean the one at Nicaea and the one in Constantinople and the first synod at Ephesus, and the one at Chalcedon, and the fifth holy synod which met again in Constantinople at the time of Justinian, of pious memory.) By means of them You have scattered every cause of scandal from Your midst, like stones from the road (cf. 1 Pet. 2: 8), and You have made an exceedingly easy passage to the union dear to God. For this achievement Your priest-befitting Perfection receives from God a reward which is great, and praise from all human beings.

You have stated in the articles of faith which were sent to them [sc. the Theodosians] by You that You confess—for it is good to use Your actual sacred expressions—'Father and Son and Holy Spirit, a consubstantial Trinity, one Godhead in three hypostases', 27 one who 'is one of the holy Trinity, God the Word, who was begotten from the Father before ages, and descended from heaven in the last days, and became incarnate by the holy Spirit and our Lady Mary, who is properly speaking and in truth Theotokos and ever-virgin'. 28 'He took from her a flesh consubstantial with ours, ensouled with a rational intellectual soul', and united this to himself from his very conception 'in both a natural and a hypostatic union, and so that he came forth from her as a single being, without confusion, without division', 'perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in humanity', 'the same suffered in one respect and did not suffer in another respect', as the inspired Cyril said. 29 'He suffered in a human fashion in the flesh as a human being, but the same one as God remained impassible amidst the sufferings of his own flesh, and the same single Christ effected what was fitting for God and what was human through one activity.' 30 For every divine and human activity proceeded from one and the same incarnate God the Word. Concerning this pious conception Leo, the archbishop of Rome, of holy memory, both thought and taught when he said: 'each form is active with the cooperation of the other.' Hence, as befits a priest, You have taught us to uphold indeed 'one Christ, from two natures, that is, both from the Godhead and from the humanity', and You have confessed 'one incarnate nature of God the Word', according to

27 Article of Faith I, document 3, above.
28 Constitution of Articles of Faith II and V.
30 Cf. Article of Faith VII.
Κύριλλον, καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον, ἦτις ἐστὶν αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς, 'εις τὴς ἁγίας καὶ ὀρμουσίου τριάδος'. ὥσπερ δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ὅπου φύσειν ὀμολογεῖν κηρύξειν, οὐχ ἔτερον εἶναι καὶ ἔτερον αὐτὸν διεξῆλθε, ἀλλ' ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατά τὸν πάνσοφον Κύριλλον, 'θεωρία μόνη διακρίνοντες τὰ εἶ ὅν ἡ ἐνώσις γέγονεν, καὶ ταύτα τὸν νῦν διασκοποῦντες ἁτρεπτά τε καὶ ἀσύνχυτα μετὰ τὴν αὐτῶν φυσικῆς τε καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἐνώσασθα μένοντα, 'πραγματικὴν αὐτῶν τὴν θεωρίαν ποιούμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ φαντασίᾳ ψευδεί καὶ διακένωσιν νοῦ διαπλάσσομαι', ἀναγιομενὴς δηλοῦντι τῆς εἰς ὅδον διατομῆς διὰ τὴν ἀφραστὸν καὶ ἀπερνήσιον ἐνώσασθαι'.

Ταύτα εὐσεβῶς καὶ λίαν ἧκριβωμένως ἐκθέμενοι πάντοις ἀκολούθως τῶν τῶν δυσσεβῶν αἱρέσεων καθηγητᾶς ἀναθέματι καθυστέρατε, μεθ' ὅν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀντειρηκότας τοῖς διάδεκα κεφαλαίοις τοῦ παναγίου καὶ ἀοιδίμου Κύριλλον καὶ μή μετανόησαντας ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ μέχρι τέλους ἐμμείναντος πλῆκτος ταῖς ὁμοίαις ἁραίς κατεκρίνατε ταύτῃ ὑμᾶς τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ ἐντυχόντες διδασκαλία, δι' ἣς τῆς ὀδός εὐθύκης κύριος τῇ τῶν τοσούτων ἡμῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐνωσίς οἰκοδομήσας, τῇ αὐτοῦ ἁνυμνησάμεν αγαθότητα, ἐμακράσιμοι δὲ καὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας διὸν ἦσαν ἱεροπρότειναι θρόνων παραδόξῳ καὶ παρὰ πάσης ἐλπίδος μεσιτεύοντες καταξιωθέσιν, τῇ τε χάρις τοῦ παναγίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦν πνεύματος καὶ τῇ ἔκλογῇ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ θεοσόφου καὶ ἀντὶς εἰρηνοποιοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, τοῦ τῆς ἡγιασμένην αὐτὸν καρδίαν ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ ἐκκόσμησαν, ὅπ' αὐτῆς ὁ ἄλλος ἐν πάσι τοῖς πρακτεῖοις ἄθυμοι νεανίσκημοι δι' ὅ πάντων ἐπέκεινα μόνος δυνάστης θεός μεγάλως ἐτὶ κραταίωσε καὶ περισσώςει, φυλάττων αὐτὸν ὡς ἑδραίωμα τῶν τε ἁγίων <θεοῦ> ἐκκλησίων καὶ τῆς ἁμωμένοι τῶν Χρυσιτανῶν πίστεως, δωρούμενος αὐτῷ μακρότητα χρόνων καὶ πλήθος εἰρήνης καὶ πάντων τῶν πολεμῶν ἐθνῶν τῆς ὑποταγήν εἰς τέκνα τέκνων τὸ βασιλείου παραπέμπετον κράτος.

Παράσχοι δὲ καὶ τῇ σῇ ὅσιᾳ καὶ πανερέω ἁγάτῃ περισσοτέρῳ τῇ αὐτῷ χάριν ἐν χείλεσι καὶ λόγον ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματος, δι' οὗ καὶ τὸ ὄς εἰκός ἐγκαταλείμμα τῶν τε ὦς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰκῇ καὶ μάτιν διαφορομενῶς σωθῆσαι, τοῖς ἅχεσι δέπακολουθοῦντες τῶν ἀρτίως ἡμῶν ἐνοθετῶν περισσότητος ἡμῶν τέκνων, οἷς δι' ἡμῶν
Cyril [now] among the saints, and one synthetic hypostasis which is our very Lord Jesus Christ, 'who is one of the holy and consubstantial Trinity'. Similarly, in proclaiming the confession 'in two natures', you did not investigate 'is one and another', but 'one and the same', according to the all-wise Cyril, 'distinguishing in contemplation alone the elements from which the union came about, and mentally considering that these remain without change and without confusion after their natural and hypostatic union', 'holding the contemplation of them a matter of reality and not of lying illusion', that is to say, once the 'division into two because of the ineffable and unconfused and unconceivable union' was removed.

Having expounded these matters in pious belief and with extreme accuracy, You placed all leaders of impious heresies one by one under anathema, in whose company also all those who had contradicted the Twelve Chapters of the all-wise and famous Cyril and have not repented but persist in their error until the end, You condemned with similar curses. Having read this orthodox teaching of Yours, through which the Lord of glory (1 Cor. 2: 8) was well pleased to build the union of so many of our brothers, we have praised his goodness and we have blessed Your holy Priesthood too because it has been deemed worthy to assist in such a wonderful way and against all hope by the grace of the all-holy and life-giving Spirit and through the choice and teaching of the godly-wise and peace-loving great emperor, who has his hallowed heart in the hands of God (Prov. 21: 1), being led and governed by this grace truly in all our undertakings. May the one sovereign God, who is over all, continue to fortify and preserve him greatly, safeguarding him as the foundation-stone of both the holy churches of God and the blameless faith of the Christians, granting him length of years and abundance of peace, and the subjection of all the hostile nations, as he transmits his royal power to his children's children.

May God provide more abundantly also to Your holy and all-sacred Love his grace on Your lips and a word in the opening of Your mouth (Eph. 6: 19), through which the possible remnant of those who randomly and vainly differ from us will be rescued. As we follow in the footsteps of those much-desired children of ours who

---

31 Cf. Article of Faith VI.
32 Cf. Article of Faith VII.
τῶν θεορέσων πνευματικάς ἁγκάλιας περιπλεκόμενοι <καὶ ἐν
φιλήματι ἀγίων ἀσταξάμενοι> ἐπευχόμεθα τούτους πάντων τῶν ἐκ
θεοῦ ἀγαθῶν τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν.

Ἡ ύπογραφή
Ἐρωμένου εἰς κυρίῳ ὑπερεύχου ἡμῶν, θεοφιλέστατε ἁδελφε.

6. Ἰσον ἐπιστολῆς Σεργίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου
Κωνσταντινοπόλεως πρὸς Ὄνωριον πάπαν Ρώμης

Οὕτω τοῖς ἁγιωτάτοις ἡμῖν ὁλικῶς τε καὶ συμφυῶς εἰς ἐνότητα
συνεσφίγμεθα πνεύματος, ὡς σπείρων ἡμᾶς πάντων τῶν ἡμετέρων
βουλευμάτων καὶ πράξεων συλλήψτορας τοὺς ἐρωτάτους ἔχειν
ἡμᾶς, καὶ εἰ μὴ πολὺ τὸ διείργον ἢ τῶν τόπων παρεῖχε διάστασιν,
tοῦτο ἢν καὶ ήμέραν ἐπράπτωμεν τῇ ὄχρᾳ καὶ τετειχισμένῃ τῆς
tιμίας καὶ ὑπομνήματι ἡμῶν ἀδελφότητος ἀειτούς περιφράττουσι
συμβουλίας ὁμοὶ ἐπείπερ ἡμῖν καὶ καμάτου χωρίς ὁ λόγος τε καὶ τὸ
γράμμα τὸ σπουδαζόμενον δίδωσιν, αὐτίκα τὰ περὶ ἢν τοῦτο
χαράσσομεν εἰς ἀφηγήσει ποιοῦμεθα.

Πρὸ τοὺς φανερῶν χρόνων, ἦν καὶ τῆν κατὰ Περσῶν ἐκστρατείαν
ὁ καλλίνικος καὶ θεοστήρικτος δεσπότης καὶ μέγας βασιλεὺς
ἐποιεῖτο διὰ τοὺς ύπέρ τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καταπιστευθέσας αὐτῷ
φιλοχριστοῦ τοιοῦτος ἁγώνας καὶ ἠπὶ τὰ τῆς Ἀρμενίων χώρας
γέγονε μέρη, <τὸ> τῶν πρωτευόντων τῆς διοικοῦσθε Σεβήρου ταῦτα
καταράτου μερίδος Παύλου τοῦνομα ἐν ἐκείνοις τῶν τόπων
ἀναφαίνεις προσέδωσαι τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐπουρήσατο εὐσεβεία τοῖς ύπέρ τῆς
καὶ τοῦτον πεπλανμένης αἱρέσεως προβαλλόμενος λόγον καὶ τοῦτο
δῆται συνηγορῶν, ἐφι' οῖς ἢ πανευσεβῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ βασιλικῆς
μεγαλόνοις—μετὰ γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισμάτων καὶ τῆς
τῶν θείων ὁμολογών καταπληκτεῖν ἠλαχίς γνώσιν—διελέγασα το
καὶ θριαμβεύσασα τὴν μοχθηρὰν τοῦτον δυσσέβειαν ταῖς αὐτοῦ
βεβήλωσι κακοτεχνίας τὰς τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας ὡς
ἀληθῆς ταῦτης ὑπέρμαχος ὁθά καὶ ἀμώμητα ἀντεξῆγαγε
δύγματα, ἐν οἷς καὶ μᾶς ἐνεργείας Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ
ἡμῶν ἐποιήσατο μνήμην.
have recently been united with us, whom we clasp in a spiritual
embrace through the intermediary of You who are pleasing to
God and *greet with a holy kiss* (Rom. 16: 16, etc.), we pray that they
will enjoy all good things from God.

The Signature
Since You are saved in the Lord, pray for us, Brother most dear to
God.

Document 6

Copy of the Letter of Sergius of Constantinople
to Honorius, Pope of Rome
(*CPG* 7606 Suppl.)\(^{33}\)

We are so completely and naturally bound to Your most holy Self
in *unity of spirit* (Eph. 4: 3) that we strive to have Your Sacredness as
a helper in all our plans and actions. And if the distance between
locations did not effect a great separation, we would do this on a
daily basis, fencing ourselves round with the strong and fortified
counsel of Your honoured and unanimous Brotherhood. However,
since both word and letter give us without effort what we
strive for, we shall relate immediately the subject on which we are
writing.

Some time ago, when our victorious and God-strengthened
master and mighty emperor was waging a campaign against the
Persians because of his struggles on behalf of the Christ-loving
state entrusted to him by God, he came into parts of Armenian
territory.\(^{34}\) One of the leaders of the accursed party of the
impious Severus, Paul by name, appeared in these places,
approached His Piety, and made a speech on Severus’ erroneous
heresy, even defending it, if you please. To this His all-pious and
imperial Magnanimity (for with his other gifts from God he has
also obtained abundant knowledge of divine teachings) argued
with him and triumphed over his wretched impiety, and against
Paul’s profane devices he contrasted the correct, undefiled teach-
ings of our most holy church, as her true champion. In so doing,
he also mentioned the one activity of Christ our true God.


\(^{34}\) This is the synod of Theodosiopolis in 633. See Winkelmann, *Der Streit*, 61–2, nr. 24, who, however, favours a date of 631.
Μετά τινα δὲ καίρου ὁ αὐτός θεοστῆρικτὸς βασιλεὺς κατὰ τὴν Λαξάνων γενόμενος χώραν τῆς, ὡς εἰρηται, γενομένης αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν αἰρετικὸν ἐκείνον Παύλον διαλέξεις ἀνεμνήσθη παρουσία Κύρου τοῦ ἀγωτάτου, τηροῦντα μὲν τὸν ἀὐτῆς φιλοχρίστου Λαξάνων χώρας μητροπολιτικὸν ἐπέχοντος θρόνον, νυνὶ δὲ τὴν μεγάλην πομαίνοντος Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. ὁ δὲ [536] ῥήθεις ἀγιώτατος ἀνήρ τούτων ἀκούσας πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπεκρίθη γαληνὴν μὴ εἰδεναι ἀκριβῶς, εἴ τε μίαν εἴ τε δύο ἐνεργείας Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἅληθινοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χρεών ἐστὶ δογματίζειν. καὶ δὴ κατὰ κέλευσιν τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐσεβείας διὰ γραμμάτων οἰκείων ἐπηρώτησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ ῥήθεις ἀγιώτατος ἀνήρ, πότερον χρή μίαν ἐνεργείαν ἢ δύο ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν λέγεθαι Χριστοῦ, καὶ εἴπερ τινὰς οἴδαμεν τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακάριων πατέρων μίαν εἰρηκότας ἐνεργείαν. θεν ἡμεῖς τὰ τῆς οἰκείας εἰδήσεως αὐτῶ δι’ ἡμετέρων ἐσημάναμεν ἀντιγράφων — στελάντες καὶ λόγον Μηνᾶ τοῦ ἀγωτάτου πατριάρχου τῆς θεοφυλάκτου ταυτῆς καὶ βασιλίδος πόλεως γενομένου προσφωνηθέντα καὶ ἐπιδοθέντα παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐνταῦθα παρόντι Βιγιλιόω τῷ ἐν ἁγίοις τῆν ἡμετέραν προηγησαμένῳ ἁγιώσυνῃ, ἔχοντα καὶ χρήσεις πατρικᾶς διαιρόσων περὶ μίας ἐνεργείας καὶ ἐνὸς θελήματος τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἅληθινοῦ θεοῦ — οὐδὲν μέντοι παντ- ἀπασιν Ἰδεῖν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἡμῶν ἀντιγράφοις ἀπεφηνάμεθα, ὡς ἐστι γνώναι τοῖς πανεροῖς <καὶ ὀμοφύσοις> ὑμᾶς τοῖς ἀποσταλεῖσιν ἴσοτύποις αὐτῶν ἐντυγχάνοντας, καὶ συγή μὲν εἰς ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου τὸ τοιούτον κεφάλαιον ἔλαβεν.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πρὸ ὀλίγου καίρου συνεργία καὶ χάριτι τοῦ πάντος ἀνθρώπους θέλοντος σωθῆναι θεοῦ <καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἅληθείας ἔλθειν> εὐσεβεὶ τις ζῆλω τοῦ κρατίστου καὶ καλλινίκου μεγάλου βασιλέως παρομοιθεῖς Κύρου ὁ ἀγιώτατος τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρεως μεγα- ὁπόλεως πατριάρχης καὶ κοινὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς καὶ συλλειτουργὸς φιλοθέως τε καὶ ἑπιεικῶς προστεθάπατο τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρεως μεγαλόπολιν τὰ Πύτχων καὶ Διοσκόρου, Σεβήρου τε καὶ Τιουλανὸν τῶν θεοστυγῶν νοσοῦντας τῇ καθολικῇ προσελθεῖν ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ μετὰ πολλὰς διαλέξεις καὶ καμάτους, οἷς μετὰ πλείστης φρονήσεως καὶ λυστελεστάτης οἰκονομίας ἐν τῷ πρόγ- ματι κατεβάλετο, τὸ σπουδαζόμενον διὰ τῆς ἀνωθεν κατώρθωσι χάριτος: γεγόνασι μεταξὺ μέρους ἐκατέρου δογματικά τινα κεφάλαια, ἐφ’ ὀσὶς ἀπαντεῖς οἱ πρώτην μὲν εἰς διαφόρους ἀπεσχοινισμένοι
After some time the same God-strengthened emperor came to the land of Lazica and was reminded of his discussion, as mentioned, with that heretic Paul, by the presence of the most holy Cyrus, who then held the metropolitan throne of the Christ-loving land of Lazica, but is now shepherd of the great Alexandria. When the said most holy man [sc. Cyrus] heard of the discussion, he replied to His Serenity that he did not know exactly whether one should teach one or two activities of Christ our true God. Therefore, at the command of His Piety the said most holy man enquired of us in his own letter whether it was necessary to speak of one activity or two in Christ our Saviour, and whether we knew of any of the holy and blessed Fathers who had spoken of one activity.\textsuperscript{35} To this we indicated to him in our reply what we ourselves knew, sending him as well a document of Menas, formerly the most holy patriarch of this God-protected and imperial city.\textsuperscript{36} This document was addressed and handed by him to Vigilius, Your Holiness's predecessor, [now] among the saints, who was present there, and contained various testimonies from the Fathers on the subject of one activity and one will of our Saviour Christ, true God. In these rescripts of ours, however, we declared nothing at all of our own, as Your all-sacred and unanimous Self can discover by reading the copies of the documents that were sent. And that subject went into abeyance from that time on.

Recently, with the help and grace of God who wishes all human beings to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2: 4), and stimulated by the pious zeal of the most powerful and victorious great emperor, Cyrus, the most holy patriarch of the great city of Alexandria and our common brother and fellow minister, in a God-loving and seemly manner exhorted those in the great city of Alexandria who were sick with the beliefs, hateful to God, of Eutyches and Dioscorus, Severus and Julian, to approach the catholic church. After many discussions and efforts, which he put into the matter with the greatest prudence and the most advantageous arrangement, he achieved by the grace of heaven what he was striving for. Between each party certain doctrinal articles were composed, in which all who had earlier been divided into opposing parties and had subscribed to their lethal forefathers,

\textsuperscript{35} This refers to document 1, above.
\textsuperscript{36} This refers to document 2, above.
μερίδας προπάτωρας δὲ Διόσκορον καὶ Σεβήρον τούς ἀληθηρίους ἐπιγραφόμενοι ἤνωθεν τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ καὶ μόνῃ καθολικῇ εἰκκλησίᾳ μία τε ποιμῆν Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀπασ ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρεων φιλόχριστος γέγονεν [538] λαὸς καὶ πᾶσα σχέδων πρὸς τούτοις ἡ Ἀγινπτος καὶ Θηβαῖς καὶ Λιβύη καὶ αἱ λοιπὲς τῆς Ἀγυπτικῆς διωκήσεως ἐπιρρήσει, οὕστως ἢν ἰδεῖν πρῶς, ὡς εἰρήκαμεν, εἰς ἀναρίθμητον πλῆθος αἱρέσεων διεσκεδασμένους, εὐδοκία δὲ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σπουδὴ θεαρέστω τοῦ ῥήθησιν ἀγιωτάτου τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρεων ἱεράρχου εἰς <χείλος> γεγονασὶ πάντες, μία φωνῇ, καὶ ἐνέσπει πνεῦμας τὰ ὀρθὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁμολογούντες δόγματα· τῶν εἰρημένων δὲ καὶ ἐστοιχημένων ἐν καθέστηκε κεφάλαιον τὸ περὶ μίας ἐνεργείας Χριστοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.

Τούτων οὖν προεκβιληθότων Σωφρόνιος ὁ ὁσιώτατος μοναχὸς, ὁ ταῖοι—ὡς εἴκος καὶ μόνης μεμαθηκαμεν—τῆς Θεοσωλομοιμιών χειροτονθείς πρόεδρος—οὕτω γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἐξ ἐθνοῦς συνοδικὰ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἐνθαμάθη—κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρεων τηρουάτα γενόμενος καὶ τῷ ῥηθέντι ἀγιωτάτῳ πάπα των ἡμῶν, ἡνίκα τὴν, ὡσα εὔρηται, πρὸς τοὺς πρώην αἱρετικῶς εὐδοκία θεοῦ κατώρθου παράδεχον ἑνωσιν καὶ σιν αὐτῷ τὰ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων διασκοπάμενος κεφαλαίων, ἡμετριώθη καὶ ἀντεῖπτε πρὸς τὸ τῆς μίας ἐνεργείας κεφάλαιον δύο παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐνεργείας Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἢ ἢ ἡμῶν δογματίζεσθαι. τοῦ δὲ λεχθέντος ἀγιωτάτου πάπα μάλιστα μὲν χρήσεις τινὰς αὐτῶτῶν ἡμῶν πατέρων προαγαγόντος ὅποράθην ἐν τοῖς τῶν οἰκείων συγγραμμάτων μῖαν ἐνέργειαν εἰρηκότων, ἐτε δὲ ἐκ περιουσίας φάσκοντος, ὡς πολλάκις οἱ ἁγιοι πατέρες ἡμῶν διὰ τὸ κερδάναι πλειόνων ψυχῶν σωτηρίας ταιούτων αναφεύγων κεφαλαίων θεαρέστοις ὁικονομίαις χρησάμενοι φαινόταται καὶ συµβάσεις μηδὲν τῆς ἀκριβείας τῶν ὀρθῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας δογμάτων παρασαλέσαντες, καὶ λέγοντος, ὡς ἀρά χρή καὶ ἐτι τοῦ παρόντος τοιούτων μυριάδων λαοῦ σωτηρίας ἐν χεραὶ προκειμένης μηδὲν περὶ τοῦ τοιούτου [540] κεφαλαίον ἐριστικῶς εὐγομαχεῖν διὰ τὸ, ὡς εἰρήται, καὶ ψυχῶν διὰ τοὺς θεσπεσίων πατέρων τῆς ταιούτης εἰρήθαι φωνῇ καὶ μηδὲν περὶ τούτου τῶν τῆς ὀρθῶν παραβλάστεσθαι λόγον.

Ὁ ῥηθεὶς θεοφίλης Σωφρόνιος τῆς τοιούτης ὁικονομίας ὀδηγάως κατεδέξατο. ἐπεὶ οὖν τούτου ἑνεκα μετὰ γραμμάτων τοῦ αὐτοῦ
Dioscorus and Severus, were united to the most holy and only catholic church. The Christ-loving population of Alexandria became one flock of Christ, our true God, and in addition to them almost all of Egypt, Thebaïd, Libya, and the remainder of the provinces in the diocese of Egypt. Formerly, as we have said, it was possible to witness their fragmentation into an untold number of heresies, but now, by the favour of God and the God-pleasing zeal of the aforementioned most holy chief-priest of Alexandria, they all became one mouth, one voice, and in unity of spirit confessed the correct teachings of the church. From what was discussed and settled, one article of faith was established concerning the one activity of Christ, our great God and Saviour.

Events having proceeded in this way, Sophronius, the most holy monk, who now, as we have learned only from hearsay, has been ordained leader of Jerusalem (for up to the present we have not yet received the customary synodical letter from him), was in Alexandria at the time and was in the company of the said most holy pope. This was the time, as has been said, when, by the favour of God, Cyrus had achieved an amazing union with the former heretics. With him Sophronius looked into the issues of these articles of faith, and opposed and contradicted the article on the one activity, demanding that one must in every way teach the doctrine of two activities in Christ our God. In particular the most holy pope, already mentioned, adduced for him testimonies from our holy Fathers where they spoke here and there in some of their writings of one activity. Yet Cyrus still superfluously alleged that often, when articles of faith like these made their appearance, our holy Fathers, for the sake of gaining the salvation of more souls, appear to have used God-pleasing accommodations and agreements without undermining the accuracy of the correct teachings of the church. Cyrus asserted that, since in fact at the present time too the salvation of so many myriads of people was at stake, it was imperative not to contend argumentatively at all on the subject of that article of faith because, as was already said, an expression of this kind had also been uttered by certain inspired Fathers, and the principle of orthodoxy had not been harmed by it at all.

Sophronius, dear to God, whom we have mentioned, would in no way accept such an accommodation. Therefore, because of

---

37 See document 3, above.
38 i.e. Article of Faith VII of the Announcement, in document 3, above.
άγιοτάτου ἡμῶν συλλειτουργοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς παραγέγονε, τὸν περὶ τούτου τε καὶ παρ ἡμῖν ἀνεκίνησε λόγον ἐνστάμενος τῶν τοιούτων ἐξαιρεθῆναι κεφαλαίων μετὰ τὴν γενομένην ἐνωσιν τὴν τής μιᾶς ἐνεργείας φωνῆν—σκληρον ἡμεῖς ἡγησάμεθα τούτο πῶς γὰρ σκληρον οὐκ ἦν,—καὶ σφόδρα βαρύτατον ἄτε δὴ μέλλον ἀναλύειν τε καὶ ἀνατρέπειν ὅλην ἑκείνην τὴν καλῶς γεγενημένην ὁμοιόμοιαν τε καὶ ἐνωσιν κατά τε τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρεών πόλιν καὶ κατά πάσας τὰς ὑπ’ αὐτὴν ἐπεμέχα τὰς ἐν μιᾶς καὶ μεγάλης τῇ φωνῇ ἐν τοῖς θείαις μυσταγωγίαις ταύτην ἀνακατάστασιν. πολλῶν τοῖνυν περὶ τούτου κεκαλυμμένων λόγων ἡμῶν πρὸς τὸν εἰρημένον ὁσίωτατον Σωφρόνων τέλος προετρέπαμεν αὐτὸν χρῆσεις ἡμῖν προκομίσαι ἁγίων καὶ ἐκκρίτων πατέρων, ἐκείνων μεντοι προδήλως, ὦ ὃς ἀπάντητος κοινῶν διδασκάλων ὁμολογούμενην καὶ τὰ τούτων δόγματα νῦνοι αἰ ἀγαθοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησία χειρόσελος. δύο μητέρων καὶ αὐταις λέξεσιν ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ λέγει παραδοτοῦσας. ὁ δὲ τούτο ποιήσας παντοῖος ἡπόρησεν.

Ἡμεῖς οὖν τὴν ἐνετείλες ἀρξαμένην ἐξάπτεσθαι τιαὶ τῶν ἑνταύθα ἀμφισβήτησιν κατανοῆσαι και εἰδότες, ὡς ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ἁμιλονεικίων αἱ τῶν αἱρέσεων διχοστασίαι γεγόνασιν, ἀναγκαῖον ἐκρίνωμεν πάσαν θέσαιν σπουδὴν πρὸς τὸ καταπαύσαι τε καὶ ἐκκόψαι τὴν περιττὴν ταὐτὴν λογομαχίαν καὶ πρός μὲν τὸν συχνὸς εἰρημένον ἁγίωτατον [542] τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρεών πατριάρχην γεγραφήκαμεν, ὥστε αὐτὸν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πάλαι χωρίζομενον ἐνωσιν σὺν θεῷ καταρθώσατα μηκέτι τοῦ λοιποῦ τοῖνυν συγχωρεῖν μίαν ἡ διὸ προφέρειν ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἀλλά μᾶλλον, καθάπερ αἱ ἁγιαὶ καὶ οἰκουμενικαὶ παραδεδοκασί σὺνόδου, ἐνα καὶ τὸν ἄλλον υἱὸν μονογενῆ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεοῦ ἐνεργεῖν ὁμολογεῖν τά τε θεία καὶ τά ἀνθρώπινα, καὶ πάσαν θεοπρεπὴ καὶ ἀνθρωποπρεπὴ ἐνέργειαν εἰς ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου θεοῦ λόγου ἀδιαρέτως προϊέναι καὶ ἐς ἑνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναφέρεσθαι διὰ τὸ τὴν μὲν τῆς μιᾶς ἐνεργείας φωνῆν, εἰ καὶ τις τῶν ἁγίων εἰρηται πατέρων, ὄμως ἐξεπείξει καὶ θορυβεῖν τάς τινων ἁκοᾶς ὑπολαμβανόντων ἐπὶ ἀναφέρεσι ταύτην.
what had transpired he approached us with a letter from our same most holy fellow minister, and engaging in discourse with us too on the matter, insisted that the expression ‘one activity’ after the union took place be excluded from these articles of faith. We thought that this was harsh. For how was it not harsh and exceedingly onerous,\(^{39}\) when it was going to undo and overthrow that entire concord and unity which had come about so well in the city of Alexandria and in all her provinces, which at no stage up to the present had accepted even the very name of our inspired and renowned Father Leo or had made mention of the holy, great, ecumenical synod in Chalcedon, while now with clear, loud voice they are proclaiming it in their divine rites?\(^{40}\) So when we had engaged in many discussions on this subject with the said most holy Sophronius, we finally entreated him to produce for us testimonies from the holy and select Fathers, that is, obviously those whom we all confess as our common teachers and whose teachings the holy churches of God acknowledge as law, testimonies which expressly and literally impart as tradition that we should speak of two activities in Christ. This he was completely unable to do.\(^{41}\)

We, therefore, realizing that the dispute that had thereby arisen was being kindled by some of those there, and knowing that it is always from such arguments that heretical dissensions come about, have judged it necessary to devote all our effort to stopping and cutting off this excessive wrangling over words. We wrote to the oft-mentioned most holy patriarch of Alexandria, so that he who with God’s help had effected unity between those who had formerly been separated, should in the future no longer permit anyone to propose one or two activities in Christ our God, but rather, just as the holy, ecumenical synods have handed down, a person should profess that one and the same only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God, performs both the divine and the human activities, and that every activity, both fitting for God and fitting for a human being, proceeds without division from one and the same incarnate God the Word, and is to be referred to one and the same [person], because the expression ‘one activity’ (even if it was used by some of the holy Fathers) still alienates and

\(^{39}\) I have amended Riedinger’s punctuation here.

\(^{40}\) This may indicate that in some form the Announcement was used liturgically.

\(^{41}\) This is at variance with Sophronius’ supposed composition of a florilegium of 600 anti-monoenergistic citations from the Fathers. Cf. Winkelmann, *Der Streit*, 8.2–3, nr. 46, and the discussion of Sophronius’ works in sec. 1.2, above.
προφέρεσθαι τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἁσυχῶτας καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἦμων μὲν ἄνωθεν δύο φύσεων (ὄπερ οὐκ ἔστι ποτὲ μηδὲ γένοιτο· ἀσκάτως δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν δύο ἐνεργείων ῥήσου πολλοὺς σκανδαλίζειν οἷα μηδε των τῶν θεσπεσίων τε καὶ ἐκκρίτων τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰρημένην μυσταγωγῶν, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἔπεσθαί ταῦτη τὸ καὶ δύο πρεσβεύειν θελήματα ἐναντίως πρὸς ἀλληλα ἔχοντα, ὅσο τοῦ μὲν θεοῦ λόγου τὸ σωτήριον τέλον τὸ ἐκπληρωθῆναι πάθος, τῆς δὲ κατ’ αὐτὸν ἀνθρωπότητος ἀντιπιπτούσης τῷ αὐτοῦ θελήματι καί ἐναντιομένης, καὶ ἐνθὲν δύο τοὺς τάπαντας εἰσάγεσθαι, ὅπερ δυσεῖσθε. ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποκειμένων δύο ἁμα καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα ἐναντίως ὑφεστάναι θελήματα ἡ δὲ σωτηρία τῶν θεοφόρων πατέρων διδασκαλία ἐναργῶς ἐκπαιδεύει τὸ μηδέποτε τὴν νοερῶς ἐνυμωμένην τοῦ κυρίου σάρκα κεκυριομένην καὶ εἰς οἰκείας ὅρμης ἐναντίως τῶν νεύματος τὸ ἦμωμένου αὐτῆς καθ’ ὑπόστασιν θεοῦ λόγου τὴν φυσικὴν αὐτῆς ποιήσασθαι κύνησιν, ἀλλ’ ὅποτε καὶ οἰχαὶ ὅσον αὐτός ὁ θεὸς λόγος ἐβούλετο, καὶ, σαφῶς εἰπεῖν, ὃν τρόπον τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἡμέτερον [544] ἤγερμονεται καὶ κοσμεῖται καὶ τάπτεται ὑπὸ τῆς νοερᾶς καὶ λογικῆς ἡμῶν φυχῆς, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ ὅλον τὸ ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦ σύγκριμα ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου θεότητος αἰεὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ἄγομενον θεοκίνητον ἵνα κατὰ τὸν Νῦσσης Γρηγόριον λέγοντα ἐν τοῖς κατ’ Ἑυνομίον οὕτως· ἐκάθετο τὸ νῦν ὁ οὐσίος ἀπαθής πάντως ἐστὶ καὶ ἀκήρατος· εἰ δὲ τὰ πάθος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντο, διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρωπόν πάντως τῷ δεχομένου τὸ πάθος τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐνήργησεν. ἐνεργεί γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡ θεότης διὰ τοῦ περὶ αὐτὴν σώματος τὴν τοῦ παντὸς σωτηρίαν, ὡς εἰναι τῆς μὲν σαρκὸς τὸ πάθος, τοῦ δὲ θεοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν."

Ταῦτα τοῖς, <ὡς εἰρήται,> τὴν ἄρξαμένην ἀνάπτεσθαι φιλονεικίαν ἐωρακότες ἀναγκαῖον ἐκρίμασε ταῖς τετριμμέναις μᾶλλον τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων φωναῖς καὶ συνοδικῶς ὁρισμέναις διὰ πάντων ἄκολουθησαι καὶ μήτε τὰ σπανίως ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων εἰρημένα καὶ οὐ περὶ αὐτὰ τὸν σκοπὸν ἐσχηκότων, ὡστε σαφῆ καὶ ἀναμφίλεκτον τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν ἐκθέσθαι διδασκαλίαν εἰς κανόνα καὶ νόμον πάντως ἀγειν δογματικόν, ὅποιον ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ περὶ μιᾶς ἐνεργείας αὐτοῦς εἰρημένον, μήτε μὴ τὰ μηδαμῶς εἰρημένα τοῖς ἐκκρίτοις πατράσιν, ὑπὸ τῶν δὲ τὸν προφερόμενα, φημί, δὴ τὰς δύο ἐνεργείας ὑσ δόγμα προφέρειν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν.
confuses the ears of some, who suppose that it has been proposed in order to do away with the two natures which have been united without confusion and hypostatically in Christ our God. This is not ever the case, nor may it be so. In the same way the expression ‘two activities’ scandalizes many as well, on the grounds that it was not uttered by any of the inspired and select spiritual teachers of the church either. For to follow that expression and to advance two wills in mutual conflict, such that, while the God the Word wished to bring to fulfilment his saving Passion, his humanity stood in the way of his will and opposed it, and thereby two are introduced who will opposing things, is impious. For it is impossible for two wills to subsist at the same time in one and the same subject. The saving instruction of the God-bearing Fathers clearly teaches that the intellectually ensouled flesh of the Lord never separately and of its own initiative made its own natural movement at variance with the approval of God the Word united to it hypostatically, but at the time and according to the nature and quantity which the God the Word himself wished. To put it clearly, just as our body is governed, and ordered, and subject to our intellectual and rational soul, so too in the case of Christ the Master his whole human constitution always and in every case was led by the Godhead of his Word and moved by God, according to Gregory of Nyssa, who spoke as follows in his writing against Eunomius: ‘As God the Son, he is completely free of passion and uncontaminated. But if some passion is related of him in the Gospel, such passion operated through the human element that received it completely. For the Godhead truly enacted the salvation of all through the body around it, so that the passion was from the flesh, while the activity was from God.’

Well, then, as we have said, when we saw this argument beginning to flare up, we judged it necessary rather to follow in everything the tried-and-true utterances of the holy Fathers and the synodical definitions and not those uttered occasionally by some Fathers without the aim of expounding the relevant teaching clearly and unambiguously, with a view to bringing it into a canon or a rule of teaching, as for example when they spoke too of one activity, or follow indeed what was never said by select Fathers but is now adduced by some people (I mean the two activities) as if to adduce a teaching of the church.

Καὶ πέρας ἔδοξε καὶ ἔστερχηθε, ὡστε τὸν εἰρημένον ὁσιώτατον ἱεροφόρον μηδένα τὸ λοιπὸν περὶ μιᾶς ἡ δύο ἐνεργειῶν λόγων κυνείν. ἄλλη ἀρκεῖσθαι τῇ προλεγμενή ἁσφαλεί τε καὶ τετρυμμένη τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὑθατομί τε καὶ διδασκαλία. τούτως οἷν ἀρκεσθεὶς ὁ συχνός εἰρημένος ὁσιώτατος ἄνήρ καὶ παραφυλάττειν αὐτὰ διαμεθεματίσμενος ἦτθεν ἡμᾶς καὶ δι’ ἐπιστολῆς τὴν περὶ τούτων αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν ἀπόκρισιν, ὡστε τὴν τοιαύτην αὐτῷ, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἐπιστολήν ἐπιδεικνύει τοῖς ὅσος ἐκός ἐπερωτῶν αὐτὸν περὶ τῆς εἰρημένης ζητήσεως βουλομένοις, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἀσμένως πεπράχαμεν, ὧ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τούτως ἐντεθεὶς ἐξέπλευσεν.

[546] Ἀρτίως δὲ ὁ πανευσεβὴς καὶ θεοστήρικτος ἢμῶν διεστότης κατὰ τὴν Ἐδεσσαρίων διατριβῶν πόλιν πανευσεβὴς κεραίαν ἐπούρησε πρὸς ἡμᾶς παρακελευμένην, ῥᾳ τὰς πατρικὰς ἐκεῖνας παρεκκλάμοικεν τρίσεις ἡμοῖς ἐμφανεῖς τῷ γενομένῳ, ὡς εἰρηκαί, παρὰ τοῦ ἑν ἁγίου Μηνᾶ πρὸς τὸν ἁγιώτατον Βιγίλλιαν δογματικῷ περὶ μᾶς ἐνεργείας καὶ ἐνός θελήματος λόγῳ καὶ ταύτας τῆς θεούσφοι αὐτοῦ ἀποστελώμενα γαληνότητι, ὃ δὴ καὶ πρὸς ἔργων ἡγάγωμεν, ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν τῶν ἡδὴ κεκινημένων ἔχοντες μιῆμην καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης κινήσεως ἀρέσχειν θόρυβον ἐπιστάμενοι ἀνηγάγωμεν τῇ αὐτοῦ πανευσεβείς γαληνότητι διὰ μετρίας ἡμῶν ἀναφοράς καὶ γραμμάτων πρὸς τὸν εὐκλεέστατον βασιλικὸν οικελλάριον τῶν περὶ τούτου παρ’ ἡμῶν γενομένων ἄπασιν ἐξῆς τοῦ κεφαλαίου τῆς λεπτομέρειαν, καὶ ὅσον οὐ χρή τὰ περὶ τῆς τοιαύτης χιτήσεως ἐρευνᾶν, ἀλλ’ ἐμένειν τῇ τετρυμμένῃ καὶ αὐθαγάνως παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογουμένη πατρικὴ διδασκαλία περὶ τοῦ τοιούτου χτητόματος, καὶ ὁμολογεῖν τὸν μονογενὴν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ὑπὸ κατὰ ἁλῆθειν θεόν ἀμα καὶ ἀνθρωπος, τὸν αὐτὸν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ θεία καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ ἐξ ἐνός καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου θεοῦ λόγου, καθὰ φθάσαντες ἐφημεν, πάσαν προϊείναι ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀδιαμέριτως θείαν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπινην ἐνεργειαν. τούτῳ γὰρ ἡμᾶς ὁ θεοφόρος ἐκδιδάσκει Λέων διαρρήκτη τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸν ἐνεργεῖν γὰρ ἐκατέρα μορφὴ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ὃπερ ἴδιον ἐσχήκειν ἐφ’ οἷς ἀντίγραφον πανευσεβή κελευεῖ τοῦ πανημέρου αὐτοῦ ἐδεξάμεθα κράτοις τὰ πρέποντα τῇ θεοδηγήτῳ αὐτοῦ περιήχουσαν γαληνότητι.
Finally it was decided and established that the most holy Sophronius, of whom we have spoken, should not in future start any discussion about one or two activities, but should be content with the safe and tried-and-true correct teaching of the holy Fathers, mentioned above. The oft-mentioned most holy man, then, was content with these conditions, and, when he had confirmed that he would abide by them, asked us to provide him with an answer on these matters in writing as well, so that, so to speak, he could show such a letter to those who perhaps would wish to question him about the enquiry of which we have spoken. This we did, and gladly.\(^{13}\) Then after that he left here by ship.

Recently, when our all-pious and God-strengthened master was staying in the city of Edessa, he sent an all-pious message to us, enjoining us to make excerpts from those testimonies of the Fathers contained, as he said, in the dogmatic work sent by Menas [now] among the saints to the most holy Vigilius on the question of one activity and one will, and to send them to His godly-wise Serenity. This task, indeed, we accomplished.\(^{14}\) But because we remembered what had happened previously and knew the commotion that had started as a result of such actions, we conveyed to His all-pious Serenity by means of a modest report and letter to the most illustrious imperial finance minister (sakellarios) all the finer points consecutively of what we had done regarding this chapter.\(^{15}\) [We said that] it was not necessary to examine the facts by an enquiry like that, but to remain in the tried-and-true teaching of the Fathers, which was confessed and agreed to by all on this question, and to confess that the only-begotten Son of God, who in truth is God and at the same time a human being, performs divine and human activities. And from one and the same God the Word incarnate, as we have said previously, every activity, both divine and human, proceeds without partition and without division. For this the God-bearer Leo teaches us explicitly: 'Each form effects with the cooperation of the other what it possesses as its own.'\(^{16}\) On these points we received an all-pious rescript from His most clement Authority, containing sentiments befitting His God-guided Serenity.

\(^{13}\) This lost letter is registered in Winkelmann, Der Streit, 75, nr. 38.

\(^{14}\) On this keleusis issued by the emperor Heraclius see ibid. 74, nr. 37.

\(^{15}\) On this letter see ibid. 75 6, nr. 39.

\(^{16}\) Tome to Flavian 11, 4; ACO II, 1, 1, 14, 27 8; trans. Tanner, i. *79.
Τούτων οὖν ἀπάντων ἀνωθεν οὕτω παρηκολούθηκότων εὐλογον ἂμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἐκρίναμε τῶν κατὰ μέρος μεμνημονευμένων τὴν εἴδησιν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ ἀδελφικῇ καὶ ὁμοψύχῳ μακαριώτητι παρασχεῖν διὰ τῶν ἐσταλμένων παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἱσοτύπων, καὶ προτρέπομεν τοὺς πανιέρους ύμᾶς τούτοις ἀπασιν ἐντυχεῖν καὶ τῇ προσοψῇ ύμὶν θεαρέστω καὶ πληρεστάτῃ ἀγάπῃ καὶ νῦν ἐπομένους, εἰ τί περ ἠγνος ἑλλείπον εὑρηται, τούτῳ τῇ δεδωρημένῃ ύμῖν ἐκ θεοῦ χάριτι ἀναπληρώσαι καὶ δι᾽ ὅσιων ύμῶν συλλαβῶν σὺν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ εὐκταία ῥώσει τὰ περὶ τούτων ύμῖν δοκοῦντα σημάναι.

7. Ἑπιστολὴ Ὄνωρίου πάπα Ρώμης πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν Σέργιον

Τὰ γραφέντα παρὰ τῆς υμετέρας ἀδελφότητος ἐδεξάμεθα, δι᾽ ὅν φιλονεκίας τινὰς καὶ νέας φωνῶν ζητήσεις ἐγνωμεν εἰσενεχθείσας παρὰ Σωφρόνιου τινὸς τηνικαίτα μὲν μοναχοῦ, νυνὶ δὲ, ὡς ἁκοῦμεν, ἔπισκοποῦ καθεστῶτος τῆς Ἑρωσολυμιτῶν πόλεως κατὰ Κύρου τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἀδελφοῦ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλεως προέδρου μίαν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἡσυχοὶ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἐπιστρέψασιν ἐκ τῶν αἱρέσεων κηρύξαντος. ὡς τὸς Σωφρόνιος παραγενόμενος πρὸς τὴν υμετέραν ἀδελφότητα καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην ἀποτιθέμενος μέμψιν πολυτρόπως παιδευθεὶς ἠτησε περὶ ὁν παρ᾽ ύμῶν κατηχήθη ἐγγράφως αὐτῷ σαφηνισθήναι.

Ὡς των γραμμάτων πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν Σωφρόνιον πεμβόλεστων παρ᾽ ύμῶν δεξάμενοι τὰ ἱσα καὶ ἐντυχόντες ἐπαινοῦμεν τὴν υμετέραν ἀδελφότητα μετὰ πολλής προνοίας τε καὶ ἐπισκέψεως γράφασιν, περιαρούσαν τὸ καυνὸν τῆς ὀνομασίας δυνάμενον τοῖς ἀπλουστέροις σκάνδαλον εἰσάγειν. ἡμᾶς γὰρ δέον ἐστὶ βαδίζειν ἄσσετε ἐλάβομεν, καὶ γὰρ προτρουμένου τοῦ θεοῦ παραγενόμεθα πρὸς τὸ μέτρον τῆς πίστεως, ἤντια οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀληθείας [τῷ φωτὶ] τῶ σκοινῷ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἐξέτευαν, ὁμολογοῦντες τὸν κυρίον Ἡσυχοὶ Χριστοῦ μεσίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἐνεργοῦντα
Since, then, all these events ensued in this way from the beginning, we judged it fair and at the same time necessary to communicate to Your brotherly and unanimous Beatitude the knowledge of what I have partly recorded by means of the copies which we have sent. We exhort Your All-sacredness to read all of this, and as we now too follow the God-pleasing and most full love which is in You, [we beg You] that, if there is anything which is perhaps found wanting, to complement this by the grace which has been given to You by God and by Your holy words with Your hoped-for support, and to indicate the matters which You judge right.

Document 7
Honorius, First Letter to Sergius
(CPG 9375 Suppl.)

We have received the letter from Your Brotherhood from which we ascertained that certain arguments and new inventions of vocabulary have been introduced by a certain Sophronius (who was at that time a monk, but now, as we hear, has been appointed bishop of the city of Jerusalem) against Cyrus, our brother and the leader of the church of Alexandria, who proclaimed to those who had returned from heresy one activity of our Lord Jesus Christ. This Sophronius came to Your Brotherhood, renounced this criticism, and after being taught in manifold ways, requested that the matters about which he had been instructed by You be clearly articulated to him in writing.

We have received a copy of the letter sent by You to this same Sophronius, and having read it we praise Your Brotherhood for having written with great prudence and scrutiny, excluding the new expression, which could introduce scandal to simpler people. For it is necessary that we walk as we have learned (1 Thess. 4: 1), and with God as our leader arrive at the full measure of belief (Rom. 12: 3) which the apostles of truth extended with the rope of the truth of the divine scriptures. They confessed that the Lord Jesus Christ, the mediator between God and human beings (1 Tim. 2: 5), effected

47 Text in ACO ser. sec. II, 2, 548–558, 8 (Greek); 549, 4–559, 5 (Latin). Kreuzer, Die Honoriusfrage, 32–47, gives a German translation of this document, based on his own edition of the Greek.

48 On this letter see Winkelmann, Der Streit, 75, nr. 38, and cf. document 6, above.
τὰ θεία μεσιτευόνσα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς ἐνωθείσης αὐτῶ τῶν θεῶν λόγω καθ’ ὑπόστασιν καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἀφράστως καὶ [μονογενῶς] <μοναδικῶς> προσηλθείσης τῆς σαρκὸς ἀδιαρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀσυγχύτως τελείας <α> τῆς θεότητος, καὶ ο ἐκλάμψας ἐν σαρκὶ τοῖς θαύμασι τελεία τεθέντι, αὐτός ἔστιν ὁ καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς τὰς διαθέσεις τοῖς ὄνειδισμοῖς τοῦ πάθους ἐνεργήσας, τέλειος θεὸς καὶ ἀνθρωπός, εἰς μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἑκατέραις ταῖς φύσεις, λόγος σάρξ γενόμενος καὶ ἐνώθησεν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτὸς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου καταβάς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς, [550] καθὼς γέγραπται, σταυρωθεὶς ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης, ὁπόταν ὠμολόγηται τὴν θεότητα μηδαμῶς δύνασθαι τίνα ὑπομείναι ἀνθρώπινα πάθη, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου προσελήφθη ἡ σάρξ, δι’ ἑαυτῆς γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις οὕτως εἴπετο: οὔθεις ἀναβεβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ δηλαδὴ παρεδόθη μισθός ὑπὸ τὴν θεότητα μηδαμῶς δύνασθαι τίνα ὑπομείναι ἀνθρώπινα πάθη, καὶ [μονογενῶς] <μοναδικῶς>, ὃς διακεκριμένος καὶ ἀσυγχύτως οὕτως καὶ ἀδιαρέτως δόξῃ ἐνοῦσαι, ὡς ἀναμφίλεκτος θαυμαστῶς λόγῳ νοηθεὶς μενοῦσών τῶν διαφόρων ἑκατέρων φύσεων ἐνοῦσαι. ὥστε ὁ ἀπόστολος συνάδων πρὸς Κορινθίους εἴπε: σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο, οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο τῶν καταργουμένων ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ ἀποκεκριμένην, ἵνα προώρισαν ὁ θεὸς εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων, ἵνα οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο ἔγνω <κεύν>: εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν. ὡς ὁ δὴ δηλαδὴ θεότης οὐδὲ σταυροῦθαι ἦδοντο οὐδὲ παθῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πεῖραν λαμβάνειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀφράστου συνάφειαν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης καὶ θείας φύσεως διὰ τοῦτο κατ’ ἀμφότερα καὶ θεὸς λέγεται παθεῖν καὶ ἡ ἀνθρωπότης ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατελθηθήναι μετὰ τῆς θεότητος. οὖν καὶ ἐν θέλημα ὀμολογοῦμεν τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐπειδὴ προδῆλως ἐκ τῆς
divine acts with the assistance of the humanity hypostatically united to the same God the Word; and [that] the same one effected human acts in an ineffable and unique manner once the incarnation had taken place, without division, without change, without confusion,\textsuperscript{49} perfect in the Godhead. The one who in the flesh was radiant through the miracles [effected through] his perfect Godhead is the same one who effected the dispositions of the flesh in the reproaches of the Passion. Perfect God and human being, he is \textit{the one mediator between God and human beings} (1 Tim. 2: 5) in both natures. \textit{The Word who became flesh and dwelt among us} (John 1: 14), the same Son of Man who came down from heaven (cf. John 3: 13). One and the same, as is written, is the crucified \textit{Lord of glory} (1 Cor. 2: 8), while it is confessed that the Godhead is in no way capable of undergoing any human passions. The flesh was assumed not from heaven but from the holy Theotokos. For the truth in the Gospels spoke on its own behalf as follows: \textit{No one has ascended into heaven except the one who descended from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven} (John 3: 13), obviously teaching us that the passible flesh was united to the Godhead in an ineffable and unique manner, with the result that it is united to glory with differentiation and without confusion or division in such a way that it is unambiguously understood to be united in a wondrous manner while the different natures remain. In agreeing with this the apostle said to the Corinthians: \textit{Among the mature we speak wisdom, but it is a wisdom that is not of this age, nor of the rulers of this age, who are rendered useless. But we speak the wisdom of God hidden in mystery, which God decreed before the ages for our glorification. None of the rulers of this age understood this, for, if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory} (1 Cor. 2: 6–8). Of course, the Godhead could neither be crucified nor have the experience of human suffering, but, through the ineffable conjunction\textsuperscript{50} of the human and divine nature, one can consequently make both statements: that God is said to suffer, and that the humanity \textit{came down from heaven} (John 6: 41) with the Godhead. It follows too that we confess one will of the Lord Jesus Christ, since manifestly our nature was assumed by the Godhead,

\textsuperscript{49} The terminology of the Chalcedonian definition of faith is used here.

\textsuperscript{50} Greek \textit{συνάφεια}, a word more usually associated with the Nestorian position, is an editorial supplement from the Latin translation.
θεότητος προσελήφθη ἡ ἠμετέρα φύσις, οὐχ ἀμαρτία ἐν ἐκείνη
Δηλαδή ἡ φύσις ἡ πρὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας κτισθείσα, οὐχ ἢτις μετὰ τὴν
παράβασιν ἔφθαρη. Χριστὸς γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν ἁμοιόματι σαρκὸς
ἀμαρτίας παραγενόμενος τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἀφείλατο τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ
ἐκ τοῦ πλημώματος αὐτοῦ ἤμεισα πάντες ἐλάβομεν, καὶ μορφὴν
dούλου λαβόν ἐν σχήματι εὐρέθη ὡς ἀνθρώπος.

Επειδὴ γὰρ χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας συνελήφθη ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, διὰ
τοῦτο καὶ χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας ἐστὶν ὁ τόκος ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἀχαίνου
παρθένου καὶ θεότοκου <οὐδεμιᾶς> μετασχῶν πείρας τῆς ἀμαρ-
τησάσθες φύσεως. τὸ γὰρ τῆς σαρκὸς ὅνομα κατὰ δύο τρόπους διὰ
tῶν θείων λογίων ἐπὶ [552] καλῶ καὶ ἐπὶ κακῷ ἐγνωμεν λαμβάν-
εθα, καθὼς γέγραπται· οὐ μὴ καταμείη τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐν τοῖς
ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰώνα, διότι εἰσι σάρξ, καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος-
σάρξ καὶ αἵμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι, καὶ πάλιν τῷ νῦ
δουλεύω τῷ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ τῷ νῦν τῆς ἀμαρτίας
tεθωρᾷ δὲ ἑτέρον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι μου ἀντίστρατευμένον τῷ
νῦν τοῦ νῦν μου καὶ αἰχμαλωσίαν με <ἐν> τῷ νῦν τῆς
ἀμαρτίας, ὡς ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι μου. καὶ πολλὰ τουατα ἐπὶ κακῷ
ἀπολύθων εἰσθήνοι λεγοῦσι τα καὶ λέγοσθα, ἐπὶ ἀγαθῷ δὲ οὕτως
Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· ἐλεύθερα ἑτάποσα σάρξ ἐν ἕρωμα-
αλῇ καὶ προσκυνήσουν ἐνώπιον μου, καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰωβ· ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ
mου ὑθομοι τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ ἄλλης ὅλαι πάσα σάρξ τῷ σωτηρίῳ
τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἄλλα διάφορα.

Οὗ προσελήφθη οὖν, καθὼς εἰρήκαμεν, ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡ
ἀμαρτήσασα φύσις, ἡ ἀντιστρατευμένη τῷ νῦν τοῦ νῦν, ἀλλ’
ἐλθε εστάθησαι καὶ σώσαι εἰς τὸ ἀπολύματος, τούτεστι τὴν ἀμαρτήσασαν
τοῦ ἀνθρωπεύου γένους φύσιν. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ νόμος τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡ
βέλημα διάθεσις ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς ἐν γέγονεν ἐν τῷ σωτῆρι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ
ὑπὲρ νόμον ἀνθρωπίνης [φύσεως] <αἰρέσεως> ἐτέχθη, καὶ γὰρ
γέγραπται· οὐκ ἦλθεν ποιήσαι τὸ βέλημα μου, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντος
με πατρός, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἔγαλθεν, ἀλλ’ ὅπερ ποίεσις, πάτερ καὶ
ἄλλα τοιούτου ποιήσῃ, οὐκ εἰσὶ ταῦτα διαφόρους βέληματος, ἀλλὰ ἡ
τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς προσληφθείσης. ταῦτα γὰρ δὲ
ἡμᾶς ἐλέθη, ὡς δέδωκε παρὰ δεινομά, ἢν τοὺς ἱγνώσαν αὐτοῖς
ἐξωμεθα, ὁ τῆς εὐδοκείας διδάσκαλος τοὺς μαθητὰς διδάσκαλοι,
ἵνα μὴ τῷ ἱδρυν ἱκανός ἤμον, ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ μάλλον ἐν πάσι
προτιμήσῃ θελήμα. Ὁδώ τοῖς βασιλικῆς πορευόμενοι δεξία καὶ ἀριστερὰ τῶν
θηρευτῶν τὰς περικειμένας παγίδας ἐκφεύγοντες πρὸς λίθον τῶν
there being no sin in it (cf. Heb. 4: 15)—the nature, of course, created before sin, not the one that was corrupted after the transgression [sc. of Adam]. For Christ the Lord, who came in the likeness of sinful flesh (Heb. 4: 15), removed sin from the world (John 1: 29), and from his fullness all of us have received (John 1: 16). Taking the form of a servant, he was found in the likeness of a human being (Phil. 2: 7).

For since he was conceived without sin from the Holy Spirit, on this account he was also born without sin (Heb. 4: 15) from the holy, undefiled Virgin and Theotokos, and did not partake at all in the experience of our nature that sinned. We know that the word ‘flesh’ is used by the divine sayings in two ways, in a good and bad sense, as it is written: My spirit will not abide forever among these human beings, because they are flesh (Gen. 6: 3). And the apostle [said]: Flesh and blood will not inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 15: 50). And again: In my mind I serve the law of God, but in my flesh, the law of sin. I see in my limbs another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which is in my limbs (Rom. 7: 25, 23). Many passages of this kind are usually construed and cited without qualification in a bad sense. In a good sense Isaiah the prophet spoke as follows: All flesh will come to Jerusalem and will worship before me (Isa. 66: 23). And in Job: In my flesh I shall see God (Job 19: 26). And elsewhere: All flesh will see the salvation of God (Luke 3: 6). And [there are] various other passages.

As we have said, it was not then the sinful nature which is at war with the law of the mind (Rom. 7: 23) that was assumed by the Saviour. Rather he came to seek and save the lost (Luke 19: 10), that is, the sinful nature of the human race. Another law, or a different or contrary will, was not in the limbs (Rom. 7: 23) of the Saviour; since he was born above the law of the human [condition]. For although it is written: I did not come to do my will, but that of the Father who sent me (John 6: 38), and Not as I will, but as you will, Father (Matt. 26: 39), and there are other passages of this kind, these are not expressions of a different will, but of the economy of the humanity which he assumed. These words are said on our account, to whom is given an example so that we may follow in his footsteps (1 Pet. 2: 21). The teacher of pious belief teaches the disciples so that each of us may prefer not our own will, but rather the will of the Lord in all things.

As we travel on the royal highway (Num. 20: 17), then, avoiding to the right and left the hunters’ traps that lie spread, let us not dash

51 Here the translation diverges from what is suggested by the punctuation in Riedinger’s text.
ήμετερον μὴ προσκρούσωμεν πόδα, τοῖς Ἰδομαιοίς, τουτέστι τοῖς γηνύοις <και> αἱρετικοῖς τὰ οἰκεῖα καταλληγάνουτες, μήτε εἰς ἔχνοις ποδοὺς γῆς, τουτέστιν εἰς τὴν φαύλην αὐτῶν διδασκαλίαν, παντὶ τρόπῳ αἱ διάνοια ζῆσαν πρὸς τοὺς πατρίδοις ὅρους ταῖς τρίβοις [554] τῶν ἄγουμένων ἦμων βαδίζοντες.

Καὶ κἂν εἰ τίνα ψελλίζοντες, ἣν οὕτως εἰπὼμεν, ἐπεχείρησαν προφέρουντες ἐκθέασθαι τυποῦντες αὐτοὺς ἐν σχῆματι [διδασκάλων] <τρεφότων>, ὡς δυνηθῶσι τὰς διανοίας [τυπώσαι] <διδασκάλων> τῶν ἄκροστῶν. οὐ χρὴ ταῦτα πρὸς δόγματα ἐκκλησιαστικὰ μεταστρέψειν, ἀπὸ οὖδὲ σύνοδοι κατεξέτασαν οὖδὲ αὐθεντίᾳ κανονικαὶ ἐδοξασαν σαφῆνες, ἣν μίαν ἡ δύο ἐνεργείας τις τολμήσῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κηρύξαι, ὡς οὐδὲ εὐαγγελικὰ οὖδὲ ἀποστολικὰ γράμματα οὖδὲ συνοδικαὶ κρίσεις <περὶ τοῦτων γενόμεναι> φαίνονται ὁρίσασαι, εἰ μὴ <ἴσωσ>, ὡς προείπομεν, τινές ψελλίζοντες τίνα ἐδίδαξαν συγκαταβαίνοντες πρὸς τὸ τυποῦν τὰς διανοίας καὶ ἐννοίας τῶν ἐπὶ νηπιαίων, ἀτιμά πρὸς τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ δόγματα φέρεσθαι οὐκ ὀφείλει, ἀπὸ εἰς ἐκαστὸς ἐν τῷ ἱδίῳ λογισμῷ πλημμυρῶν ὡς οἰκεῖαν γνώμην προφέρει.

Ὅτι γὰρ ὁ κύριος ήμών Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς καὶ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἔστιν ἐνεργῶν τὰ θεία καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, τελείως αἱ θείαι γραφαὶ καὶ φανερῶς ἀποδεικνύουσαι. πότερον δὲ διὰ τὰ ἔργα τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος μία ἡ δύο ἐνεργείαι ὡφελον παραγόμεναι λέγεσθαι ἡ νοεῖσθαι, ταῦτα πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνήκειν οὐκ ὡφελον, ἀλλὰ καταλληγόμενοι ταῦτα τοῖς γραμματικοῖς ἤγουν τεχνογράφοις, οὔτως εἰσώσας τοῖς παιδίν ἐν τῷ παραγωγῶς ποιεῖν τὰ ἐφευρισκόμενα παρ' αὐτοῖς ὁνόματα πιπράσκειν. ἤμεις γὰρ οὐ καὶ μὲν ἐνεργεῖαν ἡ δύο τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἁγιόν πνεύμα διὰ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν παρελάβομεν, ἀλλὰ πολυτρόπως ἐγνωμεν αὐτῶν ἐνεργοῦντα· γέγραπται γὰρ ὡς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ πνεύμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὕτως οὐκ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ. καὶ πάλιν· οὐδεὶς δύναται λέγειν κύριον Ἰησοῦν εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίων. διαίρεσεις δὲ γιασμάτων εἰσί, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεύμα·
our foot against a stone (Ps. 91: 12), leaving the Idumeans,\(^{52}\) that is the earthly ones and the heretics, to their own business. May our thoughts not come into contact in any way with the footstep of earth, that is, with their foul teaching, so that we shall be able to reach the landmarks of the fathers (Prov. 22: 28) as we walk in the footsteps of our guides.

Although they [sc. some leaders] stammered over some words, so to say, they tried to bring forward [ideas] and explain them, modelling themselves in the fashion of nurturers, so that they might be able to teach the minds of their listeners. It is not necessary to change into church teachings those utterances which not even synods ordained nor genuine canons saw fit to clarify, such that one could dare to proclaim one or two activities in the Lord Jesus Christ, which not even the Gospels or apostolic writings or the decisions of synods which were held on the matter appear to have defined. Although perhaps, as we said before, by stammering over some words certain people taught something, by way of accommodation to form the minds and thoughts of those who were still beginners, these utterances which one individual, filled with his own reasoning, put forward as a personal opinion ought not to be adduced as church teachings.

That our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son and Word of God through whom all things came into being (John 1: 3), is one and the same in effecting divine and human actions, the divine scriptures demonstrate perfectly and clearly. But whether on account of the works of the Godhead and the humanity it was necessary for the introduction of one or two activities to be spoken of or thought—this need not have been referred to us. Rather we leave these matters to the grammarians or the wordsmiths, whose custom it is to sell their invented expressions to boys for making spin-offs.\(^{53}\) We have not received from the holy scriptures that the Lord Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit [are] one or two activities, but we have learned that he acted in manifold ways. For it is written: Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him (Rom. 8: 9), and again: No one can call Jesus Lord except by the Holy Spirit. There are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord;

\(^{52}\) The Idumeans, or Edomites, inhabitants of southern Judaea who were not regarded as fully Jewish, refused Moses and the Israelites passage through their country and were consequently rejected by Israel (Num. 20: 14– 21). I am indebted to Jeff New for pointing out this connection to me.

\(^{53}\) This is an allusion to rhetorical exercises in the schools of grammarians.
καὶ διαιρέσεις διακομιῶν εἰσιν, ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ κύριος· καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργειῶν εἰσιν, ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ θεὸς, ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. ἐὰν γὰρ αἱ διαιρέσεις τῶν ἐνεργειῶν πολλαί εἰσι, καὶ ταῦτα πάσας ὁ θεὸς ἐν πάσι τοῖς μέλεσι τοῦ πεπληρωμένου σώματος ἐνεργεῖ, πόσω μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ τῷ κυρίῳ ταῦτα δύνανται πληρέστατα ἀρμοσθῆναι, ὅπως καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐν εἴῃ τελειον, ἵνα δηλαδὴ συνδράμη, ὡς γέγραπται, εἰς ἄνδρα τελειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ [556] πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀλλοις, τοῦτοσιν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι τοῖς ἰδίοις, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολυτρόπως ἐνεργεῖ, ἐν ὧν ἤσσι καὶ κυνόνται καὶ εἰσὶ, πόσω μᾶλλον δι’ ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ μεσίτου θεοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπων πληρέστατα καὶ τελειοτητα καὶ πολυτρόπως καὶ ἁφράστως ἡμᾶς δέον ἐστίν ὁμολογεῖν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ἐκατέρας φύσεως αὐτῶν ἐνεργεῖν.


[558] Ταῦτα μεθ’ ἡμῶν ἡ ἀδελφότητι ἡ ὑμετέρα κηρύξει, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ταῦτα μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁμοφύλως κηρύσσομεν προτρέποντες ἡμᾶς, ἵνα τὴν εἰσαχθείσαν προσηγοριῶν τῆς νέας φωνῆς τῆς μιᾶς ἡ τῶν δύο ἐνεργειῶν ἐκφεύγοντες ἐνα μεθ’ ἡμῶν τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ὕδω τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος, θεοὺ ἀληθινον ἐν δύο φύσειν
and there are varieties of activities, but the same God, who effects everything in everyone (1 Cor. 12: 3–6). If the varieties of activities are many, and God effects all of them in all the limbs of the full body, how much more can this be applied more fully to Christ the Lord, our head, so that both head and body are one perfect thing, in order obviously to meet, as is written, in a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ (Eph. 4: 13). For if in others, that is, in his own limbs (Rom. 7: 5), the Spirit of Christ, in whom they live and move and have their being (Acts 17: 28), acts in manifold ways, how much more must we confess that, through the mediator between God and human beings (1 Tim. 2: 5) himself, he effects things most fully and most perfectly and in manifold ways and ineffably through the cooperation of each of his natures?

We must think and hope in accordance with the decrees of the divine sayings, and of course reject those which are recognized by their novelty of expression as causing scandal to the holy churches of God, lest infants (cf. Heb. 5: 13), when they stumble against the expression ‘two natures’, may consider that we uphold the madness of Nestorius; or, if indeed on the other hand, we decide that one activity should be confessed in the Lord Jesus Christ, we be considered by stupid ears to be confessing the senseless folly of the followers of Eutyches; being on our guard lest, when the vain and empty weapons of these heresies have been burnt up, their ashes renew the rekindled torches of incendiary questions; confessing in simplicity and truth that our Lord Jesus Christ, one and the same, acts in his divine and human nature. It is better if we take [this position], so that the vain people who weigh up the natures, the lazy, busybody philosophers, inflated and swollen, may rattle at us with their frog cries, than that the Christian peoples who are simpler and poor in spirit (Matt. 5: 7) possibly remain hungry. No one will deceive the disciples of the fishermen with philosophy and empty deceit (Col. 2: 8), the disciples who follow their teaching. For every supposition that is rocky and turbulent with cunning argumentation has been crushed in their nets.

Your Brotherhood will proclaim this with us, just as we too unanimously proclaim it with You, urging You to avoid the introduced expression of the new vocabulary ‘one or two activities’, and to proclaim with us in orthodox faith and catholic unity the one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, true God (1 John 5: 20),

34 I read αὐτῶν here instead of Riedinger’s αὐτῶν.
ἐνεργούντα τὰ τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ὀρθοδόξῳ πίστει καὶ ἐνότητι καθολικῆ κηρύξετε.

Ἡ ύπογραφή
Ὁ θεός σε ἐρρωμένον φυλάξαι, ἀγαπητέ καὶ ἀγιώτατε ἅδελφε.

8. Epistula secunda Honorii papa ad Sergium Constantinopolitanum

Τῷ ἀγαπητῷ ἅδελφῷ Σεργίῳ Ὀνώριος.

ἡ ἡ ἀρχή. Τὰ γραφέντα παρὰ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ ἡμῶν τέκνου Σηρίκου τοῦ διακόνου. Ἐχει δὲ ἡ αὐτὴ ἐπιστολὴ μετὰ τινὰ ὀυτῶς.

[622] ... οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ πρὸς Κύριον τὸν ἅδελφον ἡμῶν, τὸν τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας πόλεως πρόεδρον, εἰς τὸ ἀνατραπῆναι τὴν ἐσωυμίαν τῆς νέας ἐφευρέσεως τῆς μιᾶς ἡ τῶν δύο ἐνεργείων, ὁς μὴ ὀφείλειν τῷ λαμπρῷ κηρύματι τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίων τὴν ἀχλῶν τῶν συνεσκιασμένων φιλονεικῶν περιχεθῆναι ἤγον περιρραίνοσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐκβληθῆναι δηλαδὴ τὴν προσηγορίαν τῆς νεωτεριστει σαφοπείνος μιᾶς ἡ διπλῆς ἐνεργείας ἀπὸ τοῦ κηρύματος τῆς πίστεως. οἱ γὰρ ταῦτα λέγοντες, τί ἔτερον ὑπονοοῦσιν ἡ καθ’ ὀμοιότητα τῆς προσηγορίας τῆς μιᾶς ἡ τῶν δύο φύσεων Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ὀυτῶς καὶ μίαν ἡ δύο ἐνεργείας, περὶ οὐ λαμπρῶς ἡ θεία γραφὴ διαγορεύει μιᾶς δὲ ἐνεργείας ἡ δύο εἶναι ἡ γεγονέναι τῷ μεσίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον Ἔσσουν Χριστὸν νοεῖν ἡ προφερεῖν πάνω μάταιον.

Ἐχεὶ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἡ αὕτη ἐπιστολὴ ὀυτῶς:

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τῇ ύμετέρᾳ ἀγιωτάτῃ ἅδελφότητι συνείδομεν διὰ τῶν παρόντων γραμμάτων κατάδηλα ποιήσασθαι πρὸς καταρτίσμον τε καὶ γενῶσιν τῶν ἀμφιβαλλόντων, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ὃςον πρὸς τὸ
who in two natures effects the works of the Godhead and of the humanity.

The Signature
May God preserve You in good health, dear and most holy Brother.

Document 8

Honorius, Second Letter to Sergius
(CPG 9377 Suppl.)

To our beloved brother Sergius, Honorius [sends greetings].

This is the beginning [of the letter]: The letter was composed by our beloved child, the deacon Sericus. After some text, the same letter reads as follows:

[A letter was sent], moreover, to Cyrus our brother, the leader of the city of Alexandria, so that he would reject the wording of the new invention of one or two activities, since the mist of shadowy arguments ought not to be spread around or poured around the luminous proclamation of the churches of God. On the contrary, the mention of the newly introduced term ‘one or double activity’ should of course be excluded from the proclamation of the faith. For what else do those who speak of these things suppose but that, according to the similarity of the term ‘the one or the two natures’ of Christ our God, so too are there ‘one or two activities’, concerning which divine scripture declares luminously? To think or allege that the mediator between God and human beings (1 Tim. 2: 5), Jesus Christ the Lord, is or was of one or two activities is completely vain.

Towards the end the same letter reads as follows:

We have resolved through the present letter to make these matters plain to Your all-holy Brotherhood, in order to remedy and understand the matters under dispute. For the rest, as far as it

---

δύμα το ἐκκλησιαστικὸν συντείνει, καὶ τίνα τε ὀφείλομεν κρατεῖν ἢγουν κηρύττειν διὰ τὴν ἀπλότητα τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ εἰς τὸ περιηγεῖν ταῖς δυσγερέις περιόδους τῶν ζητήσεων, ὥσ ἀνωτέρω εἴπομεν, οὐδὲ μίαν οὐδὲ δύο ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ τοῦ μεσίτου θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀρίζειν, ἀλλ’ ἐκατέρας τὰς φύσεις ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ Χριστῷ τῇ φυσικῇ ἐνότητι ἡμομέναι μετά τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἐνεργούσας καὶ πρακτικὰς ὁμολογεῖ τὸ ὀφείλομεν, καὶ τὴν μὲν θείαν ἐνεργούσαν ἡ εἰς τὸν θεοῦ, τὴν δὲ ἀνθρωπίνην ἀποτελοῦσαν τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, οὐ διηρημένως οὐδὲ συγκεκριμένως ἢ τραπεῖσαν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ φύσιν εἰς ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν τραπείσαν εἰς θεότητα ἐκδιδάσκοντες, ἀλλὰ τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν φύσεων ἀκεραίας ὁμολογούντες: εἰς γὰρ καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἔστι ταπεινὸς καὶ ἰψηλός, ἰσος τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἄττων τοῦ πατρός, αὐτὸς ὁ πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων τεχθεὶς ἐν χρόνῳ ἐγένετο, δι’ οὗ οἱ αἰῶνες ἐγένοντο, ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι, καὶ ὁ νόμον δεδοκιμάσθη κένον ὑπὸ νόμου, ὡς [624] τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοραση- ταυ, αὐτὸς ἐσπαυρώθη, αὐτὸς τὸ χειρόγραφον ὅπερ ἢν καθ’ ἦμῶν καταργῶν, ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ ἐκ τῶν ἁρχῶν καὶ τῶν ἱεροσοφίων ἐθραμμένων.

Ἐξαιροῦται οὖν, ὅσο εἴπομεν, τὸ σκάνδαλον τῆς νέας ἐφευρέσεως, οὐ δεν ἡμᾶς ἀρίζειν ἢ κηρύττειν μιᾶς ἢ δύο ἐνεργείας, ἀλλ’ ἀντὶ μιᾶς, ἢν τινες λέγουσιν ἐνεργείαν, δεν ἡμῶς τὸν ἐνα ἐνεργοῦντα Χριστὸν τὸν κύριον ἐν ἑκατέρας ταῖς φύσεις ἀληθεῖς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν δύο ἐνεργείων ἐξαιρεθείσης τῆς προσηγορίας τῆς διπλῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτὰς μᾶλλον τὰς δύο φύσεις μεθ’ ἦμων κηρύ- χως, τούτου τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς σαρκός τῆς προσηγορίας, ἐν τῷ ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ μονογενοῦς νικό τοῦ πατρός ἀναγχύτος, ἀδιατέτοιο, ἀπροσπόστως ἐνεργούσας τὰ ἰδία.

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τῇ μακραποτάτῃ ἦμῶν ἀδελφότητι συνεδόμεμεν κατάδηλα ποιήσατι, ὡσ τῇ προβείει τῆς μιᾶς ὁμολογίας δεῖξωμεν ὁμοφυλοχάτοις ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἦμῶν ἁγιότητι, δηλαδὴ συμφωνοῦμεν ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι τῇ ἱση διδαχῇ τῆς πίστεως γράφοντες.
affects the teaching of the church and what we ought to hold, or indeed to proclaim on account of the simplicity of human beings, and in order to destroy the vexatious spreading of the questions, as we said above, we are not obliged to define either one or two activities in *the mediator between God and human beings* (1 Tim. 2: 5), but to confess that both natures are united in the one Christ in the natural union, each active and effective with the cooperation\(^{56}\) of the other. We teach that the divine [nature] effects what belongs to God, while the human [nature] accomplishes what belongs to the flesh, without division and without confusion or changing the nature of God\(^{57}\) into a human being, or changing the human nature into Godhead, but we confess the uncontaminated differences of the natures. For one and the same is he who is lowly and lofty, equal to the Father (cf. John 10: 30) and less than the Father (cf. John 14: 28). The same one who was born before the ages came to be in time; the one through whom the ages came into being, himself came to be in the age. And the one who gave the law came to be *under the law so that he might redeem those who were under the law* (Gal. 4: 4–5). The same one was crucified, the same one, *cancelling the bond which was against us, triumphed on the cross over the powers and authorities* (Col. 2: 14–15).

Excluding, therefore, as we have said, the stumbling-block of the new invention, we must not define or proclaim one or two activities, but instead of one activity which some speak of, we must confess that the one Christ the Lord truly acts in both natures. And instead of two activities, once the expression ‘the double activity’ is excluded, they will proclaim with us rather these two natures, that is, of the Godhead and of the assumed flesh in the one person of the only-begotten Son of the Father; without confusion, without separation, without change, each effecting what is its own.\(^{58}\)

We have resolved to make these matters clear to Your most blessed Brotherhood, so that by the publication of the one confession we may show ourselves to be of the same mind as Your Holiness, that is, by writing with one voice in the one Spirit, in the identical teaching of the faith.\(^{59}\)

\(^{56}\) This is again the wording of Leo’s *Tome*.

\(^{57}\) This is the terminology of Chalcedon.

\(^{58}\) A combination of Chalcedonian and Leonine terminology.

\(^{59}\) Again I have departed from Riedinger’s punctuation here.
Έτι μήν καὶ τοῖς κοινοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἡμῶν Κύρῳ καὶ Σωφρόνιῳ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις, ἵνα μὴ τῇ νεαρᾷ φωνῇ, τουτέστι τῇ προσηγορίᾳ τῆς μᾶς ἡ διπλῆς ἐνεργείας, ἐνίστασθαι ἡ ἐπιμένειν φανῶσιν, ἀλλὰ περιαρεθείσης τῆς προσηγορίας τῆς τοιουτοῦρπον νέας φωνῆς τῶν ἐνα Χριστοῦ κόριον μεθ’ ἡμῶν κηρύξωσιν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεία καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα εἰς ἐκάτερας ταῖς φύσεσιν, καὶ εἰ τὰ μάλιστα τούτους, οὓς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ προλέχθηκε ἀδελφὸς καὶ συνεπίσκοπος ἡμῶν Σωφρόνιος ἀπέστειλε, παρεσκευάσαμεν, ἵνα μὴ δύο ἐνεργείων ἑπωμυμίαν τοῦ λοιποῦ κηρύττειν ἐπιμεῖνην, ὅπερ καὶ πάντως ἐπηγ- γείλαντο τὸν προλέχθεντα ἀνδρὰ μέλλειν ποιεῖν, εἶτε Κύρος ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν καὶ συνεπίσκοπος ἀπὸ τῆς προσηγορίας τοῦ λέγειν μίαν ἐνεργείαν ἀποστῆ.

9. Ἐκθεσὶς Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως

Πιστεύομεν εἰς πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἁγίον πνεῦμα, τριάδα ὅμο- ούσιον, μίαν θεότητα ήτοι φύσιν καὶ οὐσίαν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ ἔξουσίαν ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσειν ἤγουν προσώπωσι, γνωρίζοντες ἑκάστης ὑποστάσεως τὴν ἰδιότητα, μονάδα ἐν τριάδι καὶ τριάδα ἐν μονάδι, μονάδα μὲν κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας ἢτοι θεότητος λόγον, τριάδα δὲ κατὰ τὰς ὑποστάσεις ήτοι πρόσωπα. οὕτε γὰρ τὸ ἐν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν φρονοῦντες τῆς τῶν προσώπων διαφοράς ἐξιστάμεθα, οὕτε τριάδα προσώπων πιστεύοντες τὴν μίαν ἄθετομεν θεότητα. εἰς θεὸν, εἰς θεὸν οὐκ, εἰς θεὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον, εἰς τὰ τρία θεὸν τῷ ταύτῳ καὶ ἀπαραλλάκτῳ τῆς θεότητος, ἢ γὰρ τῶν προσώπων διαφορὰ θεότητος ἡ οὐσία οὐκ εἰσάγει διαίρεσιν. μίαν τοῖς προβεβομεν ἰδιότητα, τὰς ἰδιότητας ἀνυχύτως φυλάττοντες καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἐν πρόσωπον τριώμενον συναλείφοντες τὰ τρία κατὰ Σαββέλλιον, οὐδὲ εἰς τρεῖς οὐσίας τὴν μίαν θεότητα διαιροῦντες ἢ ἀλλοτριοῦντες τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας τὸν υἱὸν ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον κατὰ τὴν Ἀρείου μανίαν. ἢ γὰρ ἐν τρισὶν ἡ θεότητι, ὡς φησιν ὁ μέγας ἐν θεολογίᾳ Γρηγόριος, 'καὶ τὰ τρία ἐν, τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ θεότης, ἢ τὸ γε ἀληθεστερον εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἡ θεότης'. 
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We wrote also to our common brothers, the bishops Cyrus and Sophronius, that they should not appear to side with or adhere to the recent term, that is, the expression of one or a double activity, but, once the expression of the new term has been excluded—of whatever kind—they should proclaim with us one Christ and Lord, who effects divine and human acts in both natures. We have, however, especially instructed those whom our previously mentioned brother and fellow-bishop Sophronius sent to us, lest he continue to proclaim the expression ‘two activities’ in the future, which they firmly promised the said man would do,⁶⁰ if Cyrus, our brother and fellow bishop, distanced himself from the expression ‘one activity’.

Document 9

Ekthesis of the emperor Heraclius
(CPG 7607 Suppl.)⁶¹

We believe in Father and Son and Holy Spirit, consubstantial Trinity, one Godhead or nature and essence and power and authority, in three hypostases or persons, which disclose the particularity of each hypostasis, unity in trinity and trinity in unity, according to the principle of the essence or Godhead, a trinity according to the hypostases or persons. For neither in thinking of the oneness according to the essence do we abandon the differences of the persons, nor in believing in a trinity of persons do we deny the one Godhead. The Father is one God, the Son is one God, the Holy Spirit is one God, the three are one God in the same (1 Cor. 8: 6) and unalterable [manner] of the Godhead, for the difference in the persons does not introduce a division of Godhead or essence. Hence we uphold one Godhead, while guarding the particularities without confusion. Neither do we coalesce the three into one person with three names, like Sabellius, nor do we divide the one Godhead into three essences, or alienate the Son or the Holy Spirit from the Father’s essence, as in Arius’ madness. ‘For the Godhead is one in three,’ as Gregory, the great theologian, says, ‘and the three are one, those in which is the Godhead, or—to speak more truly—which are the Godhead.”⁶²

⁶⁰ i.e. they promised that Sophronius would not continue to proclaim the expression ‘two activities’.
⁶¹ Text in ACO sec. sec. I, 156, 20–162, 12.
⁶² Gregory Nazianzen, Or. 39, 11; SC 358, 172, 19–21.
[158] Ὄμολογούμεν δὲ τὸν ἐνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, τὸν μονογενὴ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν θεὸν λόγον, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, τὸ φῶς ἐκ τοῦ φωτός, τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καταξιώσαι ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ γαστρὶ τῆς παναγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας ἐνοικήσαι, καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐνώσαντα σάρκα ἐαυτῷ, καθ' ὑπόστασιν ψυχὴν ἐκουσάν λογικὴν τε καὶ νοημάτων, γεννηθήσαντες ἐξ αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸν ἀεὶ τέλειον θεὸν τὸν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι καὶ τέτειλον ἄνθρωπον ἁσυγχύτως καὶ ἀδιαρέτως, ὀμοσύσιον τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὀμοσύσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἄνθρωπότητα, καὶ κατὰ πάντα ὀμοιοὶ ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.

Ὄθεν καὶ δύο γεννήσεις τοῦ αὐτοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ λόγου ὁμολογούμεν, τὴν μὲν πρὸ αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀχρόνως καὶ ἁσωμάτως, τὴν δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἁχράντου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας μετὰ τῆς νοερῶς ἐξυγεσκεμένης σαρκός. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ πανύμνητον ἀειπαρθένον Μαρίαν κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀληθείαν θεοτόκον κηρύττομεν, οὐχ ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι ἐξ αὐτῆς λαβώντος, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν σαρκωθέντος ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκούσιον πάθος σαρκὶ καταδεξαμένου.

Σύνθεσιν δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν δοξάζομεν, τῇ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἀκολουθοῦντες διδασκαλία. ἐπὶ γάρ τοῦ κατ' Χριστὸν μυστηρίου ἡ κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἐνωσις καὶ τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν ἀποβάλλεται, καὶ φυλάττει μὲν ἐκατέρας φύσεως τὴν ἰδιότητα, μίαν δὲ ὑπόστασιν καὶ ἐν πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καὶ μετὰ τῆς νοερῶς ἐξυγεσκεμένης αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς δεικνύσων. οὐ τετάρτῳ ἡμῖν ἀντὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος εἰσαγομένης, μη γένοιτο, οὐτε γάρ τετάρτου προσώπου προσβήκῃν ἡ ἁγία τριάς ἐδέξατο, καὶ σαρκωθέντος τοῦ ἐνὸς ταύτης θεοῦ λόγου. οὔτε ἄλλος μὲν ἡ ὁ θαυματουργῶν ὃς
We confess that one of the holy Trinity, the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, who was begotten from the Father before all the ages, light from light, the splendour of glory, the stamp of the Father’s hypostasis (Heb. 1: 3), through whom all things came into being (John 1:3); who in the last days (Heb. 1:2) for us and for our salvation descended from heaven, deigned to sojourn in the undefiled womb of the all-holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary, and from her united hypostatically to himself flesh which possessed both a rational and intellectual soul, was born from her, the same being the always perfect God and a perfect human being, without confusion and division, consubstantial with God the Father according to the Godhead, and the same one consubstantial with us according to the humanity, indeed in every respect like us except for sin (Heb. 4:15).

Consequently we confess as well two births of the same only-begotten God the Word, the one before the ages from the Father without time and without body, his other birth in the last days (Heb. 1:2) from the holy, undefiled Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary with the intellectually ensouled flesh. Because of this we proclaim the holy and all-praiseworthy ever-virgin Mary to be properly speaking and in truth the Theotokos, not because God the Word took the beginning of his existence from her, but in the last days (Heb. 1:2) became incarnate from her without change and became human, and voluntarily accepted the suffering of the flesh on our account.

We glorify Christ as a composition, following the teaching of the holy Fathers. For with regard to the mystery concerning Christ, the union according to composition dispels both confusion and division, and guards the particularity of each nature, while demonstrating the one hypostasis and the one person of God the Word also with his intellectually ensouled flesh. We do not introduce a quaternity instead of the holy Trinity—heaven forbid!—for nor did the holy Trinity admit the addition of a fourth person, even when God the Word, one of the Trinity, became flesh. Nor

---

63 This paragraph combines the second article of the Nicene Creed with the key section of the Chalcedonian definition (from which the citation of Heb. 4:15 is taken).

64 Several times in this document the intellectually or rationally endowed flesh of the Word is referred to. On the anti-Apollinarian background to these Cyrillic terms see McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, 175–93.

65 On this anti-Nestorian expression elsewhere see e.g. Justinian, *On the Right Faith*, 76, 8; trans. Wesche, 167. Cf. sec. 2:3:3 with n. 42, above.
θεός, ἄλλος δὲ παρ’ ἐκείνων ὁ τὰ πάθη ὑπομείνας, ἀλλ’ ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὕλον ὑμολογοῦμεν, θεὸν ἁμα καὶ ἀνθρωπον, μίαν ὑπόστασιν, ἐν πρόσωπων, παθητῶν σαρκὶ, ἀπαθῆ ἐν θεότητι, καὶ τέλειον <ἐν> θεότητι καὶ τέλειον> τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τά τε θαῦματα καὶ τὰ πάθη, ἀπερ ἐκουσίως ὑπέμενε σαρκὶ.

Ὁθεν καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἐνα Χριστόν ὑμολογοῦμεν, ἐνα οὐς, ἐνα κύριον, ἐν πρόσωπον, μίαν ὑπόστασιν σύνθεσιν, καὶ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεαρκωμένην σαρκί, ἐφυκωμένην νοερῶς, καθα Κύριλλος ὁ θεσπέσιος ἐφράνης τε καὶ ἐδίδαξε. καὶ ἐν δύο φύσει τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι δοξάζοντες, ὡς ἐν θεότητι καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι τὸν ἐνα κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν γνωρίζεσθαι ὑμολογοῦμεν, τὴν διαφοράν δια τούτου καὶ μόνον σημαίνουτε τῶν φύσεων, ἐξ διὸν ἀνυγχύτως ἡ ἀφραστος ἐνωσις γέγονεν. οὔδε γὰρ ἡ θέωσις μετακειμάτηκεν εἰς σάρκα, οὔδε ἡ σάρξ εἰς θεότητα μετεβλήθη, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἰδιότητι τῇ κατὰ φύσιν καὶ μετὰ τὴν καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἐνωσις εκάτερον ἐμείνε.

Ὁθεν ἐνα ὑμείς ὕλον τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, εξ ἀνάρχου πατρός καὶ εξ ἀχράντου μητρός, τὸν αὐτὸν προαόμολον τε καὶ ἐξ ἐσχάτων ἀπαθῆ καὶ παθητῶν, ὅμοιον καὶ ἀράτον, καὶ ένως καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τά τε θαῦματα καὶ τὰ πάθη καθοτομεῖν, καὶ πάσας [160] θείας καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σεαρκωμένῳ θεῷ λόγῳ προσέρχομεν, καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ προσάγομεν τὴν προσκύνησιν, ἐκοινώσως καὶ ἀληθῶς υπὲρ ἡμῶν σταυρωθέντι σαρκὶ καὶ ἀναστάντι εκ νεκρῶν καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνελθόντι, καθημένων τε ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρός, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχομένον κρίνας ζωντας καὶ νεκροὺς, οὐδαμῶς συγχωρούντες τινὶ τῶν πάντων μιᾶς ἡ δύο λέγειν ἡ διδάσκειν ἐνέργειας ἐπὶ τῆς θείας τοῦ κυρίου ἐνανθρωπίσεως, ἀλλὰ μάλλον, καθάπερ αἰ ἄγιοι καὶ οἰκουμενικαὶ παραδιδόνας σύνοδοι, ἐνα καὶ τον αὐτὸν ὕλον μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἐνεργήσαι ὑμολογεῖ τὰ τε θεία καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, καὶ πάσαν θεοπρεπὴ καὶ ἀνθρωποπρεπὴ ἐνέργειαν εξ ἐνώς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεαρκωμένου θεοῦ λόγου ἀδιαίρετος καὶ ἀνυγχύτως προϊέναι καὶ εἰς ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναφέρεθαι διὰ τὸ τῆν μὲν τῆς μίας ἐνεργείας φωνήν, εἰ καὶ τισὶ τῶν πατέρων λέλε-
was it the case that the one who worked miracles as God was one, and the one who underwent suffering was another besides him, but we confess one and the same Son, at the same time God and human being, one hypostasis, one person, possible in the flesh, impassible in the Godhead, and perfect in divinity and the same perfect [in humanity, and both the miracles and the sufferings that he voluntarily underwent in his flesh.

Accordingly we confess one Christ from two natures, one Son, one Lord, one person, one composite hypostasis, and one nature of God the Word, incarnate in the flesh, intellectually ensouled, as the inspired Cyril both thought and taught. And, glorifying the same one as existent in two natures, we confess that our one Lord Jesus Christ is disclosed as true God in Godhead and humanity, signifying by this purely the difference in the natures from which the ineffable union took place without confusion. For neither did the Godhead pass over into the flesh, nor did the flesh change into the Godhead, but each remained in its particularity according to its nature, even after the hypostatic union.

Accordingly we know one Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, from a father without beginning and a mother undefiled, the same one both before the ages and in the last [days] (Heb. 1:2), impassible and possible, seen and unseen; and we proclaim both the miracles and the sufferings of one and the same; and we attribute to one and the same God the Word incarnate an entire divine and human activity; and we offer him the one worship, in that voluntarily and truly he was crucified for us in the flesh and rose from the dead and ascended into heaven; and he sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. In no way do we agree that anyone at all should speak of or teach one or two activities regarding the divine incarnation of the Lord, but rather, just as the holy and ecumenical synods handed on, he should confess that one and the same only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God, performed activities both divine and human, and that every activity fitting for God and fitting for a human being proceeded without division and without confusion from the same God the Word incarnate, and is referred to one and the same. The expression 'the one activity', even if it was uttered

66 Supplied from the Latin translation.
67 This is the language of the Council of Constantinople (381). See Tanner, i. 24.
68 This translates the Greek των τῶν.
κται, ὅμως ἔνενει καὶ θορυβεῖν τάς τινών ἀκοὰς, ὑπολαμβανόντων ἐπ’ ἀναιρέσει ταύτην προφέρεσθαι τών ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπόστασιν ἠμώμενον δύο φύσεων, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τήν τῶν δύο ἐνεργειών ῥήσιν πολλοὺς σκανδαλίζειν, ὡς μήτε τινά τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐγκρίτων τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυσταγωγῶν εἰρημένην, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἔσπευσαι ταύτῃ τὸ καὶ δύο προσβείεων θελήματα ἐναντίως πρὸς ἀλλήλα ἔχοντα, ὡς τοῦ μὲν θεοῦ λόγου τὸ σωτηρίου θέλων ἐκ- πληρωθῆναι πάθος, τῆς δὲ κατ’ αὐτὸν ἀνθρωπότητος ἀντιπιττούσης τῷ αὐτοῦ θελήματι καὶ ἐναντιομένης, καὶ ἐντείθεν δύο τοὺς τάναντια θέλοντας εἰσάγεσθαι, ὅπερ δυσσεβὲς ὑπάρχει καὶ ἀλλότριον τοῦ Χριστιανικοῦ δόγματος. εἰ γὰρ ὁ μιαρὸς Νεστόριος, καίπερ διαιρῶν τὴν θείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἐνανθρώπην καὶ δύο εἰσάγων υἱοῦ, δύο θελήματα τούτων εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἐτόλμησε, τοὐναντίον δὲ ταυτοβουλίαν τῶν ύπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀναπλαττομένων δύο προσώπων ἐδοξασε, πῶς δυνατὸν τοὺς τὴν ὀρθήν ὁμολογούντας πίστιν καὶ ἕνα υἱόν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν δοξάζον- τας, δύο καὶ ταύτα ἐναντία θελήματα ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ παραδέχεσθαι; ὅθεν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν ἐν ἁπάσι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ κατακολουθοῦντες, ἐν θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ὁμο- λογούμεν, ὃς ἐν μηδενὶ καιρῷ τῆς νοερᾶς ἐφυσικῆς ἀυτοῦ σαρκὸς κεχωρισμένως καὶ ἐξ οἰκείας ὀρμῆς ἐναντίως τῷ νεόματι τοῦ ἡμώμενου αὐτῇ καὶ ὑπόστασιν θεοῦ λόγου τὴν φυσικὴν αὐτῆς ποιήσασθαι κίνησιν, ἀλλ’ ὅποτε καὶ οἶνον αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς λόγος ἠβούλετο.

Ταῦτα τῆς εὐσεβείας τὰ δόγματα παραδεδώκασιν ἡμῶν οἱ ἅπ’ ἄρχας αὐτοται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου γενόμενοι καὶ οἱ τοῦτων μαθηταὶ καὶ διάδοχοι, οἱ καθέξις θεόπνευστο τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδ- ἀσκαλοὶ, ταύτων δὲ εἰπεῖν αἱ ἁγιαὶ καὶ οἰκομενικαὶ σύνοδοι τῶν μακαρίων καὶ θεοφόρων πατέρων, τοῦτο τί τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ καὶ τῶν κατὰ ταύτην τὴν βασιλίδα πόλιν καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ τῶν ἐν Χαλκηδών καὶ τῶν αὐθέν τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ συνελθόντων συνώδει, καὶ ταύτας ἐν ἁπάσιν ἀκολουθοῦντες καὶ τὰ θεία αὐτῶν περιπτυσσόμενοι δόγματα πάντας οὓς ἐδέξαντο δεχ- ὀμέθα καὶ οὓς ἄπε[162]βάλλοντο ἀποβαλλόμεθα καὶ ἀναθεματ- ἰζομεν καὶ ἐξαίρετον Ναυάτον, Σαβέλλιον, Ἀρείου, Εὐνόμου, Μακεδονίου, Ἀπολινάριον, Ὀριγένη καὶ Μαρκίου, Θεόδωρου τῷ Μοσχουστία, Νεστόριου, Εὐνύχεα, Δίοσκορον καὶ Σεβήρου τῷ εὐσεβῆ συγγράμματα Θεοδωρίτου τα κατὰ τῆς
by some of the Fathers, nevertheless alienates and confuses some who hear it, who suppose that it will lead to the destruction of the two natures which were hypostatically united in Christ our God. In a similar way the expression 'the two activities' scandalizes many, on the grounds that it was uttered by none of the holy and select spiritual leaders of the church, and certainly to follow it is to uphold also two wills at variance with one another, such that while God the Word wished to fulfil the salvific suffering, his humanity resisted and opposed him with its own will, and as a result two persons with conflicting wills are introduced, which is impious and foreign to Christian teaching. For if even the abominable Nestorius in dividing the divine incarnation of the Lord and introducing two sons did not dare to speak of two wills, but on the contrary glorified an identity of wills in the two persons he had fabricated, how is it possible that those who confess the correct faith and glorify one Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God, also accept these two contrary wills in him? Hence, following the holy Fathers closely in all things and in this too, we confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, true God, such that at no time did his rationally ensouled flesh separately and on its own initiative perform its natural movement in a manner contrary to the command of God the Word, hypostatically united to it, but God the Word himself decided at the time and according to the nature and the extent [of the movement].

These pious teachings the ones who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word handed on to us (Luke 1: 2-3). As well as those who were their disciples and successors, the inspired teachers of the church in succession, the five holy and ecumenical synods of the blessed and God-bearing Fathers, said the same, that is, those at Nicaea, and those in this imperial city, and those at Ephesus and those at Chalcedon, and those who assembled again in Constantinople at the fifth synod. Following these synods in every respect and embracing their divine teachings, we accept all those whom they accepted, and we reject and anathematize those whom they rejected, in particular Navatus, Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Origen, both Evagrius and Didymus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus and Severus, the impious writings of Theodoret against

69 See Hovorun, Will, Action and Freedom, 14-15, for the fragments of Nestorius that assert one will and activity in Christ.
ὁρθῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρώτης ἁγίας συνόδου καὶ τῶν δώδεκα κεφαλαίων τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Κυρίλλου καὶ ὅσα ὑπὲρ Θεοδώρου καὶ Νεστορίου συνεγράφατο, καὶ τὴν λεγομένην Ἰβα ἑπιστολήν, καὶ προτρέπομεν οὕτω πάντας Χριστιανοὺς φρονεῖν καὶ οὕτω δοξάζειν, μηδὲν προστιθέντας τούτους, μηδὲν τούτων ψευδοῦς μήτε μεταίροντας, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὅρια αἰώνια, ἀπερ οἱ θεόπνευστοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυσταγωγοὶ ἐπὶ σωτηρία πάντων ἐπήξαντο.

Ἡ ύπογραφή
Ἡράκλειος, πιστὸς ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ βασιλεῖς, ὑπεσημηνάμην.
the correct faith and against the first holy synod at Ephesus and against the Twelve Chapters of Cyril [now] among the saints, and whatever was written by Theodore and Nestorius, and the so-called Letter of Ibas. We urge all Christians so to think and so to believe, adding nothing to them, taking nothing away from them, nor, according to what is written, changing the ancient landmarks (Prov. 22: 28) which the inspired spiritual teachers of the church fixed for the salvation of all.

The Signature
I, Heraclius, emperor faithful to Jesus Christ, God, have placed my signature.
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Medierranean world 47
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Modestus, patriarch of Jerusalem 20
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christology 39
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Navatus (Novatian), rigorist 57, 60, 139,

215

Nazarites, Jewish-Christian sect 147

neo-Chalcedonianism 7, 12, 13
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117 n. 82, n. 83, 211 n. 63

terminology of 44

Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed 3

Nicephorus I, patriarch of

Constantinople 64

Nicetas, imperial official 24
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Paul, apostle 34, 47, 71, 73, 115, 121, 197
Letters to Timothy 56
Paul of Beit Ukkame (the Black) 10–11, 24, 59, 141
Paulines 10
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