

ΑΙ ΑΡΧΑΙΑΙ  
ΑΝΤΙΧΑΛΚΗΔΟΝΕΙΟΙ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΑΤΟΛΗΣ  
ΚΑΙ Η ΒΑΣΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΠΑΝΕΝΩΣΕΩΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ  
ΜΕΤΑ ΤΗΣ ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΟΥ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ\*

ΥΠΟ  
ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΚΑΡΜΙΡΗ  
ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟΥ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

**5. Appendix\*\***

The problem of the unification of the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East with the Orthodox on the basis of Cyril's formula: «mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene».

Anyone will become perplexed who today objectively and unbiasedly investigates the ecclesiastical events of the fifth century A.D. occasioned by Monophysitism. This perplexity is due to the fact that one can find no sufficient dogmatic-ecclesiastical reason for their having detached themselves from the stem of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East to which they still organically belong. If one also investigates their dogmatic teaching which developed in the following fifteen centuries together with their way of worship, their ecclesiastical structure and their government, one must conclude with astonishment that they agree with the Orthodox Catholic Church in almost all «necessaries», the exception being a vague difference of opinion with regard to the verbal formulation of the dogma of Chalcedon, - a difference which is probably more terminological than real. And indeed these churches today appear to us to accept a special form of moderated Monophysitism (as it can incorrectly be named), a Monophysitism which restricts

\* Συνέχεια ἐκ τῆς σελ. 579 τοῦ προηγουμένου τόμου.

\*\* Παρατίθεται ἐνταῦθα ἡ ἐν τῇ συνδιασκέψει τοῦ Aarhus γενομένη εἰσήγησις ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν δημοσιευθέντων Πρακτικῶν αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὸν τίτλον: Unofficial Consultation between Theologians of Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches, August 11-15, 1964. Papers and Minutes. Edited by John S. Romanides, Paul Verghese, Nick A. Nissiotis. Ἐν «The Greek Orthodox Theological Review», Volume X, Number 2, Winter 1964-1965, σ. 61-81, 14-15.

itself only to the acceptance of a divine-human nature, united and joined in Christ. Though they accept this moderated Monophysitism, they at the same time, with the Orthodox Catholic Church, condemn the archheretic, Eutyches, and his pure, unadulterated Monophysitism. This inconsistency can probably be traced to a misunderstanding of the Greek-Orthodox dogmatic terms «ousia», «physis», «prosopon», «hypostasis», «hypostatike enosis», «Logos», etc. which could not be precisely translated into the eastern national languages of the peoples to whom these churches belonged. This is the only major difference between the Orthodox and the above-mentioned venerable eastern churches, a difference which has been blunted significantly with the passing of the centuries so that one can say that it really is restricted to a difference of words and formulations. This difference increased because of the unclarity of their dogmatic doctrine and the interruption of their further dogmatic and theological development. Similarly, the separation involves several other secondary and unessential differences, e.g. with regard to the number of ecumenical councils, the number of church fathers who are to be venerated and other liturgical and canonical differences and customs.

An opinion similar to that expressed above has remained alive among many Orthodox and many adherents of the other eastern churches from the fifth until the twentieth centuries. This can be seen

1) From the participation by certain Armenian bishops in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Ecumenical Councils, from the canons of the Trullanum<sup>1</sup>, which are concerned with the Armenians;

2) From the condemnation of the «three chapters», pronounced by the Fifth Ecumenical Council, which was received by the non-Chalcedonian churches; from the encyclical addressed to «all bishop's sees in the East» (866)<sup>2</sup> by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Photius;

3) From the negotiations between Byzantine and Armenian representatives in the twelfth century which were in favour of union, and particularly from the famous «discussion» of the Byzantine Theorians with the Armenian Catholicos, Nerses IV;<sup>3</sup>

1. John Karmiris, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Athens, 1960), Vol. I (2), p.p. 231, 233, 234.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 322.

3. Migne P.G. 133, 119-297. P. Tekeyan, *Controverses christologiques en Arméno-Cilicie*, Roma 1939, p. 14 ff. See also, B. Stefanides, *Church History* (Athens, 1948) p. 380.

4) From the declaration published by the local Orthodox Synod of Jerusalem (1672)<sup>1</sup> in favour of the non-Chalcedonian churches;

5) And from the declaration of the Ecumenical Patriarch in 1951;<sup>2</sup>

6) From the amicable attitude during the meeting between Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian representatives at the First Pan-Orthodox Meeting at Rhodes in 1961.

The classical dogmatician of the Orthodox Church, John of Damascus, successfully expressed Orthodoxy's positive attitude towards the non-Chalcedonian Christians of the East when he said that he considered them, «on the basis of the Constitution of Chalcedon, to be separated from the [Orthodox] Church only with regard to their geographical position, while being Orthodox in all other things»<sup>3</sup>. Because of this situation, it is necessary that on both sides intensive efforts must be made towards the reunion of the non-Chalcedonian churches with the Orthodox Church.

Self-evidently, all discussions and endeavours towards union must concentrate on the one serious dogmatic difference of opinion existing between them in order to eliminate it. This difference of opinion concerns the dogma of the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, as formulated at the Fourth Ecumenical Council. As soon as this difference is settled, the other smaller ones existing between them can easily be eliminated. With regard to this cardinal difference we believe that, provided that the dogma of Chalcedon remains untouched, a new *formula concordiae* could be found for the Orthodox Church and for the non-Chalcedonian churches separated from it which would satisfy both sides; because in regard to the essence of the dogma there does not seem to be any real difference. The entire difference of opinion of the non-Chalcedonian eastern churches is based in their traditional, monophysitizing formulation of the dogma of the union of the two natures in Christ, although these churches understand this dogma in an almost Orthodox manner, believing that the two natures, the divine and the human, «neither mixed nor changed», are united in Christ. The difference of opinion which arose at the time of the Fourth Ecumenical Council and which was confirmed thereafter, seems afterwards to have increasingly lost its incisiveness and has almost completely disappeared today. Admittedly, the separated eastern churches hesitate to acknowledge

1. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, Vol. II (1), 1953, p. 731.

2. *Ibid.* Vol. I (2), p. 172. «Orthodoxia» (Constantinople) 26 (1951) 483, 490.

3. De haeres. 83. Migne P.G. 94, 741.

the Fourth Ecumenical Council and clearly to confess the two natures in Christ. On the other hand, they accept the two natures in all essentials, as «neither mixed nor changed nor divided», rejecting only the Chalcedonian «en duo physesi» (in two natures) after the union and holding to the «ek duo physeon» (from two natures) before the union. Therefore, we believe that the phrase of St. Cyril of Alexandria which is more used by and satisfactory to the monophysitizing churches, could be proposed as the basis for the desirable union. This phrase reads: «Mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene» or the more Orthodox «sarkomenou» (one incarnate nature of the God-Logos). In using it, it would be understood and interpreted in an Orthodox way, being generally understood in terms of Cyril's doctrine of the union of the two natures in Christ.

However, how do St. Cyril and the later Orthodox fathers understand the phrase «mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene»? Clearly they interpret the term «one nature» as *one* hypostasis, as *one* person of the God-Logos, who became incarnate. In other words, they view this phrase as being equivalent in meaning to the statement of John the Evangelist «the Word became flesh» (John 1:14). And in fact, when they concerned themselves with Nestorius' false teaching of «two natures = two persons», they believed that they could answer him by emphasizing the «one nature», that is, by emphasizing the one hypostasis, the one person of the God-Logos, which was used as the basis for the hypostatic union of the divine and the human natures. As is well known, the terms «nature», «hypostasis» and «person» were equated at that time since they were regarded as synonymous and identical. For that reason, the term «nature», in the phrase in question, is to be understood as «person» in and of itself, i.e. the person of the eternal God-Logos. St. Cyril writes: «...the nature of the Logos, i.e. the hypostasis, which is the Logos itself»<sup>1</sup>. By means of the preceding word «one» every Nestorian sense of a division of the one person of the incarnate Logos of God is excluded and his unity is stressed. Moreover, the participle translated by the English word «incarnate» declares that the human nature, when the fullness of time was come, was received by and hypostatically united to the eternal Logos of God. Thus, this participle occurs also in Cyril's writings both in the nominative, to agree with the word «nature», as in the phrase quoted above, and in the genitive, to agree with the phrase «of the Son and Logos», as in the following: «mia

1. Cyril of Alexandria, Apology, Migne P.G. 76, 401.

physis Huiou sesarkomenou» (one nature of the incarnate Son), and «mian einai pisteuomen ten tou Huiou physin, hos henos plen enanthropesantos kai sesarkomenou»<sup>1</sup> (we believe in the one nature of the Son, but as having become man and flesh). According to this, the expression «one nature» means one hypostasis, one person, but not, as Nestorius believed, two natures, i.e. two hypostases, or two persons, after the union. This is true because the «one nature», i.e. the one hypostasis of the God-Logos, «because incarnate». It is thus united without mixture with the human nature, received fully and completely from the Virgin Mary - a human nature which never existed before and outside of the hypostatic union («ou gar prohypostase kath' heauten sarki henothe ho Theos Logos» - because the God-Logos did not unite with a human nature, pre-existing of itself)<sup>2</sup>, being without hypostasis (anhypostatos) and without person (aprosopos) «in contemplation» (en ennoiais); because as person it used the person, or hypostasis, of the God-Logos<sup>3</sup>. For this reason, the term «nature», both in Cyril's expression «one nature» and in Nestorius' term «two natures», has the meaning of hypostasis (or person) of the one who exists in and of himself, as said already. According to St. John of Damascus, St. Cyril understands by the «expression 'incarnate' the essence of the flesh; with the term 'one nature' he understands the one hypostasis of the Logos... i.e. his divinity... Thus, they are two natures» (dia tou eipein sesarkomenene, ten tes sarkos ousian ... dia de tou mian physin, ten mian hypostasin tou Logou... t.e. tes theotetos autou... hoste duo eisi physeis)<sup>4</sup>. Cyril emphatically places the «one nature» = the one person of the incarnate God-Logos, in opposition to Nestorius' «two natures» = two persons. But he understands the one person to be the bearer of both natures, these being «neither mixed nor changed», but joined in such a way that no confusion, mixture or change, no assimilation or transition of the one into the other nature occurs: «ouch hos tes ton physeon diaphoras aneremenes dia ten henosin»<sup>5</sup>. In this way Cyril avoided not only Monophysitism but also Apollinarianism in combatting Nestorianism.

1. Cyril of Alexandria, Epist. 40, Migne P.G. 77, 192/3.

2. John of Damascus, Expositio orth. fidei, III, 2. Migne P.G. 94, 985.

3. Ibid., III, 11, P.G. 94, 1024/5.

4. John of Damascus, op. cit., III, 7.8, De comp. nat. 3. Migne P.G. 94, 1012/3. 95, 116/7.

5. Cyril of Alexandria, Epist. 4, ad Nestor. Migne P.G. 77,45.

That St. Cyril of Alexandria really uses the term «nature» in the sense of «hypostasis» or «person», i.e. with the meaning of the God-Logos himself together with the flesh united to him, is indicated often in his writings. Thus, in order to combat the Nestorians who imagine or confess «that the hypostases are separate after the indivisible union» and thus hold that there are «two Sons», he taught that the Lord, «being God by nature, became incarnate and therefore became a man, animated by a rational soul... on this account, all of the terms which are to be heard in the Gospels are to be attributed to one person, to one incarnate hypostasis of the Logos» or «to one hypostasis of the incarnate Logos, because the one Jesus Christ is Lord according to the Scriptures»<sup>1</sup>. Being used interchangeably, the terms «nature», «hypostasis» and «person» become synonymous. «One nature, therefore one hypostasis of the incarnate God-Logos, i.e. one person, one Lord». Consequently, as Emperor Justinian confirmed, «the term 'nature' was used in place of hypostasis»<sup>2</sup>. Thus, with regard to its contents, the phrase «one incarnate nature of the God-Logos» is Orthodox; it is only its external expression and formulation which seem to remind one slightly of Monophysitism. Thus, as already stated, the term «nature of the God-Logos» testifies to the divine nature and the term «incarnate» testifies to the human nature which is not of itself an hypostasis, but has become «enhypostatos,» so to speak, in the hypostasis of the Logos. Furthermore the term «one nature» testifies to the one hypostasis (or one person) of the God-Logos, i.e. to the one God-Logos, who has become flesh according to St. John's formulation (John 1:14). The unity of the person, i.e. of the bearer of both natures, is preserved in that the entire phrase is equated with the following ones: «one God-Logos incarnate» or «only one is Christ, the Logos from the Father, with his own flesh»<sup>3</sup>. Thus, St. Cyril assumes two complete natures from whose hypostatic union the one Christ resulted. He therefore does not hold that there is one nature in the monophysitic sense, i.e. that there is one substance of divinity and humanity — a view which was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council<sup>4</sup>. As a result, we have here, with respect to con-

1. Cyril of Alexandria, Apologeticus, Migne P.G. 76, 340; In Joh. fragm. P.G. 74,24.

2. Emperor Justinian, Confessio fidei, in Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum... Collectio, 9, 545.

3. Cyril of Alexandria, Epist. 17, Migne P.G. 77, 112. J. Karmiris, op. cit., I (2), p. 142.

4. J. Karmiris, op. cit., I (2), p. 195.

tents, the dogma of Chalcedon about the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. However, it is expressed in the style of the theological school of Alexandria which emphasizes the one person of Christ, thus stressing the one Christ in antithesis to the Antiochian school which emphasized the two persons—and thus two Christs—in the union and after it. Thus, Cyril of Alexandria himself, the Fifth Ecumenical Council, the Confession of the Emperor Justinian, Leontius of Byzantium, John of Damascus and other Orthodox fathers understood the phrase «one incarnate nature of the God-Logos» in this Orthodox sense.

However, how does Cyril understand the union of the two natures (as indicated in the above-mentioned phrase) in a narrower and in a more general sense? This he explains elsewhere: «We said that the two natures united. However, we believe that after they united the nature of the Son is one, as though the division were already eliminated. And yet, this nature of the Son is that of one who has become incarnate and human. If one should say, however, that the Logos, being God, became incarnate and human, then any expectation of a change should be rejected (because he remained precisely what he was), and among us the entire, complete and unmixed union should be confessed also»<sup>1</sup>. In this way, any type of monophysitic misunderstanding of the union is excluded. And again he wrote elsewhere that «(the Logos) being by nature God, was begotten as man, not simply in terms of connection (synapheia), as he (Nestorius) says, whereby he has an external unity in mind (and therefore a relative one), but as a union which is true although one cannot verbally grasp it and which surpasses understanding. Thus he is to be understood as the one and only one; because the nature is to be understood as a single whole after the union, i.e. as the incarnate nature of the Logos himself. That is something which we can similarly conceive of with regard to ourselves; for a human being is truly one, although he is composed of dissimilar things, i.e. of soul and body»<sup>2</sup>. Thus, by the term «mia physis» here too he wishes to emphasize the unity of the person of the God-Logos by the phrase «one incarnate nature of the God-Logos». The unity of the person of Christ is after all the result of the hypostatic union of the two natures (without their having been mixed, merged or changed) just as the one true human being results from the union of soul and body — completely «dis-

1. Cyril of Alexandria, Epist. 40, Migne P.G. 77, 192/3.

2. Cyril of Alexandria, Adversus blasphem. Nestorii, Migne P.G. 76,60/1. E. Schwartz, Acta Concil. I, 4, 6, p. 33.

parate things». As our famous father and bishop, Athanasius, whose belief is a constant rule for Orthodoxy, also said in his writings: «two things, by nature unlike, have come together: i.e. divinity and humanity; the one resulting from both of these is Christ»<sup>1</sup>.

Furthermore, Cyril taught, that in uniting the two natures in Christ, the Orthodox «confess one Christ, one Son, the same one Lord and, accordingly, one incarnate nature of God». However, «no mixture, or synkrisis respectively, of the two natures occurred». «... The one nature is distinct from the other, out of both of which the one and only Christ is to be understood. Neither did they fail to recognize that where union is spoken about, it does not mean the coming together of one thing, but of two or more things which are by nature different. When we say 'union', we thus confess the union of the flesh, which has a soul, and the Logos. And those who say 'the two natures' mean the same thing. Indeed, after the union, that which has been united cannot be divided. On the contrary, the Son is one, his nature one, as that of the incarnate Logos...» or, «according to the voice of John, the Logos became flesh»<sup>2</sup>. Apparently, the phrase «his one nature» (*mia physis autou*) is to be thought of in connection with the preceding term «one Son» (*eis Huios*), as the one hypostasis of the Son, so that the unity of the person of the incarnate God-Logos was not annulled by assuming flesh—as also after the union «that which has been united can no longer be separated.» Elsewhere, in countering a slanderous accusation against himself according to which he allegedly accepted, with the above-cited statements, a «mixing, i.e. alteration, or merging of the Logos with the body, i.e. a transformation of the body into the nature of divinity», he wrote that «the two natures, unmixed, unchanged and not transformed, have joined one another in indivisible union; because the flesh is flesh and not divinity even though it has become God's flesh. In the same way, the Logos is God and not flesh, even though he, according to his plan of salvation, made the flesh his own... After the union we do not separate the natures from one another; nor do we divide the one indivisible Son into two Sons. But we confess that there is one Son and he is the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos, as the fathers said»<sup>3</sup>. With the last sentence and with this teaching, Cyril combatted the Nestorian di-

1. Cyril of Alexandria, Homil. 8,6. Migne P.G. 77,572.

2. Cyril of Alexandria, Epist. 44, to Eulogius the Presbyter. Migne P.G. 77,225.

3. Cyril of Alexandria, op. cit., 45, to Succensus the Bishop I. Migne P.G. 77,232.

vision of the one into two Sons, and expressed the Orthodox faith in the one incarnate Son, i.e. in the Son who became flesh. He confessed: «The Logos from God the Father hypostatically united himself with the flesh and thus there is one Christ with his own flesh, i.e. he is God and man at the same time» (sarki kath' hypostasin henosthai ton ek Theou Patros Logon, hena te einai Christon meta tes idias sarkos, ton auton delonoti Theon te homou kai anthropon)<sup>1</sup>, the bearer of both of the natures hypostatically united in him. Similarly, he condemned every idea of fusion in the union of the two natures, as also every idea of confusion, emptying (of the one into the other), reciprocal mingling, mixture, blending, mingling, change, alteration, transformation, conversion, or metastasis respectively, of those two natures.

Cyril elsewhere explained the Orthodox sense of the phrase «one incarnate nature of the God-Logos» as meaning the one God-Logos, who also assumed human nature and united himself with it. He wrote: «Again, those who distort what is correct have failed to recognize that it is in truth one incarnate nature of the Logos. Now if there is one Son who is by nature truly the Logos from God the Father who was born in a way which is inexpressible and who then, after assuming flesh (not flesh without a soul, but flesh with soul) spiritually issued from a woman as a man, then he is not to be divided into two persons or Sons, but remained one, not without flesh, nor external to a body, but having, by virtue of an indivisible union, his own (body). Anyone who says this asserts neither fusion nor a confusion nor anything else of this sort. Furthermore, such cannot be deduced from the term. If one would say to us that the only begotten Son of God became incarnate and man, that does not imply that the two natures were confused. Neither was the nature of the Logos transformed into that of the flesh, nor was that of the flesh transformed into that of the Logos. Each nature is to be thought of as remaining itself — thus according to the manner of expression offered by us. Inexpressible and impossible to grasp in words is the way in which he united himself and manifested to us the one nature of the Son, which nature, now, as I said, is the incarnate one. This is the case because the oneness is not attributed merely to that which belongs to the nature, but also to that which is joined in the synthesis which is man, consisting of body and soul. These are disparate things, differing in nature, which truly unite there and result in the one nature of the man...

---

1. Cyril of Alexandria, op. cit., 17, to Nestorius. Migne P.G. 77,120. J. Karmiris, op. cit., I (2), p. 145.

There is, therefore, no reason to say that, if the one nature of the Logos had really become incarnate, then clearly a fusion and confusion would have had to take place, the human nature decreasing and disappearing. The human nature, however, was neither reduced, as they maintain, nor did it disappear. It completely suffices to assert that he became man, i.e. that he became incarnate. If we omitted this, then they would be in some way justified in their slander. Since, however, the phrase 'was incarnate' is necessarily added, where does a reduction or a sort of disappearance occur?»<sup>1</sup>.

Herewith, Cyril declares that he does not understand the phrase «one incarnate nature of the God-Logos» in a monophysitic sense, but in an Orthodox sense. He does so in asserting that he acknowledges the human nature, complete and intact, and thus without fusion or confusion, without reduction or decrease, as well as the divine one after their union in Christ. And elsewhere he adds: «When we spoke of the one nature of the Logos, we held back and did not add the term 'incarnate' to it, but left it to the divine economy. The word 'Logos' at the same time served as a not improbable foundation to those who formulate the question of what is perfect in humanity or, how our own inherent nature exists. However, since perfection in humanity and the expression of our individual existence is brought in by the mention of the term 'incarnate', they should cease clutching at a straw. One should condemn those who reject the divine plan and deny the incarnation by withholding from the Son perfect humanity. When one says that he became incarnate, one is confessing the fact that he became man, clearly and indubitably. As a result, this does not hinder one from thinking that 'one Son only, Christ, exists and he is God and man, perfect in divinity as in humanity...»<sup>2</sup>. According to that, therefore, they «clutch at a straw» who still today wish to understand Cyril's phrase «one incarnate nature of the God-Logos» in a monophysitic way. Because this phrase includes both natures which are hypostatically united in Christ, and it teaches quite clearly that «only one Son, Christ, exists and he is God and man, as complete in divinity as in humanity». Cyril stressed this fact repeatedly when he taught that the eternal Logos of God, incarnate in time, had received the entire and complete human nature, consisting of body and soul, from the Virgin Mary. And thus,

1. Ibid. p. 241.

2. Cyril of Alexandria, op. cit., p. 244. See also, Leontius of Byzantium, Scholien VIII, Migne P.G. 86/1, 1253.

after rejecting Monophysitism he also rejected Apollinarianism which denied to Christ's human nature its reasoning soul, or spirit (nous), and for this reason employed the contested formulation «mia physis tou Theou Logou sesarkomene». In antithesis thereto, Cyril speaks of a union of two complete and real natures, «of things, i.e. of hypostases, which are joined» (pragmaton egoun hypostaseon gegone synodos)<sup>1</sup>, so that the Lord was composed «out of two different kinds of things» (ek duoin pragmatoin)<sup>2</sup>, both of which retained the natural dissimilarity and disparity which they possessed before their union in him. On that account he characterized the union of the two natures only too accurately as «indescribable», «inexpressible», «inconceivable», «completely inexpressible and surpassing understanding», «extraordinary», «paradoxical», and as «a magnificent mystery which surpasses understanding» and can only be glimpsed and worshipped in faith.

It follows from all which has been said, that Cyril of Alexandria understood the one person of the incarnate God-Logos who had also assumed human nature and had united it to his divine nature, by the phrase «the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos». For that reason he states that the incarnate Logos is worthy of worship. He even employs the phrase «one incarnate nature of the God-Logos» in order thereby to teach the one way of worship in which the incarnate Logos is to be worshipped, substituting the phrase «one nature of the God-Logos which is incarnate and is worshipped» (mian physin tou Theou Logou sesarkomenen kai proskynoumenen) for the phrase «Huion proskynoumenon» (the Son who is worshipped). Thus he writes: we confess «not two natures of the one Son, one which is to be worshipped and one which is not to be worshipped, but one nature of the God-Logos which is incarnate and worshipped with his flesh in one act of worship. Neither do we confess two Sons; one of which is other than the true Son of God who is worshipped...»<sup>3</sup>. Elsewhere he states that «we worship the Logos of God with his own flesh as one»<sup>4</sup> and that «we are accustomed to honouring the Emmanuel by means of an act of worship, not detaching, hypo-

1. Cyril of Alexandria, 'To Those Who Dare to Advocate Nestorius' Doctrines, Migne P.G. 76,396.

2. Cyril of Alexandria, Address to Theodosius XLIV, Migne P.G. 76, 1200.

3. Cyril of Alexandria, Apolog. and Proshon., Migne P.G. 76, 249. 4209. 4212.

4. Cyril of Alexandria, Adv. Nestor. 3,1. Migne P.G. 76,121.

statically, the body of the Logos which is united to him»<sup>1</sup> so that «we worship one God who is at the same time man, believing in him as in the one who consists of divinity and humanity»<sup>2</sup>. Here it should be noted that insofar as the worship cannot be related to the nature in itself, but only to the one bearer of both natures, it follows that Cyril means the one hypostasis — and thus the one person of the incarnate God-Logos in the Orthodox and not in the monophysitic sense—by the phrase «the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos». That is, he means thereby the one God-Logos who became man and incarnate and who, together with his flesh, is worshipped in one act of worship, or as it was stated at the Fifth Ecumenical Council: «*ton Theon Logon sarkothenta meta tes idias autou sarkos*»<sup>3</sup>.

From the passages quoted above, as well as from many more, one can conclude that Cyril teaches the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, i.e. the essential, true and real union as opposed to the Nestorian «*synapheia*» (connection), i.e. an external, ethical and relative coexistence between the two natures. Yet, he conceives of the union as being without confusion, change or transformation and as being unchangeable, since the Logos of God «became incarnate neither by a metastasis or change, nor by a transformation into the nature of the flesh, nor by a confusion or fusion nor, as supposed by some, by a connection between two natures. Why those who suppose the latter do so is unexplained because the nature of the flesh is by nature unchangeable (*atreptos*) and not transformable (*analloiotos*)»<sup>4</sup>. Cyril repeats in many passages of his writings that the divine and human nature remained unchanged in Christ, united «*asygchytos kai atreptos*». The last-mentioned adjectives were taken over by the Synod of Chalcedon. And for that reason he also agrees with the *expositio fidei* of the «*Diallagai*» with the Antiocheans of 433. He agreed with them in the essence of the christological doctrine, always confessing one Christ, perfect God and perfect man, of one substance with the Father in nature because of his divinity and of one substance with us in nature because of his humanity; because the predicates occurring in the Gospels are distinguished as divine ones and human ones, some referring to the one per-

1. Cyril of Alexandria, *ibid.*, p. 97.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 60.

3. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, I (2), p. 195.

4. Cyril of Alexandria, *Epist.* 55, concerning the sacred symbol. Migne P.G. 77, 304.

son of Christ, others dividing themselves between the two natures<sup>1</sup>. And this doctrine was accepted by the Fourth Ecumenical Council as well as by the Catholic Church in the East and in the West.

With everything which we have set forth here, we have attempted to ascertain and to interpret the deeper meaning of the famous formulation of St. Cyril of Alexandria, namely «*μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λογοῦ ὑπεσάρκωμενη*». This formulation is the one to which the adherents of the non-Chalcedonian churches of the East appeal also today, in that they view it as expressing, more or less, their faith in the dogma of the union of the two natures in Christ. If our above interpretation should be regarded as correct by them, especially since it is attested to by Cyril himself and by other later authentic sources, and if the above-mentioned Christian brothers really do accept and honour the entire Christological doctrine of St. Cyril as did the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon and the whole Church of Christ in East and West, then the agreement and finally also the reunion with the Orthodox could be based precisely upon the above-cited formulation as above interpreted, and, in general, upon the Christological doctrine of St. Cyril of Alexandria — to be sure, interpreted in the Orthodox sense. As is well known, the church, since the First Ecumenical Council, has not hesitated to employ new terms, phrases and formulations in restating former expressions and expositions of dogmatic truths. The difficult discussions about the «*homousion*» which the holy fathers carried on at that great Council might serve as an eloquent example of this. Therefore, the church is not obliged to remain inflexible and to wrangle over words and phrases; it has the right to change them or to replace them with others. The only qualification is that the essence of the Orthodox dogmas, which in any case must always remain unchanged, may not be affected or altered. And so in the case in question, the Church is entitled to use a new formulation which satisfies and unites divided Christians. For that reason we believe that if the eastern Christians really accept the Christology of St. Cyril, a Christology accepted by the Orthodox as well, then the agreement desired by both sides can come about on the basis of his teaching. Also, with God's help, reunification could be achieved by drawing up a Christological formula of union and a text similar to that of the «*Diallagai*» of 433 and corresponding to Cyril's Orthodox doctrine. This, to be sure, must be done in such a way as not to invalidate the dogma of Chalcedon.

---

1. J. Karmiris, op. cit., I (2), pp. 154ff.

May, therefore, the eastern brethren re-examine the subject touched upon here in the spirit of Christian brotherliness and love, and may they then revise their attitude to the Fourth Ecumenical Council and the Orthodox Catholic Church, especially since they claim that they reject the extreme Monophysitism of Eutyches, whom they personally condemn as did the great Council of Chalcedon, a Council which they falsely consider to be Nestorian in tendency. Thereafter it will be easy to settle the other secondary and unessential differences which exist between the divided churches in the spirit of love and of desire for understanding. Included among these secondary differences are the following: those with regard to the form of worship, those in connection with the canon, those regarding the number of ecumenical councils, and that resulting from the veneration rendered to Dioskoros, Patriarch of Alexandria, by some members of the eastern churches. In this connection, it is granted that he was not damned for heresy by the Fourth Ecumenical Council but was only deposed because of anti-canonical activities. As Anatolios, the Patriarch of Constantinople, stated in the fifth session of that Council: «Dioskoros was not deposed because of the faith, but because he excommunicated his Lordship Leo, the Archbishop, and, though summoned before the Council three times, did not appear (dia ten pistin ou katherethe ho Dioskoros, all' epeide akoinonesian epoiese to kyrio Leonti to archiepiskopo kai triton eklethe kai ouk elthen)» before the council<sup>1</sup>. What is more, the same Dioskoros expressly rejected the false teachings of Eutyches»<sup>2</sup>.

In the subsequent «Discussion concerning the Paper of Professor Karmiris» he added the following:

«PROFESSOR KARMIRIS: I have read the texts on both sides of the dispute. (a) I have come to the conclusion that there is no real difference between the Orthodox and the non-Chalcedonians as far as the essence of the Christological dogma is concerned, as all of them accept the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria. There is a difference only regarding the terminology and formulation of this dogma. In the same way there are secondary differences regarding worship, canon law, customs and uses, etc. But none of these things should divide the Churches; Photius,

---

1. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum... collectio*, tom. 7,104; Metropolitan of Nevrokopiu Georgios, *The Union of the Coptic with the Orthodox Church Is Easy* (Greek), (Saloniki, 1952), pp. 53/9.

2. Mansi, *op. cit.*, tom. 6,663. E. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, tom. II, 1, 92. 168.

Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote: «Where matters of faith are not denied and there is no case of falling away from the common and catholic teaching accepted by all, when some maintain different customs and uses, one should not condemn those who profess or accept them...»

(b) The Fourth Ecumenical Council must be understood and interpreted in the light of the teaching of the Third Ecumenical Council, as well as of the Fifth which is more directly related to it, because between these three Councils there is an agreement, continuity and unity completed by the Sixth Ecumenical Council. The Fourth Ecumenical Council should be understood also in the light of the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria, on which it is principally based.

(c) The theologians who participated in this Consultation should suggest to their Churches the appointment of a mixed commission of Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian theologians to determine and study deeply all the points of agreement and disagreement on the Christological dogma, as well as on subjects regarding worship, church administration, etc. This Commission should draft a *formulam concordiae* on the Christological dogma on the basis of the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria and of the other ancient Church Fathers and submit it in due time to their churches. The appointment of this Commission must be discussed and decided by the Third Pan-Orthodox Consultation which is to take place in Rhodes during this coming November, and by the Consultation which is to take place in Addis Ababa in the near future. The decisions and the actions to be taken afterwards depend entirely upon the Synods of the churches concerned, which should promote further and in a canonical way the sacred cause of the reunion of their churches...

...Only one tradition should be taken into account—the dogmatic one. All the other points should be subsidiary to the dogmatic tradition. This latter is common to both of us. Therefore, we must consider this sufficient for our union. No primacies of Patriarchs and Bishops need be discussed nor are we interested in changing the polity of the churches. Only in certain words and definitions do we disagree. It is sufficient to recall the difference between St. Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch, who differed in their formulation, without any real difference in their faith...

...Chalcedon adopted above all the teaching of St. Cyril. The synod did not base itself of the Tome of Leo. The Tome of Leo is a piece of paper among many materials in the Council. Papal delegates asked for its adoption as definition but the Eastern fathers refused. Egyptians, Palestinians, Illyrians, all refused, including the bishops of Illyricum

who were under the jurisdiction of Leo. We have our own fathers who are the true teachers of the faith.

There are no differences between the Councils of 431 and 451 in dogma. So also there is no difference between all seven Ecumenical Councils. The faith is one and the same in all the councils. All came out of the same common tradition of the first centuries. There is a continuity and unity of faith among the Seven Councils. So there are no outstanding problems between us, whether we accept three or seven.

The differences in liturgical forms, canon law, customs and practical issues, as well as in the names of certain fathers of the Church venerated by different churches, need not be a problem. These do not separate; the precise formulation of the Christological dogma is the only thing that needs to be done...

...The Orthodox Church has one basis of unity, formulated by Photius of Constantinople. «Whenever that which is violated is not the faith, nor there is a fall from the common and catholic decree, because other customs and laws are kept by others, he who knows how to judge rightly should not think that they who keep these fall into *adikia* or that they who do not accept them violate the law». Cultural differences need not divide the Church»<sup>1</sup>.

### **An agreed statement**

«Ever since the second decade of our century representatives of our Orthodox Churches, some accepting seven Ecumenical Councils and others accepting three, have often met in ecumenical gatherings. The desire to know each other and to restore our unity in the one Church of Christ has been growing all these years. Our meeting together in Rhodos at the Pan-Orthodox Conference of 1961 confirmed this desire.

Out of this has come about our unofficial gathering of fifteen theologians from both sides, for three days of informal conversations, in connection with the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission in Aarhus, Denmark.

We have spoken to each other in the openness of charity and with the conviction of truth. All of us have learned from each other. Our inherited misunderstandings have begun to clear up. We recognize in each other the one orthodox faith of the Church. Fifteen centuries of alienation have not led us astray from the faith of our Fathers.

In our common study of the Council of Chalcedon, the wellknown

1. Ibid., pp. 75-81.