

GRIGORYAN GRIGOR
(MLU, GERMANY)

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF
CHALCEDON**

The second session of the Council of Chalcedon was held on 10 October 451¹. The main question which was to "be investigated, judged and studied" at that session was "how to confirm the true faith", because it was "particularly because of the faith that the council" had been convened, as the chief representative of Emperor Marcian, the patrician Anatolius, who presided over

¹ R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, (Translated Texts for Historians, vol. 45), vol. 2, Liverpool, 2005, p. 1-2, note concerning the second session of the Council of Chalcedon: "The second or 'corrected' edition of the Latin text of the Acts, as well as that of Rusticus, gives the session of 10 October (on the faith) as the second act of the council and that of 13 October (the trial of Dioscorus) as the third. The Greek version, however, and also the first edition of the Latin (*versio antiqua*), reverse the order though not the dates; the purpose of this was to achieve a logical sequence, with the acts that dealt with Dioscorus [I and III...] coming before the acts of the sessions (II, IV, V, VI) that dealt with the faith. We follow the chronological order given in the most of the Latin witnesses, with the session on the faith of 10 October as the second session. It has occasionally been suggested that the order in the Greek Acts is in fact chronologically correct, with the trial of Dioscorus preceding the first of the sessions on the faith, and that it is the dates of the sessions that are in error. However, though it might seem more logical to us if the council had disposed of Dioscorus first, the words of the chairman at the end of the first session [cf. ACO 2, 1, 1, § 1068, p. 195, 11-24] were quite explicit that the next session, to be held almost immediately, was to attend to the faith, while the need for a full trial of Dioscorus was not immediately apparent. Secondly and most decisively, the acclamations in the second session demanding the reinstatement of Dioscorus [...] were a natural response to his suspension at the end of the first session [cf. ACO 2, 1, 1, § 1068, p. 195, 11-24] but would have been inconceivable after his formal trial and deposition in the third. In all, we may with confidence continue to date the first session on the faith to 10 October and to number it accordingly as the second session." For the second session of the Council of Chalcedon see also P.-Th. Camelot, *Ephesus and Chalcedon*, Mainz, 1963, p. 141-143.

this and most of the sessions of the Council of Chalcedon, reminded the reassembled bishops². The heads of the Second Council of Ephesus who were deposed at the end of the first session were not present in the second session³. Already the letters of Emperor Marcian sent to the assembled bishops before the opening of the new ecumenical council at Chalcedon had indicated that the chief reason of its convening was the necessity to confirm the orthodox faith in order to establish peace and doctrinal harmony in Eastern Christendom⁴. By the time of the Council of Chalcedon the creed of the Council of Nicaea (325) had become an irreplaceable document of the orthodox faith. This had been already confirmed by the First Council of Ephesus which had explicitly forbidden in its Canon 7 the production of any new creed in addition to the Creed of Nicaea⁵.

² Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 2, p. 78 [274], 5-6; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 2, p. 10. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*, London, 1953, p. 109; n. 5.

³ Cf. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 109; R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon: A Narrative* (451), in *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400-700*, (Translated Texts for Historians, Contexts 1), ed. R. Price and M. Whitby, Liverpool, 2009, p. 76.

⁴ Cf. ACO 2, 3, 1, p. 20, 30-21, 7 (ep. 32; the Greek text is lost); ACO 2, 1, 1, § 14, p. 28-29 (ep. 14); ACO 2, 1, 1, § 16, p. 30 (ep. 16); for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, Documents 12, 14 and 15, p. 107 and p. 108-110; vol. 2, p. 2, n. 3.

⁵ For the so-called Canon 7 of the First Council of Ephesus (431), which was much cited at the Second Council of Ephesus (449) and at the Council of Chalcedon (451) as forbidding the imposition of additional doctrinal texts and the composition of new definitions, see ACO 3, 1, 1, § 943, p. 221, 23-222, 4, for an English translation of the text of Canon 7 of Ephesus from the full Latin version of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, § 943, p. 323. According to their translation that canon is as follows: "When this had accordingly been read, the holy council laid down that no one is allowed to produce or write or compose another creed beside the one laid down with the aid of the Holy Spirit by the holy fathers who assembled at Nicaea; and that as regards those who dare to compose another creed, or produce or present it to those who wish to turn to the knowledge of the truth whether from paganism or Judaism or any form of heresy, they, if they are bishops or clerics, are to be expelled, the bishops from episcopacy and the clerics from the clergy, while if they are laymen they are to be anathematized. In the same way, if any are found, whether bishops or clerics or laymen, either holding or teaching the things contained in the exposition of the incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God presented by the presbyter Charisius,

Therefore, the two Ephesine Councils of 431 and 449 had sought to settle the doctrinal matters and to confirm the faith by approving certain documents that already existed as orthodox explanations of the Nicene Creed and by condemning and deposing certain persons who in their point of view contradicted or opposed the Nicene Creed. This was also the expectation of the bishops reassembled at the second session of the Council of Chalcedon. They also expected to settle the doctrinal controversy by a formal ratification of *Tomus Leonis*, which Marcian and Pulcheria considered to be the most important document in the present doctrinal issue, and by punishing the patriarch of Alexandria and other adversaries of Pope Leo. Also the Roman representatives of the Apostolic see expected the Tome of Leo to be approved by the council as the definitive Christological statement in the settlement of the doctrinal controversy⁶. Therefore the reaction of the bishops was that of a shock and great amazement, when at the very outset of the second session the patrician Anatolius, who chaired the second session as spokesman for all the imperial representatives present, told the assembled bishops to “produce a pure exposition of the faith”, that is a new definition of the faith or a new creed⁷. But the assembly of the bishops present protested most strongly against the suggestion of the patrician Anatolius. They said that it was in no way permissible for them to produce any new exposition of the faith apart from what had been taught by the Fathers and set down in writing, and that the approval of Leo’s Tome alone is quite enough for the protection and confirmation of the orthodox faith⁸. Against the protests of the bishops the patrician Anatolius proposed that a select committee should be set up to “deliberate in common about the faith”. He

or the abominable and perverted doctrines of Nestorius, which are also attached, they are to be subjected to the verdict of this holy and ecumenical council, with the result, clearly, that a bishop is to be stripped of episcopacy and deposed, a cleric is likewise to lose his rank, while if he is a layman, he too is to be anathematized as has been stated above.” The canon actually applied only to the formula to be used in the reception of converts, as also Price and Gaddis note; cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, p. 323, n. 423.

⁶ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 2-3; R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 74-75.

⁷ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 2, p. 78 [274], 6-12; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 2, p. 10. Cf. also *Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 3, n. 5; R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75; R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

⁸ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, §§ 3-5, p. 78 [274], 17-24; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, §§ 3-5, p. 10-11. Cf. also *Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 3, R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75; R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

proposed that the chief metropolitans and a few of their bishops should come together and think in common about the faith, in order that every dispute concerning the orthodox faith might be removed. The chairman said also that even those bishops who would appear to be of a contrary opinion may reveal their opinions too⁹. The bishops protested again and appealed to above-mentioned Canon 7 of the First Council of Ephesus (431), crying: "We will not produce a written exposition. There is a canon which declares that what has already been expounded is sufficient. The canon forbids the making of another exposition. Let the [will] of the fathers prevail"¹⁰. One of the assembled bishops, Florentius of Sardis, in order to reconcile the bishops, suggested that postponement should be granted to them for reflection, because it was impossible for them who had been taught to follow the holy Council of Nicaea and the council convened at Ephesus in accordance with the faith of the holy fathers Cyril and Celestine, and had accepted Leo's Tome, to consider the question of the faith on the spur of the moment¹¹. Florentius also added: "Although indeed as regards ourselves, who have signed the letter of the most sacred Leo, we stand in no need of correction"¹². Both Florentius and, following him, the bishop of Sebastopolis, Cecropius, considered the doctrinal issue "well defined by the 318 holy fathers" to have been confirmed by the Tome of Leo which corresponded both to the Nicene Creed and to the teaching of the holy fathers and the First Council of Ephesus presided by Cyril, and therefore they saw no more necessity to produce any other definition of the faith. Cecropius asked the chairman that the Creed of Nicaea, which also Athanasius, Cyril, Celestine, Hilary, Basil, Gregory and now Pope Leo had confirmed, together with Leo's Tome be read out¹³. The chairman Anatolius agreed to Cecropius' request and the Nicene Creed was read out by Eunomius, the bishop of Nicomedia (which was the metropolitan see of Bithynia, in which Nicaea lay,

⁹ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 6, p. 78 [274], 25-31; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 6, p. 11, n. 20. Cf. also *Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 3; R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

¹⁰ The English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 7, p. 11; for the Greek text, cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 7, p. 78 [274], 32-34. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110, n. 2.

¹¹ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 8, p. 78 [274], 35-79 [275], 2; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 8, p. 11. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

¹² The English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 8, p. 11; for the Greek text, cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 8, p. 79 [275], 1-2.

¹³ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 9, p. 79 [275], p. 3-7; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 9, p. 11.

and therefore, the bishop of Nicomedia could possess the most genuine text of the creed of the Council of Nicaea)¹⁴. After the Nicene Creed had been read, the assembled bishops exclaimed that it was the orthodox faith in which they were baptized and in which they themselves baptized and according to which both Cyril and Pope Leo taught and believed¹⁵. The bishops present in the second session of the Council of Chalcedon stressed all the time that Leo's Tome is a valid confirmation and explanation of the Nicene faith and of the faith of the orthodox church fathers, and especially of Cyril, in order to limit themselves only to its proclamation and confirmation as an orthodox document expounding the Nicene Creed and avoid any further necessity to produce any other definition of the faith which for them the so-called Canon 7 of the First Council of Ephesus (431) explicitly prohibited. After the Creed of Nicaea had been read out, the patrician Anatolius himself ordered that now also "the exposition of the 150 holy fathers" should be read¹⁶, that is the Creed of the Council of Constantinople (381)¹⁷ which had been first referred to in the first session¹⁸. Before its being mentioned at the first session of the Council of Chalcedon¹⁹ the Constantinopolitan Creed (which was a free version of the Nicene Creed) is not mentioned in any other document that predates Chalcedon²⁰. As Price and Gaddis note with respect to the creed attributed to the Council of Constantinople of 381 and read out at Chalcedon, even though the council held at Constantinople in 381 had approved the mentioned creed (which is not sure either), it had certainly not presented it to be as authoritative as that of Nicaea itself, and probably very few of the bishops present at Chalcedon had even heard

¹⁴ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2 §§ 10-11, p. 79 [275], 8-26; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 10-11, p. 11-12, nn. 21-22.

¹⁵ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 12, p. 79 [275], 27-32; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 12, p. 12.

¹⁶ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 13, p. 79 [275], 33-35; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 13, p. 12.

¹⁷ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 14, p. 80 [276], 3-16; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 14, p. 12-13, n. 23.

¹⁸ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 1, § 1072, p. 195, 34-196, 6; for an English translation with an important comment, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, § 1072, p. 364-365, n. 520.

¹⁹ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 1, § 160, p. 91, 28-30; for an English translation with a useful comment, cf. Price and Gaddis, vol. 1, p. 158, n. 113.

²⁰ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 3.

of it²¹. The reference to this creed at the second session of the Council of Chalcedon and the instruction of the chairman that it should be read out after the Nicene Creed were probably intended to provide a precedent for supplementing the Nicene Creed and thereby for producing new confessions of faith apart from that of Nicaea²². The imperial commissioners intended thereby to get round the prohibition against production of new confessions of faith in Canon 7 of the First Council of Ephesus²³. They, of course, did not tell this to the assembled bishops who were ready to approve every orthodox document in support of defining the orthodox faith but not to produce a new definition of the faith by themselves²⁴. Also the reading of the Constantinopolitan Creed was accompanied by shouts of approval: "This is the faith of all. This is the faith of the orthodox. We all believe accordingly"²⁵. After the reading of the Creed attributed to the Council of Constantinople, the archdeacon Aetius proposed the reading of Cyril's doctrinal letters to Nestorius (*Obloquuntur*) and John of Antioch (*Laetentur caeli*)²⁶ which he himself read out²⁷. Both letters of Cyril were received by the bishops with shouts of acclamation: "We all believe accordingly. Pope Leo believes accordingly. Anathema to him who divides and him who confuses! This is the faith of Archbishop Leo. Leo believes accordingly. Leo and Anatolius believe accordingly. We all believe accordingly. As Cyril so we believe. Eternal is the

²¹ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 3, n. 6 and p. 191-194; R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75, n. 25; for the origin of the creed attributed to the Council of Constantinople, see esp. J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London, 1972, p. 296-331.

²² Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 3; see also *Ibid.* vol. 1, p. 365, n. 520. See also R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75.

²³ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 3.

²⁴ Cf. R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75.

²⁵ ACO, 2, 1, 2, § 15, p. 80 [276], 17-18; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 15, p. 13.

²⁶ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 16, p. 80 [276], 19-25; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 13. Both letters of Cyril had been already read out at the first session of the Council of Chalcedon (cf. ACO 2, 1, 1, § 240, p. 104, 15-106, 29 and § 246, p. 107, 22-111, 8) and were already contained in the minutes of the Home Synod of 448 at Constantinople; for an English translation of these letters see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 1, § 240, p. 173-177 and § 246, p. 178-183; see also *Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 3; R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75.

²⁷ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, §§ 18-19, p. 80 [276], 28-81 [277], 6; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, §§ 18-19, p. 13-14, nn. 24-25.

memory of Cyril. As is contained in the letters of Cyril, so we hold. We have believed accordingly, and we believe accordingly. Archbishop Leo thinks, believes and wrote accordingly"²⁸. After the bishops have declared that Pope Leo thought and believed in accordance with the mentioned letters of Cyril of Alexandria, the chairman proposed that "the letter of the most religious Leo, archbishop of the imperial and senior Rome be read"²⁹. Veronicianus, "the hallowed secretary of the divine consistory" read out Leo's *TomusadFlavianum*³⁰. Also Leo's Tome was received with shouts of bishops' approval: "This is the faith of the fathers. This is the faith of the apostles. We all believe accordingly. We orthodox believe accordingly. Anathema to him who does not believe accordingly! Peter has uttered this through Leo. The apostles taught accordingly. Leo taught piously and truly. Cyril taught accordingly. Eternal is the memory of Cyril. Leo and Cyril taught the same. Leo and Cyril taught accordingly. Anathema to him who does not believe accordingly! This is the true faith. We orthodox think accordingly. This is the faith of the fathers. Why was it not read out at Ephesus? Dioscorus concealed it"³¹. Despite the bishops' statement that "Leo and Cyril taught the same", the approval of Leo's Tome in the second session of the Council of Chalcedon was not unanimous, not all of them shared that opinion: the bishops of Illyricum and Palestine interrupted the reading of the document by pointing to three passages in Leo's *TomusadFlavianum*³² which seemed to them to imply Nestorius' heresy of dividing the natures and teaching in Christ two separate persons (*prosopa*)³³. It is possible that the objections raised by the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops to several passages of Leo's Tome had led to detailed discussions during the second session which were reduced in the record of the proceedings of the second session to three citations from Cyril of Alexandria which were quoted by

²⁸ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 20, p. 81 [277], 7-13; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 20, p. 14. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

²⁹ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 21, p. 81 [277], 14-16; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 21, p. 14.

³⁰ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 22, p. 81 [277], 20-22; for the full Greek text of Leo's Tome, see ACO 2, 1, 1, § 11, p. 10, 19-20, 5; for an English translation of the Greek version of the Tome (given in full at ACO 2, 1, 1, § 11, p. 10, 19-20, 5), see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 22, p. 14-24. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110, n. 5.

³¹ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 23, p. 81 [277], 23-31; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 23, p. 24-25. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110, n. 6.

³² Cf. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110; R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 4. Cf. also R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75.

³³ Cf. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110, n. 7.

archdeacon Aetius and Theodoret with the intention to demonstrate that Leo and Cyril were "really" in agreement as to the disputable Christological passages of Leo's Tome³⁴.

The first passage of Leo's Tome to which the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops took exception reads as follows: "For the payment of the debt owed by our nature divine nature was united to the passible nature, so that – this fitting our cure – one and the same, being the mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, would be able to die in respect of the one and would not be able to expire in respect of the other"³⁵. It was especially the concluding sentence of the quoted passage of Leo's Tome³⁶ that raised suspicion of the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops³⁷. In order to remove their suspicion Aetius, archdeacon of Constantinople read a passage from Cyril of Alexandria's *Obloquuntur* letter in order to demonstrate that there is no doctrinal disagreement between Leo and Cyril. He read the following passage from Cyril's Second Letter to Nestorius: "Since again his own body by the grace of God tasted death on our behalf, not as though he entered into the experience of death in regard to his own nature (for to say or think that would be lunacy) but, because, as I have just said, his own flesh tasted death"³⁸. Archdeacon Aetius wanted to show thereby that like Leo in his Tome, so also Cyril of Alexandria himself had clearly warned that the suffering should never be attributed to the divine nature of the Logos and that it was this very teaching of Cyril which Leo wanted to stress and defend by pointing, like

³⁴ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 4 and §§ 24-26, p. 25-26; for the Greek text, see ACO 2, 1, 2, §§ 24-26, p. 81 [277], 32-82 [278], 33.

³⁵ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 24, p. 81 [277], 33-82 [278], 3; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 24, p. 25. For the Greek text, see also ACO 2, 1, 1, p. 13, 13-16; for the Latin text, see S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum Episc. Constantinopolitanum (Epistula XXVIII) Additis Testimoniis Patrum et Eiusdem S. Leonis M. Epistula ad Leonem I Imp. (Epistula CLXV), ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, *Textus et Documenta, Series Theologica* 9, Rome, 1959, p. 24, vv. 57-60. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

³⁶ *Et mori posset ex uno et mori non posset ex altero*, in Silva-Tarouca, TD 9 (1959), p. 24, v. 60 = καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς δυνήθη καὶ τελευτᾶν ἐκ τοῦ ἑτέρου μὴ δυνήθη in ACO 2, 1, 1, p. 13, 16. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 246, n. 2.

³⁷ Cf. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

³⁸ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 24, p. 82 [278], 8-11 (= Cyril of Alexandria, Second Letter To Nestorius, in Cyril of Alexandria, *Select Letters*, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, Oxford, 1983, p. 8, 2-7); the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 24, p. 25. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

the orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, to the difference of the divine and human realities in Jesus Christ³⁹. The Illyrian and Palestinian bishops were not the only ones who took exception at the above-quoted passage of *Tomus Leonis*. Later, Timothy Aelurus, who was a staunch adherent of the Cyrillian one-nature Christology and the successor of Dioscorus of Alexandria on the See of Saint Mark, attacked in his refutation of Leo's Tome, which is today extant only in a Syriac translation (*CPG* 5482: *Refutatio synodi Chalcedonensis et tomi Leonis*⁴⁰), the same passage, which had offended the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops at Chalcedon, writing: "Notice how again he teaches similar things to Nestorius when he says he can die in one person and not expire in one, calling the mortal and the immortal two different things. But if (as he said before) he who was incarnate of Mary the Mother of God is the Father's eternal Word and he who was born of her is God and there is one person of God the Word incarnate, the incarnate died in the flesh for the salvation of the world"⁴¹. Timothy saw in Leo's two-nature doctrine a Nestorian division of one and the same God the Word into two different, mortal and immortal, persons, what had already been the fear of the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops prior to Timothy at Chalcedon. In his petition to the emperor Leo Timothy Aelurus (*CPG* 5485), denouncing the Christological doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, writes that "natures and persons and properties" were not mentioned by the Fathers of the Council of Nicaea, who never divided the one Christ but confessed that both divine and human realities in the economy belonged to the one person of Jesus Christ⁴².

The second passage of *Tomus Leonis* which raised the objection of the mentioned bishops is as follows: "For each form performs what is proper to it in association with the other, the Word achieving what is the Word's, while the body accomplishes what is the body's; the one shines with miracles while the

³⁹ Cf. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

⁴⁰ The refutation of *Tomus Leonis* is edited and translated into English by R. Y. Ebied and L. R. Wickham in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. C. Laga, J. A. Munitiz and L. Van Rompay, *OLA* 18 (1985), p. 115-166.

⁴¹ Ebied and Wickham, *OLA* 18 (1985), p. 147; cf. also R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 25, n. 76.

⁴² Cf. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity*, ed. G. Greatrex, R. R. Phenix, C. B. Horn, S. P. Brock and W. Witakowski, (*Translated Texts for Historians*, vol. 55), Liverpool, 2011, p. 143-144; see also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

other has succumbed to outrages"⁴³. This sentence was to be attacked constantly by the miaphysite adversaries of the Council of Chalcedon and Tome of Leo and criticized as an evidence of blatant Nestorianism in Leo's Tome⁴⁴. For them Leo was teaching thereby merely a transitory conjunction (συνάφεια) and no real (hypostatic) union of the Logos and a human being in Jesus Christ, but rather two Sons and two Persons⁴⁵. This was particularly the case of Timothy Aelurus who in his major anti-Chalcedonian work *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas* (CPG 5475), which is preserved only in an old Armenian translation⁴⁶, attacked

⁴³ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 25, p. 82 [278], 13-16; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol 2, § 25, p. 25, n. 79. For the Greek text, see also ACO 2, 1, 1, p. 14, 27-15, 1; for the Latin text, see S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum Episc. Constantinopolitanum (Epistula XXVIII), ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, p. 26, vv. 94-95. For the old Armenian text of the fragment, see Timotheus Aelurus, des Patriarchen von Alexandrien Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzter Lehre, ed. K. Ter-Mekertsschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz, Etschmiadzin-Leipzig, 1908, p. 78, 29-34 = Matenadaran Manuscript No. 1958, fol. 72v = ACO 2, 1, 1, p. 14, 27-15, 1. See also R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 247.

⁴⁴ Cf. R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 265-266ff.

⁴⁵ We read in this respect in R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 266-267: "The second passage [i.e. the above-mentioned passage on two forms] seemed even more blasphemous. Leo's *Agitenimutrage forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est*, Philoxenus asserts, makes it certain that, with the natures, the Pope 'numbers' the hypostases in Christ, and through his two 'forms' teaches two Sons and two Persons. Such blatant Nestorianism, he declares, must be either rejected or received in 'its entirety'. Severus takes the same view: Leo's doctrine is simply that of 'a relative communion of the forms'. Again and again in his work against the Grammarian he bids his opponent examine the statement in the Tome, along with what comes after it. Leo, he maintains, divides Emmanuel through apportioning to each nature, regarded separately, what on the one hand is God-befitting and what on the other is man-befitting; for to attribute to the one (*uni*) eating and fatigue, and to the other (*alteri*) the power to feed thousands and to walk on the sea is patently to divide the one Christ into two Persons. Throughout this section of the Tome, Severus holds, the Pope – unmindful of Cyril's injunction to Nestorius that he should 'cease dividing the natures after the union' – sets the natures side by side, and regards each as having an independent existence; consequently, the union becomes no more than a conjunction of the Logos and a Man".

⁴⁶ Timotheus Aelurus, des Patriarchen von Alexandrien Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzter Lehre, ed. K. Ter-Mekertsschian and E. Ter-

the above quoted second passage of Leo's Tome, seeing in Leo's language of "two forms" and in Leo's expression "in association with the other" an obvious separation of the one Jesus Christ into two separate persons (subjects) and thereby a destruction of the mystery of the Incarnation. Timothy Aelurus writes in response to it: "So, if you deny manifestly the mystery of Christ's economy with flesh then you should cry out shamelessly to Christ, as the ancient Jews did, and say, *'Why do you, being a man, make yourself God?'* (cf. Jn.10.33). But if the Only Begotten Word of God became a human being and did not shun the voluntary self-emptying for our salvation, then his prosopon is one, to whom we attribute both the things befitting God and the human ones, because *'[there is] one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom [are] all things and through whom we [exist]'* (1 Cor.8.6). *'[There is] one Lord, one faith, one baptism'* according to the assertion of blessed Paul (Eph.4.5), and our Lord Jesus Christ has not two forms, as it seems to the novel doctor, to the effect that the forms have separate operations (activities) or that one can distinguish two prosopa in Christ, because each form signifies two prosopa in Christ, and it is impious. Likewise [the words] 'with each other' and 'companionship' signify shamelessly two Christs for us. For one cannot use [the word] 'other' with respect to what is one, and one can never use [the phrase] 'to be in companionship with' for what is one. And no one who has learned to think in a correct way is found to teach such things with respect to the one prosopon of God the Word who became flesh without change"⁴⁷. In Leo's attribution of Christ's divine and human activities to the corresponding divine or human nature, each regarded separately as a respective source of its proper activities, Timothy Aelurus saw a patent division of the one Christ into two separate persons and a destruction of the strong Cyrilline affirmation that the same incarnate Word himself is the author and source of his divine and human activities, according to the hypostatic (true) union of divine and human elements in him (in Leo's dyophysite language Timothy saw no possibility for the communication of idioms and for the attribution of all biblical sayings to one and the same prosopon of the incarnate Logos): "But if the Word effects what belongs to him, as it seems to new Nestorius, [then] it is alien to the Godhead and to the blameless (perfect) nature to be seen and touched, and these things are rather proper to the human [nature]. It is in the same manner alien to a human being to be called true God, but it is proper to God alone. But has, then,

Minassiantz, Etschmiadzin-Leipzig, 1908. See also A.. B. Schmidt, „Die Refutatio des Timotheus Aelurus gegen Das Konzil von Chalcedon. Ihre Bedeutung für die Bekenntnisentwicklung der armenischen Kirche Persiens im 6. Jh.“, OrChris73 (1989), p. 149-165.

⁴⁷ Widerlegung, p. 80, 30-81, 20 = MatenadaranManuscript No. 1958, fol. 74r-v.

the divine evangelist John told a lie? Of course not! But it is rather the synod of the heretics that resists impudently (shamelessly) the divinely-inspired Scriptures. They do not believe that God "*showed himself upon earth and lived with men*" (Baruch 3.37), according to the word of the prophet. They do not believe that "*the Word was made flesh*" (Jn.1.14), remaining without change in the nature. They do not accept the voluntary self-emptying and poverty of God the Word that were economically performed for our salvation. They do not want to confess that the holy Virgin is Mother of God. They want that only the one prosopon of Christ sparkles, that is God the Word. They do not allow the precious body of Christ to be life-giving. They do not accept that that which is from David's seed "*will reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there will be no end*" (Lk.1.33), having shamelessly opposed the archangel Gabriel. For they teach that it fell only under sufferings, even if it is completely alien to the human nature to reign forever, and it is proper to God and is befitting him alone ... we have learned neither from the saints nor from the divinely-inspired Scripture that there are two forms in one Christ or there are two forms separated by activities. [We have neither learned] an incidental (non-essential) companionship (association), or rather a connection, which each of us is said to have with his neighbour, nor [have we learned] that each prosopon [effects] what is proper to it and what is its own, that the one is radiant with marvels, and the other fell under sufferings, but we have both learned and believe that there is one nature of God the Word which became flesh without change"⁴⁸.

⁴⁸ Widerlegung, p. 82, 4-37 = Matenadaran Manuscript No. 1958, fol. 75v-76v. In his rebuttal of Leo's Tome preserved in Syriac (CPG 5482) Timothy Aelurus quotes the following passage from Leo's Tome: "For just as change does not affect God by his loving [us], so the man is not destroyed by the greatness of God's dignity. For each form in association with the other effects what is proper to it, the Word effecting what belongs to him, the flesh accomplishing what its own things; the one sparkles with miracles the other succumbs to pains. Just as the Word is never removed from the Father's glory so the flesh did not abandon the nature of our race. For one and the same is son of God and truly son of man – God because "in the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God", man, because "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us" ... Timothy objects to the quoted passage of Leo's Tome in the following way: "Notice that he openly blasphemes by differentiating the God who loves and the particular man undestroyed by the greatness of the divine dignity. But he has stated that the man and the God each persists and effects its own things. Therefore God's Word ceases being born of woman but continues solely in the birth

The Leonine passage "Agitenimutraque forma cum alteriuscommunionem quod proprium est" which in the second session of the Council of Chalcedon had raised the objection of the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops was not scandalous only for Timothy Aelurus but also for such prominent opponents of Chalcedon like Severus of Antioch⁴⁹ and Philoxenus of Mabbug. Severus saw in Leo's

from the Father whose peer he is, for according to your argument, self-emptying does not attach him. How then does our Lord's flesh communicate eternal life, seeing it is lifegiving and he is Life, if its action succumbed to pains? How is the crucified the Lord of glory? If, as we believe, he gives life to the dead, what means is left to the other person of, as you put it, sparkling with miracles? How can you be so ignorant as to imagine that the body which can raise the dead succumbed to pains?": Ebied and Wickham, OLA 18 (1985), p. 149.

⁴⁹ For Severus' criticism of the above mentioned passage of Leo's Tome, cf. Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Oratio Prima et Orationis Secundae quae supersunt*, ed. J. Lebon, Syriac in CSCO 111 / Syr. 58 (1938), p. 284; Latin translation in Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Oratio Prima et Orationis Secundae quae supersunt*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 112 / Syr. 59 (1938), p. 221, 18-22; Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Prior*, ed. J. Lebon, Syriac in CSCO 93 / Syr. 45 (1929), p. 139; Latin translation in Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Prior*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 94 / Syr. 46 (1929), p. 96, 34-97, 3; Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Posterior*, ed. J. Lebon, Syr. in CSCO 101 / Syr. 50 (1933), p. 131; Latin translation in Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Posterior*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 102 / Syr. 51 (1933), p. 95, 15-19; Severi Antiocheni, *Orationes ad Nephaliū. Eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici Epistulae mutuae*, ed. J. Lebon, Syriac in CSCO 119 / Syr. 64 (1949), p. 84 ff (the phrase 'cum alteriuscommunionem' is omitted) and p. 180; the Latin translation in Severi Antiocheni, *Orationes ad Nephaliū. Eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici Epistulae mutuae*, ed. J. Lebon, in CSCO 120 / Syr. 65 (1949), p. 62, 9-13 ff and also p. 138, 27-30 ff (the English translation is in I. R. Torrance, *Christology After Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite, the Apology of Sergius*, Norwich, 1988, p. 154ff: "For if each form or nature does those things which are its own, those ... things are of a bastard partnership and of a relationship of friendship, such as a master's taking on himself the things which are performed by a servant, or vice versa, a servant's being glorified with the outstanding possessions of a master, while those things which are not properties of a human nature are ascribed to him out of a loving

teaching of two forms no substantial union but simply "a relative communion of the forms"⁵⁰. Like Timothy Aelurus and Severus, also Philoxenus of Mabbug understood Leo teaching through his two "forms" two Sons and two Persons. According to him, Leo's phrase "Agitenimutraque forma cum alteriuscommunionem quod proprium est" demonstrates that Leo with the natures numbers also the hypostases in Jesus Christ⁵¹. But Leo, in reality, as also R. Price and M. Gaddis note, was applying in the above mentioned passage the Aristotelian principle that every nature has its own proper movement⁵². Price and Gaddis write further in this respect: "The fact remains that Leo's understanding of the operations in Christ differed from Cyril's: for Cyril the duality of the operations exists *outside* Christ (that is, in the contrasting effects, some divine and some human, of the one 'theandric' [divine-human] activity), while for Leo it also exists *in* Christ, in whom each nature has its own striving towards the term of its activity. Following Augustine, Leo stressed the mediatorship of Christ, as God and man: only as man could he offer the supreme sacrifice, and this required human free will and a human nature that was not merely passive under the direction of the Word of God that assumed it, but possessed its own spontaneity"⁵³.

The archdeacon Aetius quoted a passage from Cyril's letter to Acacius of Melitene in order to demonstrate to the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops that there is no doctrinal disharmony between the above mentioned controversial passage of Leo's Tome and Cyril of Alexandria: "Some of the sayings are particularly

friendship. For he is a man clad with God, who in this way makes use of a power which is not his own, and is impelled by one who acts, like an inanimate instrument, perhaps a saw or an axe, which is used by a craftsman. But Jesus is not like that, away with you! For he is seen using his own power as God inhominate, and he confirms this with utterances worthy of God"; cf. also Ibid., op. cit., p. 231); Sévère d'Antioche, La Polémique Antijulianiste, III, L'Apologie du Philalèthe, édité par R. Hespel, Syr. in CSCO 318 / Syr. 136 (1971), p. 38; French in CSCO 319 / Syr. 137 (1971), p. 33, 10-16 ff.

⁵⁰ Cf. R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 267, n. 2; Eustathius Monachus, in PG 86, i, 925C.

⁵¹ Cf. R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 266-267, n. 1: "Nam Tomus Leonis manifeste una cum naturis, hypostases quoque numerat in Christo, et loco unius Filii duos [Filios] praedicat atque duas personas per duas formas, quarum dixit utramque agere cum alterius communionem quod proprium est."

⁵² Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 2, p. 25, n. 79; H. Chadwick, Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy, Oxford, 1981, p. 191-192.

⁵³ R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 2, p. 25, n. 79.

fitting to God, some again are particularly fitting to man, while others occupy a middle position, revealing the Son of God as God and man simultaneously and at the same time"⁵⁴. Price and Gaddis write⁵⁵ that in his letter to Acacius of Melitene Cyril was "trying to justify his acceptance (under pressure) of the Formula of Reunion" which distinguished the biblical sayings in the very same way⁵⁶ and which was fully quoted by Cyril in his letter to John of Antioch⁵⁷. Price and Gaddis also state that Cyril's "favoured position" was, according to his Fourth Anathema in his *Third Letter to Nestorius*, "that the sayings should not be distributed between the two natures"⁵⁸. But it should be noted that even in his writings before the acceptance of the Formula of Reunion Cyril did attribute some biblical sayings to the human φύσις of Christ and spoke of two different natures, and therefore, the acceptance of the Formula of Reunion by him cannot be interpreted as a forced concession to the Antiochenes on Cyril's part, and the careful reading of the mentioned anathema shows that Cyril actually opposed the ascription of the biblical sayings and terms to two different and separated persons or subjects in Christ, that is to the man considered separately from God the Word and to the Word of God considered again separately and by himself, and not the attribution of the biblical sayings to two individual natures of Christ which together form one separate reality⁵⁹. When Aetius quoted the above

⁵⁴ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 25, p. 82 [278], 20-22 (= Cyril of Alexandria, To Acacius of Melitene in Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, p. 52, 14-17); the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 2, § 25, p. 26. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 247-248.

⁵⁵ Cf. Price and Gaddis, vol. 2, p. 26, n. 80.

⁵⁶ "As regards the sayings concerning the Lord in the Gospels and the apostolic writings we know that theologians treat some as common, as relating to one person, and distinguish others, as relating to two natures, attributing the ones worthy of God to the Godhead of Christ and the lowly ones to his manhood", the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 1, § 246, p. 180; for the Greek text, see ACO 2, 1, 1, § 246, p. 109, 6-9. For another English translation of the Formula of Reunion, see also Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters, ed. and trans. L. R. Wickham, p. 222.

⁵⁷ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 1, § 246, p. 108, 17-109, 9; for an English translation, see Price and Gaddis, vol. 1, § 246, p. 179-180.

⁵⁸ See R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 2, p. 26, n. 80.

⁵⁹ Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, Third Letter to Nestorius in Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, Greek: p. 30, 1-6, English translation: p. 31: "Whoever allocates the terms contained in the gospels and apostolic writings

mentioned passage from Cyril's letter to Acacius of Melitene, he wanted it to be assumed that like Cyril, also Leo would have acknowledged that all the biblical sayings and all the divine and human activities were those of the one person of the incarnate divine Logos, and that the same principle of distinguishing between the biblical sayings concerning Jesus Christ which was laid down in the *Formula of Reunion* and which Cyril was explaining in his letter to Acacius, lay also

and applied to Christ by the saints or used of himself by himself to two persons or subjects and attaches some to the man considered separately from the Word of God, some as divine to the Word of God the Father alone, shall be anathema". Cf. in this respect especially H. van Loon, *The Christology of Cyril of Alexandria: Milestone on the Road to Chalcedon*, Culemborg, 2007, p. 493-495 and p. 549-554. Cf. also Cyril of Alexandria, *To Acacius of Melitene* in *Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters*, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, Greek: p. 52, 1-14, English translation: p. 53: "The Antiochene brethren, on the one hand, taking the recognized elements of Christ at the level only of mere ideas, have mentioned a difference of natures, because, as I have said, Godhead and manhood are not the same thing in quality of nature, yet they do declare there is one Son and Christ and Lord, and, since he is actually one in reality, that his person too is one; by no manner of means do they divide what are in union nor do they accept the physical division of that proponent of pitiful ingenuities. They maintain that it is only the terms applied to the Lord which are divided; they do not mean that some of these apply to a Son in isolation, the Word of God, some again to a different woman-born son, but instead that some apply to his Godhead some to his manhood (for the same Son is God and man), others too they assert, much as I do, are to be applied in some way jointly, those looking, so to say, to both aspects (Godhead and manhood, I mean)"; and *Idem*, *Second Letter to Nestorius* in *Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters*, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, Greek: p. 4, 22-6, 9, English translation: p. 5-7: "We do not mean that the nature of the Word was changed and made flesh or, on the other hand, that he was transformed into a complete man consisting of soul and body, but instead we affirm this: that the Word substantially united to himself flesh, endowed with life and reason, in a manner mysterious and inconceivable, and became man, and was called 'Son of Man' uniting it substantially, not merely by way of divine favour or good will, yet neither with the assumption merely of an outward appearance; and that though the natures joined together to form a real unity are different, it is one Christ and Son coming from them – not implying that the difference between the natures was abolished through their union but that instead Godhead and manhood have given us the one Lord, Christ and Son by their mysterious and inexplicable unification".

behind Leo's words, who, like Cyril, was allocating, in a quite orthodox way, to the Godhead of Christ those things which were God-befitting and to Christ's manhood those things which were lowly and human⁶⁰.

The third passage in *Tomus Leonisto* which the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops took exception at the second session of the Council of Chalcedon is as follows: "Although indeed in the Lord Jesus Christ there is one person of God and man, nevertheless that because of which the outrage is common in both is one thing and that because of which the glory is common is another, for he has from us the humanity that is less than the Father, and he has from the Father the Godhead that is equal with the Father"⁶¹. This passage in *Tomus Leonis* was later attacked also by Timothy Aelurus in his *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas* who saw in it again, despite Leo's confession that "in the Lord Jesus Christ there is one person of God and man", an obvious Nestorian division of one and the same Christ into two separate persons who were merely relatively conjoined with each other according to the common dignity or the sovereign power. Timothy Aelurus writes in his refutation of the mentioned passage in Leo's Tome: "The choir of the divine apostles, who were the eyewitnesses and the ministers of the Lord (cf. Lk. 1.2), proclaimed one Lord Jesus Christ under heaven, and those who became later holy teachers of God's churches, following in the footsteps of the apostles, handed down the belief in one God, the Father almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God to us, and taught that he is God and Light and that he is consubstantial with the Father, even if they proclaimed him in flesh under heaven. For he is not proclaimed (preached) by them in the world, being still naked and without flesh. For [though] these names, I mean "Jesus", "Christ" and "man", were not proper to God the Word before the incarnation, all the names both before and after the incarnation became his own after his birth from a woman. Therefore, after this he was proclaimed by the saint apostles of the holy church without any distinction now incarnate now God, Lord Jesus Christ, eternal life, true God, one Lord Jesus Christ. But this novel Nestorius opposed the holy apostles and the teachers of God's holy church and, belching nonsense for us

⁶⁰ Cf. R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 247.

⁶¹ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 26, p. 82 [278], 24-28; the English translation is by Price and Gaddis, vol. 2, § 26, p. 26. For the Greek text, see also ACO 2, 1, 1, p. 16, 4-8; for the Latin text, see S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum Episc. Constantinopolitanum (Epistula XXVIII) Additis Testimoniis Patrum et Eiusdem S. Leonis M. Epistula ad Leonem I Imp. (Epistula CLXV), ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, p. 28, vv. 122-125. For the old Armenian text of the fragment, see *Widerlegung*, p. 108, 13-17 = *Matenadaran Manuscript* No. 1958, fol. 99r = ACO 2, 1, 1, p. 16, 4-7. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 248.

from his heart, says not in the spirit of the Lord, "For although (he says) it seems that there is one *prosopon* (person) of Christ because of a mere relative (non-essential) conjunction (connection) of God and of the man who is from Mary, it is not so. He says it is not so, for there is one *prosopon* and another. Therefore one is joined with another by reason of the relative conjunction, according to the dignity or the sovereign power. The shame and the sufferings are attributed again to the man, and the things which are worthy of glory [are attributed] to God the Word". And the things he has just said are similar to what he had previously said, "For each form in association with the other effects what is proper to it, the Word effecting what belongs to him, the flesh accomplishing its own things. For one of them sparkles with miracles, the other succumbs to sufferings or insults (injuries)". And now again, "For although, rather, there is one *prosopon* (person) of God and man in the Lord Jesus Christ⁶², nevertheless the source in each of them of what is called the common shame, because he makes it his own, is one thing and the source of the common glory another". But we do not have this custom or confession of the impious ones, nor do the churches of God. For we have received from the holy fathers [the doctrine] that the Word of God who is before the eternity, for our sake and for our salvation came down from heaven without flesh and was made flesh from the Mother of God Virgin Mary and, having been born from her as a human being, he suffered on our behalf (for our sake) in flesh and died and was buried and rose from the dead on the third day and appeared to the disciples and showed them his hands and feet which had been nailed to the wood (tree) and his redemptive (saving) side that had been pierced, convincing them of his resurrection, that He who was crucified rose from the dead for the sake of immortal life. It is this one who was taken up into heaven and sat on the right hand of the Father and will come with his glory to judge the living and the dead and to repay everyone according to his deeds, demanding account of both vane and blasphemous words"⁶³. In his other refutation of the "blasphemies" uttered in the letter of Leo bishop of Rome, which is preserved only in Syriac (CPG 5482), Timothy objected: "By confessing Christ as "our Lord" he again craftily subverts the expression "God and man". But he has subverted [this] by saying that the person is one. And again as if he had forgotten his own words he subverts them by speaking of "one" and "another". How, then, tell me, could "one" have become "one and another"? For "one" and "two" cannot be thought of as being the same, neither can the concept of unity be attributed to "one and another". How can you call "Lord" him who borrowed from another person his being lord as you said, 'by a connexion of

⁶² Or "For although in the Lord Jesus Christ God and man there is one person..."

⁶³ *Widerlegung*, p. 110, 7-111, 26 = *Matenadaran Manuscript* No. 1958, fol. 100v-102v.

fellowship'? Therefore, at all points you are shown to be in contradiction with what you said at the beginning. For the terminology of "one and another" belongs to those who divide, terminology which you apply to each nature, artfully using the word 'unity' as its companion and safeguarder, relying, I suppose, on the force of the division being unimpaired by the unity. For it belongs to an introducer of that connection of fellowship which each of us has with God, to have one who makes his own another's properties and renders them common, the glory belonging to God on the one hand, the weakness attributed to man on the other. Nestorius, too, in his teaching says: 'I divide the natures but unite the worship'"⁶⁴.

That time it was Theodoret of Cyrrhus who spoke up in support of Leo's Tome in the second session of the Council of Chalcedon, quoting a passage from Cyril of Alexandria's *Scholia de Incarnatione*: "He became man without shedding what was his own, for he remained what he was; he is certainly conceived as one dwelling in another, that is, the divine nature in what is human"⁶⁵. In the passage quoted by Theodoret Cyril was expressing the incarnation by way of the Godhead's indwelling in the manhood of Christ as in a temple. This way of expression was very dear to the Antiochenes.⁶⁶ Theodoret's argument was, like that of the archdeacon Aetius, that Leo, like Cyril, was not separating the natures to such an extent as to posit two different sons or persons. On the contrary, Theodoret's point was to demonstrate that Leo, as Sellers puts it⁶⁷, was 'understanding' (*intelligere*) Christ's two natures in their difference and was showing how outrage belonged to Christ's manhood and glory to his Godhead. Both Aetius and Theodoret, by their reference to Cyril, were claiming that in the three above-quoted controversial passages of his Tome Leo was in no way dividing the one Christ into two different subjects, but was in full accordance with Cyril himself in recognizing the difference of the divine and human natures united in Christ⁶⁸.

⁶⁴ Ebied and Wickham, OLA 18 (1985), p. 152. Cf. also Price and Gaddis, vol. 2, p. 26, n. 81.

⁶⁵ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 26, p. 82 [278], 32-33 (= ACO 1.5, p. 228, 20-21); the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 26, p. 26, n. 82. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 248, n. 2.

⁶⁶ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 26, n. 82.

⁶⁷ Cf. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

⁶⁸ Cf. *Ibid*, *op. cit.*, p. 248 ff. That Theodoret spoke up in support of the Tome was noted by the Pope Leo himself in a letter to Theodoret of 453: cf. ACO 2, 4, Ep. 120, p. 80; R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 26, n. 82.

Though the archdeacon of Constantinople Aetius and Theodoret of Cyrrhus quoted equivalent passages from Cyril's works to demonstrate the doctrinal unanimity between him and the pope, Illyrian and Palestinian bishops were not satisfied and they demanded through their spokesman, Atticus, the bishop of Nicopolis, that also Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius (*Cum Salvator*) be taken into consideration which contained Cyril's famous Twelve Chapters against Nestorius⁶⁹. The mentioned bishop asked that they might be given time to compare the letter of Leo with Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius⁷⁰. While Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius was ignored by moderate adherents of the Alexandrian patriarch (who championed especially his more conciliatory letter to John of Antioch and Second Letter to Nestorius which played a more dominant role at Chalcedon), his more radical and uncompromising followers constantly referred to Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius (which was the reason for what Cyril's moderate followers ignored that letter) in order to demonstrate that there could be no doctrinal harmony between what had been defined and confirmed at Chalcedon and what had been taught by Cyril in his Twelve Chapters appended to the Third Letter to Nestorius. The fact that the spokesman of the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops, Atticus of Nicopolis, referred to Cyril's Third Letter and asked that it be taken into account at the Council of Chalcedon was not to remain without consequences: just as the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops had a difficulty to find a doctrinal harmony between Leo's Tome and Cyril's Twelve Chapters, so it was to be later also for Timothy Aelurus who was the first major anti-Chalcedonian author who in his *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas* (CPG 5475) opposed the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril to the Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith in order to show that there was never any doctrinal unanimity between the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria's writings and the Christology of Leo's Tome and the Council of Chalcedon. As in the second session of the Council of Chalcedon, in the course of which, after Cyril's Second Letter to Nestorius, his Letter to John of Antioch and the Tome of Leo had been read out, the bishops declared that Cyril and Leo are in agreement with each other as regards their teaching (an exception being the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops)⁷¹, so also in the proceedings of the fourth session of the council we find statements of many

⁶⁹ For Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius, see Cyril of Alexandria, *Select Letters*, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, p. 12-32.

⁷⁰ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 29, p. 82 [278], 37-83 [279], 5; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 29, p. 26-27; see also *Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 4, n. 8; R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110-111; R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 75-76.

⁷¹ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 23, p. 81 [277], 23-31; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 23, p. 24-25. R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

bishops concerning the doctrinal harmony between Leo's Tome and Cyril's conciliar letters (the reference was primarily to the Second Letter to Nestorius which was approved at the first session of the First Council of Ephesus)⁷². The same idea is expressed also in the text of the Chalcedonian Definition where after the two above-mentioned letters of Cyril Leo's Tome is referred to as equally orthodox and important "for the confirmation of the true doctrines"⁷³. Timothy Aelurus categorically rejected this assertion of the Chalcedonian Fathers: "They calumniate our blessed Father and Archbishop Cyril as though he, like them, taught in his synodical letters addressed to Nestorius the same impious things, [which were written] in the letter of Leo in order to seduce (deceive) suddenly those who are simpler. Accordingly, they show, in an exaggerated way, as I think, that [Cyril] thinks of the same duad [of persons] like Nestorius, for also Leo, the destroyer of Christ's flocks, wrote concerning this [duad], or rather, determined it by means of his writing, or rather, his letter"⁷⁴ ... And how are the writings of the blessed Cyril addressed to Nestorius consonant with those things which Leo impiously wrote in his letter to Flavian? For Leo, as it was proved above, teaches everywhere division and two natures, which operate separately, and two sons, and two prosopa in reference to one Christ, our Lord and God, and does not confess that the holy Virgin is Mother of God. But the blessed Cyril teaches everywhere that Emmanuel, who was born of the holy Mother of God Mary, is one Son and one Lord, always attributing to him both the divine and human things, and confesses him to be God in truth. And hence the holy Virgin is Mother of God. He says that it is this one who was crucified and buried and rose again and will come to judge the quick and the dead according to the doctrine of the Apostles and of the blessed Fathers at Nicaea, and it is this confession which is to be confessed. For [Cyril], writing to Nestorius, anathematizes his impious and abominable (unholy) doctrines until his last letter written to him"⁷⁵. After Timothy had quoted the Twelve Chapters

⁷² Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 9.1-158, p. 94 [290], 4-109 [305], 6 (for example § 9.1-5, p. 94 [290], 4-25; § 9.10-12, p. 94 [290], 34-95 [291], 8; § 9.14-29, p. 95 [291], 12-97 [293], 19; § 9.39-51, p. 98 [294], 17-100 [296], 4ff); cf. also ACO 2, 3, 2, § 9.1-161, p. 106 [365], 9-112 [371], 33; for an English translation see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 9.1-161, p. 127-146.

⁷³ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 34, p. 129 [325], 6-16.

⁷⁴ *Widerlegung*, p. 164, 13-20 = *Matenadaran Manuscript No. 1958*, fol. 153v-154r.

⁷⁵ *Widerlegung*, p. 164, 29-165, 11 = *Matenadaran Manuscript No. 1958*, fol. 154r-v.

appended to Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius⁷⁶ and two passages from Cyril's writing *On the Creed*(Ep. 55)⁷⁷ to prove that there is a vast doctrinal chasm between Cyril's Christological teaching and that of Leo and Chalcedon, he writes: "So, it has been plainly demonstrated by the things quoted above that those things which the impious Leo wrote to Flavian and those things which were decreed by the council of the scorners are not consonant with those things which the blessed Cyril wrote to Nestorius or with his other works and treatises, which these people, having mentioned, misrepresented, as if they were unsuitable for the confirmation of the orthodox doctrines, for light has no fellowship with darkness, and a believer has nothing in common with an unbeliever (cf. 2 Cor.6.14-15). Therefore, let them not mix the orthodox name of the blessed Cyril instead of honey, them, who find excuses for [their] sins and want to disseminate (spread) their poison in the souls of those, who are simpler, and to conceal impiously their cunning from them"⁷⁸.

Cyril of Alexandria's Third Letter to Nestorius was no more mentioned in the subsequent sessions of the Council of Chalcedon⁷⁹. After bishop Atticus of Nicopolis had asked for taking into consideration also Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius and to compare it with *Tomus Leonis*, whose proposal was recorded but in reality ignored, the chairman of the second session proposed an adjournment of further discussion of the faith at a formal session of the council until the supporters of Leo had provided further reassurance for those who were not in full agreement with Leo's Tome at a meeting which should be held at the residence of Anatolius of Constantinople. They proposed that Anatolius should select from among the bishops who had signed Leo's Tome those who he considered competent to instruct Atticus and the other objectors and reassure them⁸⁰. At the close of the second session the supporters of Dioscorus asked that Dioscorus and the other five leaders of the Second Ephesine Council (Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Eusebius of Ancyra,

⁷⁶ See Widerlegung, p. 165, 14-167, 35 = Matenadaran Manuscript M No. 1958, fol. 154v-156v = Cyril of Alexandria, Third Letter to Nestorius in Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, p. 28, 23-32, 16.

⁷⁷ See Widerlegung, p. 168, 2-14 and 16-38 = Matenadaran Manuscript No. 1958, fol. 156v-157v = Cyril of Alexandria, On the Creed(Ep. 55) in Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters, ed. and trans. by L. R. Wickham, p. 130, 1-12 and p. 130, 12-30.

⁷⁸ Widerlegung, p. 169, 1-14 = Matenadaran Manuscript No. 1958, fol. 157v.

⁷⁹ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 2, p. 4, n. 9, and vol. 1, p. 63-68.

⁸⁰ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 31-33, p. 83 [279], 8-18; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 2, §§ 31-33, p. 27. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, op. cit., p. 110-111; R. Price and M. Gaddis, The Acts, vol. 2, p. 4.

Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia in Isauria) who were suspended at the close of the first session be restored to the council, saying again that they all had erred⁸¹. Their request caused the opposition of the bishops from the diocese of the east and of the representatives of the clergy of Constantinople⁸². After the Oriental bishops and the representatives of the Constantinopolitan clergy had exclaimed "the Egyptian into exile"⁸³ and "Dioscorus into exile"⁸⁴, the Illyrians pleaded again that Dioscorus should be restored to the council⁸⁵, to which the clerics of Constantinople replied: "He who is in communion with Dioscorus is a Jew"⁸⁶, and the Orientals exclaimed again: "The Egyptian into exile! The heretic into exile!"⁸⁷. This confrontation of the Illyrian bishops with those from the diocese of the east and with the representatives of the Constantinopolitan clergy showed clearly that the deposition of Dioscorus and his chief allies at the end of the first session had caused a serious division in the council and had become a threaten to all its work⁸⁸. Though the answer of the imperial commissioners to the plea of the supporters of Dioscorus to restore him and the other five bishops

⁸¹ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 34, p. 83 [279], 19-21; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 34, p. 27, n. 88. Cf. also R. V. Sellers, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

⁸² Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, §§ 35-36, p. 83 [279], 22-24; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, §§ 35-36, p. 28.

⁸³ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 36, p. 83 [279], 23-24 and § 38, p. 83 [279], 27-28; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 36 and § 38, p. 28.

⁸⁴ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 40, p. 83 [279], 32-33; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 40, p. 28, n. 90.

⁸⁵ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 41, p. 83 [279], 34-36; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 41, p. 28, n. 91.

⁸⁶ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 42, p. 83 [279], 37-38; the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 42, p. 28.

⁸⁷ ACO 2, 1, 2, § 43, p. 84 [280], 1-2, the English translation is by R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 43, p. 28.

⁸⁸ Cf. R. Price, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 76. Cf. also ACO 2, 1, 2, § 39 and § 41, p. 83 [279], 29-31 and 34-36; for an English translation with supplements from the Latin version of the Acts, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 39 and 41, p. 28, n. 91. As the subsequent development of the events after the Council of Chalcedon showed the warnings of the Illyrian bishops (§ 39: "The churches are divided" and § 41: "May no misfortune occur in your time. May no misfortune occur in your reign. May there be no division in your reign") were really prophetic ones, the deposition and exile of Dioscorus in the third session of the Council of Chalcedon did divide the eastern church.

to the council is not recorded, one can assume that it was a negative one, because the following third session of the Council of Chalcedon was in fact devoted to the full trial of Dioscorus, and the other five suspended bishops were not restored until the fourth session⁸⁹. The second session of the Council of Chalcedon was closed by the declaration of its chairman, the patrician Anatolius, that the proposals he had made would "be put into effect"⁹⁰. This meant that a special committee would be set up in order to draft a new definition of the faith which Marcian had planned to be the council's principal work. What the committee drew up was presented to the assembled bishops at the fifth session of the Council of Chalcedon. Though the suggestion of the chairman at the beginning of the second session to produce a new definition of the faith had not gained the full approval of the assembled bishops, the resistance of the bishops was ignored: it was in no way to become an impediment to the plan of the imperial government, that is, of Marcian and Pulcheria, to become a new Constantine and Helena, supplementing the Nicene Creed with a new definition of the faith, which was to be drawn up under their direction for the final settlement of all the doctrinal disputes which were threatening the ecclesiastical peace and union in Eastern Christendom⁹¹.

ԳՐԻԳՈՐՅԱՆ ԳՐԻԳՈՐ (ՄԼՀ, ԳԵՐՄԱՆԻԱ)

ՔԱՂԱԿԵՂՈՆԻ ԺՈՂՈՎԻ ԵՐԿՐՈՐԴ ՆԻՍՏԻ (10 ՀՈԿՏԵՄԲԵՐ 451 Թ.) ՇՈՒՐՋ

Հողվածում քննության է առնվում Քաղկեդոնի ժողովի երկրորդ նիստի ընթացքը իր դավանաբանական որոշումներով: Ուսումնասիրվում է ժողովի երկրորդ նիստի ընթացքում Նիկեական հանգանակի, Կ. Պոլսի Տիեզերական ժողովի հանգանակի, Կյուրեղ Ալեքսանդրացու երկու ժողովական նամակների (Նեստորիոսին ուղղված երկրորդ նամակի և Հովհաննես Անտիոքացուն ուղղված նամակի) և Լևոն պապի Տումարի՝ որպես ուղղափառ հավատքի

⁸⁹ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, §§ 14-18, p. 109 [305] 27-110 [306], 5; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, *The Fourth Session*, §§ 14-18, p. 147.

⁹⁰ Cf. ACO 2, 1, 2, § 45, p. 84 [280], 5-6; for an English translation, see R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, § 45, p. 28, n. 92.

⁹¹ Cf. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts*, vol. 2, p. 5.

անխտելի չափանիշներ հռչակվելու գործընթացը: Քննության է առնվում Հռոմի Լևոն պապի (441-461 թթ.) Կ. Պոլսի պատրիարք Փղաբիանոսին ուղղված Տումարի երեք վիճելի հատվածների բովանդակությունը, որոնց ուղղափառ լինելը կասկածի տակ էին առել Իլիրիացի և Պաղեստինցի եպիսկոպոսները, և այդ հատվածների հերքումը Ալեքսանդրիայի պատրիարք Տիմոթեոս Կուզի (457-477 թթ.) կողմից իր հայտնի Հակաճառությունում ուղղված Լևոնի Տումարի և Քաղկեդոնի ժողովի սահմանման դեմ:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(A) Sources

1. Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 2, 1, 1, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Berlin and Leipzig, 1933.
2. Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 2, 1, 2, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Berlin and Leipzig, 1933.
3. Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 2, 3, 1, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Berlin and Leipzig, 1935.
4. Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 2, 3, 2, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Berlin and Leipzig, 1936.
5. Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 2, 4, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Berlin and Leipzig, 1937.
6. The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, ed. and trans. R. Price and M. Gaddis, vol. 1-3, in: TTH 45, Liverpool, 2005.
7. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. Church and War in Late Antiquity*, ed. G. Greatrex, R. R. Phenix, C. B. Horn, S. P. Brock and W. Witakowski, TTH 55, Liverpool, 2011.
8. Cyril of Alexandria, *Select Letters*, ed. and trans. L. R. Wickham, Oxford, 1983.
9. S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum Episc. Constantinopolitanum (Epistula XXVIII) Additis Testimoniis Patrum et Eiusdem S. Leonis M. Epistula ad Leonem I Imp. (Epistula CLXV), ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, Textus et Documenta, Series Theologica 9, Rome, 1959.
10. Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Prior*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 93 / Syr. 45, Paris, 1929.

11. Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Prior*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 94 / Syr. 46, Leuven, 1929.
12. Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Posterior*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 101 / Syr. 50, Paris, 1933.
13. Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis Tertiae Pars Posterior*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 102 / Syr. 51, Leuven, 1933.
14. Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Oratio Prima et Orationis Secundae quae supersunt*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 111 / Syr. 58, Paris, 1938.
15. Severi Antiocheni, *Liber contra impium Grammaticum, Oratio Prima et Orationis Secundae quae supersunt*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 112 / Syr. 59, Leuven, 1938.
16. Severi Antiocheni, *Orationes ad Nephaliū. Eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici Epistulae mutuae*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 119 / Syr. 64, Leuven 1949.
17. Severi Antiocheni, *Orationes ad Nephaliū. Eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici Epistulae mutuae*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 120 / Syr. 65, Leuven, 1949.
18. Sévère d'Antioche, *La Polémique Antijulianiste*, III, *L'Apologie du Philalèthe*, ed. R. Hespel, CSCO 318 / Syr. 136, Louvain 1971, and CSCO 319 / Syr. 137, Louvain 1971.
19. Timothy Aelurus, *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas* (CPG 5475), ed. K. Ter-Mēkērttschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz, *Timotheus Älurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzten Lehre*, Leipzig, 1908.
20. Timothy Aelurus, *Refutatio synodi Chalcedonensis et tomi Leonis* (CPG 5481), ed. and trans. R. Y. Ebied, L. R. Wickham, OLA 18 (1985), [p. 115-166], p. 120-142 (text), p. 143-166 (translation).

(B) Secondary Literature

1. Camelot, P.-Th., *Ephesus and Chalcedon*, GÖK 2, ed. G. Dumeige and H. Bacht, Mainz, 1963.
2. Chadwick, H., *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy*, Oxford, 1981.
3. Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Creeds*, London, 1972.

4. Price, R., *The Council of Chalcedon: A Narrative (451)*, in: *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400-700*, ed. R. Price and M. Whitby, TTH, Contexts 1, Liverpool, 2009.
5. Schmidt, A.. B., „Die *Refutatio* des Timotheus Aelurus gegen Das Konzil von Chalcedon. Ihre Bedeutung für die Bekenntnisentwicklung der armenischen Kirche Persiens im 6. Jh.“, *OrChris* 73 (1989), p. 149-165.
6. Sellers, R. V., *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*, London, 1953.
7. Torrance, I. R., *Christology After Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite, the Apology of Sergius*, Norwich, 1988.
8. van Loon, H., *The Christology of Cyril of Alexandria: Milestone on the Road to Chalcedon*, Culemborg, 2007.

Abbreviations

ACO – Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum

CPG – Clavis Patrum Graecorum

CSCO – Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium

GÖK – Geschichte der ökumenischen Konzilien

OLA – Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta

OrChris – Oriens Christianus

TTH – Translated Texts for Historians