Rufinus of Aquileia - c 345 - 410 - Altaner 459-462- Gr 317 f.
   translated and defended Origen - Word man framework
Marius Victorinus Afer - d. after 362 - Altaner 430-4232  - Gr 919-21
   Word man framework - Neoplatonist thinker
Augustine - 354-430 - Altaner 487-534 - Gr 321-328

321   before baptism conceived Xt as a man, completely human,
 partaking wisdom to the full

322   between 394-397 sharp distinction drawn between the unity
 of God and man in Xt and the gift of grace to other men
      susceptus quippe a Verbo totus homo, id est, anima
 rationalis et corpus
      persona conceived as Antiochenes conceive prosopon
      to this Gr attributes difficulties Augustine experienced
in maintaining the transcendence of the Logos
323   (Jesus Christus homo) ita susceptus secundum catholicam fidem
ut ipse esset Filius Dei, id est, in illo ipszo Dei sapientia
sanandis peccatoribus appareret.
325   .. persona hominis est mixtura animae et corporis, persona
autme Christi mixtura est Dei et hominis

---

John Chrysostom - 344/54- 407 - Alt XXX 373-387
Born in Antioch - hermit - deacon 381 - priest 386 - bp Constan 397
335  Chief christological concern: transcendence and immutability
 of the divine essence
    The soul of Christ is a physical reality but not a
 theological factor.
    The divinity is in the humanity as in a holy temple
    Nowhere an explicit recognition of Xt's distinct human knowledge
337  Whenever Xt acted as a man, it was either to prove the
 reality of the economy or out of conxdescension

---

Theodore of Mopsuestia d 428 Altaner 370-373
Along with Chrysostom a pupil of the Rhetor Libanius and of
 Diodore of Tarsus - became bp of Mopsuestia in 392
Logos-man framework - condemned Constant II, AD 553  DS434 DBX224
338-342  Gr expounds Theodore's general teaching - sound
 Xx 342 He experiences the theology and presence of Xt as a liturgist,
 his speculative theology is subsidiary and not an aim in itself,
 his philosophy stands still further in the background
 As with the Cappadocians we find in his writings the analysis
 of the ens physicum concretum with the concepts hypostasis & prosopor

343  We must ask, How does the christological problem present
itself to him, and what means of solving it are at his disposal
Recall Fuller: tools of early community, Gk speaking Jews, etc
345  Argues against Apollinarians: if the Transcendent Logos
were the life principle in Xt's flesh, then the body could have
lacked nothing - for all weaknesses are the result of a weak
life-principle

Both body and soul had to be assumed if body and soul were
to be redeemed.  Xt assumed first a soul and then a body.
It was only possible to save the body through the spiritual soul
Christ assumed a soul and by the grace of God brought it to
the immutability needed to free it of sin.  He also assumed
a separate human understanding, for without this the soul
would not have been human

346  Argues from agony in the garden, from Heb 5 7-9, to reality
of human soul

Both Apollinaris and Theodore see redemption achieved in the
complete moral integrity of the spiritual principle in Christ,
in its immutability as they conceive it (Hellenisticzlly)
But for Apollinaris the immutability is that of the Logos,
for Theodore it is achieved through grace in a man.

348  Too often Theodore gives the impression that the Word
assumed an already self-sufficient man

"The only son of God, God the Word, really wished, alone
for our salvation, to assume one from among us, to raise him from
the dead, to have him ascend into heaven, and to establish
him at the right hand of the Father."

349  He uses the language of indwelling, which however is scriptural,
and he shows that he does not consider it the whole story

Jn 6 62: "if ye should see the Son of man ascending where
he was before" Theodore notices that this implies preexistence

Otherwise it would have been: "if ye should see the Son of Man
ascending where he who is in him was before..."

351  Prosopon used in the Antiochene sense: countenance

"For when we distinguish the natures, we say that
the nature of God the Word is complete, and that his prosopon
is complete (for it is not correct to speak of a hypostasis
without its prosopon); and we say also that the nature of the
man is complete and likewise his prosopon.  But when we look

to the conjunction, then we say one prosopon."

352  This one prosopon is the fact that the man shares in all
the dignity of the Word indwelling in him, in all his power,
in the exercise of universal judgement

"Prosopon is used in a twofold way: for either it signifies
the hypostasis and that which each one of us is; or it is
conferred upon honour dignity and worship; for example
Peter and Paul signify thehypostasis and the prosopon of
each one of them, but the prosopon of our Lord Christ means
honor greatness and worship.  For becauseGod the Word
was revealed in manhood, he was causing the glory of his hypostasis
to cleave to the visible one; and for this reason 'prosopon
of Christ' declares it (the prosopon) to be (a prosopon)
of honor, not the ousia of the two natures."

354  This is not the later unio in hypostasi et secundum hypostasin
For this is not the later meaning of hypostasis

It anticipates the later meaning only verbally, since
the prosopon in an archaic sense is the principle of union.

359  "If then we try to distinguish the natures we say that the
man is perfect inhis hypostasis that the God is perfect in his.
But if we want to consider the union, we say that both the
natures are a single person (and hypostasis) and acknowledge
that because of its union with the God head the flesh receives
honor beyond all creaturesand the Godhead fulfils everything
in him."

---

Nestorius   b after 381 d. at theearliest 451   Altaner 393-395
Born of Persian parents, was a priestmonk at Antioch, probably
a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia.  Because of his great
fame as a preacher, Theodosius II made him bp of Constantionope
in 428

373  On his arrival in Constantin he found some saying mary
was Mother of God and others saying she was only mother of a man

He invesitigated the matter and decided that she should be
said to be Mother of Christ, that is, mother of God and of man,
for Christ is God andm man

374  Nestorius directs his remarks prinnicipally against
 Arians and Apollinarians.  Among the latter he includes Cyril
 of Alexandria.  He rightly remarks that their denial of a
 a himan soul to Christ gives a special and mistaken meaning
 to the title, theotokos.  The Word is the life-giving part
 of the compound born of Maryx on Apollinarian christology.

     Cyril's formula "one nature of God the Word made flesh"
 was takmen from the Apollinarian pseudepigrapha. Cyril clung
 to it despite the fact that eventually he fully recognized
                               humna
 a human soul giving life to the body of Christ. Grillmeier 400-6

     Ne storius further attacks the traditional communicatio
 idiomatum and the expression Deus passus.

376  "You start your account with the creator of the natures and
  not with the prosopon of the union.  It is not ht Logos that
  has become twofold; it is the one Lord Jesus Christ who is
  twofold in his knatures.  In him are seen all the characteristics
  of the God-Logos, who has a nature eternkal and unable to
  suffer, and also all those of the manhood, that is a nature
  mortal, created, and able to suffer, and lastly those of the
  union and incarnation."

377  "Notice how by putting 'Christ', the indication of the two
  natures, (the Fathers) did not first of all say, 'We believe in the
  one God-Logos,' but chose a name which describes the two."

     "If you will, take a closer look at the statements  (of the
  Nicene Creed), and you will find that the choir of the Fathers
  did not say that the consubstrantial Godhead is capable of
  suffering, nor (did they say) that the nature coeternal with
  the Father was new-born, nor thatk the Godhead was raised
  which itself raised the destroyed temple... See how they put
  first 'Lord' and 'Jesus' and 'Christ' and "only begotten'
  and 'Son.' the names commonto the Godhead and the manhood
  as a foundation, and thus they build on it the tradition of the
  Incarnation and Passion and Redemption."

379    "Even before the Incarnation the God-Logos was Son and God and
       together with the Father, but in the last times he took the
       form of a servant; but as already previously he was Son both in
       name and in nature, he cannot be called a separate Son after
       takin g this form, otherwise we would be decreeing two Sons."

            The foregoing is Nestorius at his best, but "Nestorius
       is never completely clear about the ontological primacy  of the
       hypostasis or person of the Logos.  But he is seriously concerned
       tomaintain the traditional unity of Christ.  For this reason
       he opposes the expression, anthropotokos, from the moment
       he takes office as bishop."

380    Nestorius repeatedly affirms that one and the same is
       seen in the uncreated and in the created nature.

            But this one in the same results from the union.  "But in
       same way as the perishable body is one thing and the immortal
       soul is another, yet both go to make up one man, so too (one
       is made up)from the maxrtal and the immortal, from the perishable
       and the imperishable, from that which is subject to a beginning
       and from the nature which has no beginning.  This means that
       I confess God the Logos one prosopon of the Son."

384    By building the unity of Christ completely on the idea of
       prosopon, Nestorius transcends all attempts to envisage the
       unity as a unio in natura et secundum naturam.  This was the
       way of the Arians and the Apollinarians; but even some
       speculative attempts by or thodox Fathers came near to this
       natural unity.

            Nestorius is fond of referring to Philippians 2, 5-8.
       Form of God and form of a servbant suggest what he means by
       prosopon: the mode of appearance of a concrete nature.
       Thus he makes Christ .. (not the Logos) say:

            "Being in the form of God I am clothed in the form of a
       a servant; although I am God the Logos, I am visible in the
       flesh; althought I havex rule over all things, I take upon
       myself the prosopon of the poor for your sake; although I am
       visibly hungry, I give food to those that hunger."

442    Later in the Liber Heraclidis Nestorius will explain that
       the one prosopon is achieved in a twofold way; through the
       compensation of the prosopa and through the mutual interpenetration
       or perichoresis of these prosopa. Kenosis and exaltation.

385  "The divine Logos was not one (allos) and another (kai allos)
      ... Rather one was the prosopon of both in dignity and honor,
      worshipped by all creation, and in no way and no time divided
      by otherness of purpose and will"

     "The two natures have one Lordshp (authentia) and one power
   (dunamis) or might (dunasteia) and one prosopon in the one
   dignity (axia) and in the same honor (time)."

388  In the time of Nestorius, it is everywhere apparent that
   no adequate metaphysicof the substantial union of spiritual
   beings had yet been evolved.  More than all òthers, however,
   Nestori s saw the problem of finding such a substantial union
   which would leave intact the physis qua physis.  This clear
   insight into the problem, together with his inadequate solution
   explains his inability to justify his own pɨositions and to
   think himself (his way) into (the positions of) others.
   All the traditionlal difficultieis come to a head in hisx
   writings.  We understand how he co ld be condemned if the
   the consequences of his false pɨremises were drawn.  But we
   can recognize just as clearly that he need not have been
   condemned had attention been paid to his care for traditions
   and to the new problem which he pɨosed, despite his speculative
   impotence (Prestige).

## The Case of Leporius

390  Leporius, a monk in Gaul, had difficulties with the
   transfer of attributes (comm idiomatum).  God is not a man;
   a man is not God.  He was excommmunicated by the Bishop
   of Marseilles, and fled to A rica, where Augustine resolved
   his difficulties and composed a Libellus emendationis
   which Leporius had to read in the presence at Carthage.

391  "It was not God the Father that was made man, not was it
   the Holy Spɨirit, but the only begotten of the Father.
   So there is to be acknowledged one person of the flesh and of
   the Word so that faithly and without hesitation we believe
     that one and the same God the Son.. in the days of the
     his flesh ever to have performed all that pertain to men,
     and truly ever possessed and that pertains to God....
The union is in the one divine person not in the divine nature
   and not through the union of the natures.

                                                               *62*

Altaner 328-334.  ob. 444.  bp Alex 412-444.

400  Cyril represents the Logos sarx Christology of Athanasius
    and the younger Didymus.  In 429-30 he devotes himself to
    deeper theological study so as to be able to enter the field
    against Nestorius.  Certain circles seem to have used this moment
    to send the Patriarch of Alexandria a number of works that
    bore thae names of Roman Popes Julius and Felix and of Gregory
    the Wonder-worker, Athanasius, and Hippolytus (DVI 108)

        In conssequence he accepted as authoritative the mia phusis
    and the mia upostasis formulae of Apollinaris.

402  In his second letter to Succensus he had toi meet four
    arguments against his mia phusis.  The fourth was to the effect
    that it cannot be claimed that Xt suffered only after the
    flesh, and this Cyril grants for it would imply that the
    suffering was involuntary and non-rational.  Succensus further
    point that if Christ had a body and a soul, then he had a
    human nature as well as a divine nature, and therefore two
    natures.  Cyril grants that Christ's humnan nature is an
    autokineton, a self moving principle, a phusis.

        Succensus then set the dilemma: either two natures or
    no human psychology.

403  To this must be added  the first objection which ran:
    if there is no human soul, then the suffering must be ascribed
    to the divine nature.

        Cyril fully grants the reality of Christ's human soul,
    but he still clings to his mia phusis and mia hypostasis.
    He understood these terms to refer to a concrete reality.
    He considered the Apollinarian writings to represent Churhc
    tradition.  He granted two natures before the union.
    He granted distinction after the union.  He denied separation
    after the union

        Alexandrian logos sarx has come to its end.  Suffering
    is placed in the soul as well as the flesh.  All the signifcance
    of the human obedience and sacrificial action of Xt comes
    into the open.

logos-sarx
404  Under XXXXXXXXXXXX influence Cyril still retains the
doctrines of zoopoiesis and organon.  The natural life of
the body is now derived from the human soul and not from
the logos qua logos.  But the divine energeia of the Logos
flows directly into the body and makes it life-giving.

405  Cyril's insistence on unity means that all thought
of Christ also is thought of the Logos. "God the Logos
did not come into a man, but he became man, while remaining God"

408  Cyril dsitinguishes between Nestorius and Orientals.
The former divides God and man; the latter distinguish between
the two.

411  Mia phusis tou theou logou sesarkomene
The one nature or hypostasis is the nature and hypostasis
of the logos.  It is this that becomes incarnate.

412  M. Richard's Summary
The upostaseis or phuseis of Christ may not be divided
after the union

The idiomata may not be divided between two persons or
two hypostaseis (or two independent phuseis) but they must
all refer to the single person, ax to the mia phusis
(hypostasis) tou theou logou sesarkomene

The Logos is united kath upostasin to the flesh which he
has taken. (i.e. the logos himself is understood to be and
in reality is a single Christ, the same God and man.

DVI 138

When Cyril  attempts to answer objections against his
mia phusis, he has no distinction intermediate between the
distinction between Peter and Paul and a distinction that
occurs only in the mind, only in comtemplation.

However he illustrates this latter distinction by the
distinction between body and soul; the nature of the one
differs from the nature of the other; but when conjoined there
results only one human nature.

So he admits Christ be ex duabus naturis but after the
incarnation he will have only one nature.

Cyril's sola contemplatione corresponds, not to the
scholastic distinctio rationis, but to their distinctio realism
minor.

Diodore } denies natural union of Ap.

Theodore } anti Apollinarist

Nestorius } affirmsal

① danger of adoptionism

② not natural union

③ union in πρόσωπον : countenance
ίδιον

Cyril

μία φύσις

admitted 2 natures : said before the
μία