

else, he cannot be blamed for not having been an innovator. In some sense of course Nestorius failed on the first count as the theological position of current christology could have shown him that his metaphysical analyses did not fully succeed in doing justice to tradition. We mean the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*, of which the famous *theotokos* was the expression.

This point is the most important that can be gathered from this course. It is that the dogmas, so far being products of Hellenism as people have been glibly repeating since Harnack, in fact are unintelligible on the basis of any Hellenic or Hellenistic philosophy: Platonic Aristotelian Stoic Epicurean Gnostic Neoplatonic. They become in a sense intelligible in so far as they provide the spring board for the development of a specifically Xtian philosophy.

More when we consider the issue, How can Chalcedon make sense.

Proclus Gr 453-466 Altaner 395 f.

Bp of Cyzicus 326 but not accepted. Patriarch of Const 434-4346
453 One of the opponents of Nestorius in Constantinople.

As a preacher one of the best successors of Chrysostom. The most famous sermon on Mary in ancient times was preached by him the presence of the Patriarch Nestorius and towards the end an affirmation of Mary as *Theotokos* is a conclusion to what has gone before.

454 From Mary was born neither the pure Godhead nor a mere man. We do not proclaim a divinized man but an incarnate God Christ and God the Logos are not distinct, not *allos kai allos*. The natures have come together but the union involves no confusion.

Sermo de dogmate incarnationis:

"There is only one Son for the natures are not divided into two hypostases, but the awesome economy of salvation has united the two natures in one hypostasis."

Tomus ad Armenios:

In 435 the Armenian priests Leontius and Aⁿel, without the knowledge of the highest Armenian churchleaders but ostensibly in their names, arrived with an inquiry about the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia. A number of extracts from Theodore's were brought.

The answer was the much-cited Tomus ad Armenios of Proclus, to which in turn were added a number of Capitula arising out the collection made by the Armenians. At no stage in all this was the name of Theodore mentioned. Restraint and a tendency to mediate characterize the document throughout. Antiochenes and Alexandrines could each detect certain features of their own teaching. Extreme formulas of either side were avoided.

456 "For knowing only one Son and having been taught in all piety I acknowledge only one hypostasis of the Word made flesh."

** mia hypostasis tou theou logou sarkothentos

Where however Cyril's one reality is replaced by one person ~~xxxxxxxx~~ sesarkomenae yields to sarkothentos an expression occasionally employed by Cyril

in 438 Proclus sent his Tomus and Capitula to the Antiochenes and demanded their subscription. They accepted the Tomus -- thereby laying a foundation for Chalcedon -- but resisted his desire for a condemnation of Theodore whom they immediately recognized ~~from~~ in the Capitula.

** read: mian homologo ten tou sarkothentos theou logou hypostasin

The Trial of Eutyches and the Formula of Flavian of Constantinople

456 Flavian, the successor the Patriarch Proclus, saw at the beginning of his term of office a resurgence of the dogmatic struggles to which he was to fall victim.

The opposing parties were Eutyches, the monophysitically inclined archimandrite, and Theodoret of Cyrus. The dogmatic elements of this controversy are found in Th's Eranistes, and in his letters we can trace the seriousness of the position in the Eastern church. The powerful Dioscoros with all his supporters from Egypt and Constantinople entered the dispute.

On November 8, 448, the so-called synodos endemousa, i. e. the Synod of Bishops who happened to be in the capital, met in Constantinople. Bishop Eusebius of Dorylaeum rose and instituted a libellus against Eutyches. Its contents were no less than a charge of heresy. Canonical proceedings were demanded. The trial took place in seven sessions from November 12 to the 22.

457 Only at the last session did the accused appear.

At the first session, after the charge made by Eusebius was read, there were read Cyril's second letter to Nestorius and the formula of union of 433. After a few words by Eusebius who contended that any departure from the readings was an attack on the faith, Flavian rose and read a statement that contained the important words:

"We acknowledge that Christ is from two natures after the Incarnation, in one hypostasis and one person confessing one Christ, one Son, one Lord."

Eutyches responded: 'I acknowledge that the Lord was from two natures before the union, but after the union I acknowledge only one nature.' On November 22, 448 Eutyches condemned.

Unwittingly Flavian had provided the opposition with a slogan

But a start was made towards the one hypostasis one prosopon two natures of Chalcedon

The Robber Synod of Ephesus, 449 LTK² 8, 1009 f; ODCC 789 f.

459 Called by Theodosius II on the appeal of Eutyches and his support^{ers}

Run by Dioscoros, attended by 140 bpp, also hordes of monks and soldiers. Roman legates insulted when they presented opposition of Leo I and his Tomus ad Flavianum. Eutyches reinstated. Decision of synodos endemousa invalidated. Flavian of Const and Eusebius of Dorylaeum were banished and replaced. Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edessa, Domnus of Antioch were liquidiert.

From Leo I's letter to Pulcheria the Empress: non iudicium sed latrocinium comes the name Räubersynode, Brigandage.

460 Eutyches launched a campaign to reverse the decision agst himself

He appealed to the holy council of the bpp of Rome Alexandria Jerusalem and Thessalonika. He sent letters all over the world the one to Pope Leo is still extant. Despite his extreme age and his illness he had been obliged to be present in the court Required to acknowledge the two natures in Christ, he had refused to say anything beyond Nicea and Ephesus. Even his life had been in danger. He had escaped safely only through Leo's intercession and the soldiers he had brought along with him as a precaution

461 Together with this letter Eutyches sent copies of his own libellus fidei, of Eusebius's charges, extracts from the Fathers that included the Apollinarian forgeries

461 Above all Eutyches worked on the Emperor through his protectors at court, chief of whom was Chrysaphius.

Theodosius II interceded for Eutyches in a letter to Leo I which Leo answered in his Ep 24.

Theodosius arranged an official investigation of the Home Synod and eventually reinstated Eutyches and on March 30, 449, called for a General Council to clarify the disputed questions. The rescripts to Dioscoros of Alexandria and the Archimandrite Barsumas in Syria show quite clearly that the purpose of the new synod was the utter defeat of Nestorianism, the reinstatement of Eutyches, and the deposition of Flavian and his supporters. Theodoret of Cyrus, the man most to be feared, was not allowed to be present. The president of the meeting was to be Dioscoros and not Flavian.

Flavian's appeals to Leo I led the latter to send a delegation to the council. They brought with them his Tomus ad Flavianum, and his desire that it be read at the council, and his insistence that the case of Eutyches did not require a general council.

August 8, 449 about 140 bpp assembled at Ephesus. At the first session Dioscoros refused to have Leo's letter read and immediately began proceedings concerning Eutyches. Eutyches was allowed to read out his account of the Home Synod, teeming as it was with misrepresentations. He reinstated as Archimandrite, Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum were deprived of their office, by a vote of 113 bpp. At a signal from Dioscoros soldiers, monks and parabiani burst in to intimidate the remaining 27 bpp.

463 Hence Leo I : "in illo Ephesino non iudicio sed latrocinio

At a later session August 22 also Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edessa and Domnus of Antioch were deposed and exiled.

Reaction to Latrocinium

Immediately after the session of August 22 Hilary, deacon and Roman legate, returned to Rome bearing a letter from Flavian begging help in the desperate situation.

October 13 449 a number of letters were sent to the East in the name of the Roman synod (Sept 29 - Oct 13) to Pulcheria the Empress, to her imperial brother, to the clergy and people of Constantinople, to four important Archimandrites

At the beginning of March Pulcheria, the clergy and people, and two of the Archimandrites replied, but the emperor remained unsweevingly on the side of Dioscoros.

464 On July 16, 450 Leo sent a delegation to the East with copies of his Ad Flavianum, his Epp 69-71, and an anthology of extracts from the Fathers.

On July 28 Theodosius died suddenly, Pulcheria succeeded him, and this changed situation meant that the delegation was received with favor, Leo's letters were carefully translated into Greek, and promulgated at a synod in Constantinople in October 450. One of Pulcheria's first measures was the deposition of Eutyches protector, Chrysaphius. On August 25 Pulcheria took as her consort and a co-regent a vigorous and capable officer the Thracian Marcian. Even in the notice of his election to Leo, the new Emperor expressed his readiness to join with the Pope in restoring the shattered peace of the church by a new general council.

The Tomus ad Flavianum DS 290-295 Gr 465 - 477 Altaner 417-422
Leo I the Great, pope 440-461, as early as 430 an influential personage in the papal Curia, from Tuscany, caused Attila king of the Huns to turn back after meeting him at Mantua (452), persuaded Geiserich king of the Vandals at least spare Rome of torture murder and fire, though it was sacked.

468 Leo's understanding of opponents superficial: Nestorius becomes an adoptionist; Eutyches a Docetist and a Manichaeon

469 His simplification aroused opposition where a more sympathetic approach would have gained friends

But it is hard to expect a Latin to achieve what the Greeks failed to achieve among themselves.

465 Christology based on apostles creed: I believe in God the Father almighty and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary: traditional Western one person, two natures, from Tertullian Novatian

466 Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae

Et in unam coeunte personam

Suscepta est a maiestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas,

Ab aeternitate mortalitas

467 Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo

470 Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod

proprium est. Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est.