

- 470 Note that it is not utraque forma that acts, is the agent, but the person is the agent. The forma or natura is that by which one acts -- not principium quod but principium quo
Trouble later on ~~ix~~ this score with monophysites and monothelites
- 473~~X~~ Communicatio idiomatum grounded in unity of person
- 474 Each nature retains its properties; their union a mixture
- 475 Two substances avoided. Chalcedon translates hypostasis by using ~~x~~ Rufinus subsistentia.

The Council of Chalcedon Ann 451 DS 300-303

- 480 Only under constant pressure from Emperor did Fathers agree to draw up a new formula of belief
Some movement: thirteen Egyptian bpp; then special commission under leadership of Patr Anaktolius of Chople, which used the disputed ek duo phuseon; but imperial commissioners and ~~Qx~~ Roman delegates urged that Dioscoros had been condemned and a formula respecting Leo's in two natures be worked out. This was carried out ~~x~~ by a commission of 23 bpp in the oratory of St Euphemia; their work was greeted with shouts of approval on October 25.
- 481 English translation of main part of text.
Influences: Second letter of Cyril to Nestorius; Cyril's Laetentur and the formula of Reunion of 433; Tome of Leo to Flavian; Flavian's profession of faith which had been read at the Council in the context of the acts of the trial of Eutyches; one phrase suggests a letter of Theodoret (de Urbina Chalkedon I)
- 482 "... all the important centres of church life and all trends of contemporary theology ~~maxx~~ Rome, Alexandria, Cpnstantinople, and Antioch, have contributed to the framing of a common expression of faith.
Chalcedon not just a reaction to Cyrillian council of Ephesus
What had to be excluded were Nestorianism and Monophysitism. Cyril's one nature of the God Logos incarnate could not exclude Monophysitism effectively. The formula of reunion and the tome of Leo had to come to the fore.
The significance of Chalcedon is that it tackled the problem that had thoubled theologians since Eustathius of Antioch pointed out that the Arians denied Christ to have a human soul over 120 years previously.

483 First paragraph no technical terms except already received homoousios: one and the same is ~~both~~ both God and man

Second paragraph: technical terms, nature, person, hypostasis. Do not ask their definitions. Fathers at Chalcedon would have ~~not~~ been able to define them. They were simply endeavoring to meet Nestorius objection: God and man, eternal and temporal, immortal and mortal are not one and the same. The answer is logical, not metaphysical. What differ are the two natures. What is one and the same is the person

Augustine: What is meant by persona? What there are three of in the trinity. Not three Gods, not three Fathers, not three Sons. not three Spirits, but three persons.

Similarly. Nature denotes what there are two of in Christ, and person denotes the one and the same that is both God and man.

"Following then the holy Fathers.." It goes back to Ignatius of Antioch (Eph 7 2) whose christological framework predicates the ~~divine~~ divine and the human of one and the same subject

484 The first paragraph determines the meaning of the second, and it settles issues without discussion of Alexandrine one nature or Antiochene two natures.

It asserts the full humanity of Christ against Docetists, Arians, Apollinarians

It asserts the unity of Christ overemphasized by Arians, Apollinarians, and in a sense by Cyril (verboten)

485 Homoousios is recalled but predicated both of Godhead and manhood. This recall is motivated by the fact that Eutyches had agreed that Mary was homoousios with us but not Jesus. For Eutyches Christ's flesh was not of the same substance as ours.

Where Alexandrines shouted one nature and Antiochenes ~~two~~ two natures, Chalcedon said: Christ is one and the same Son, Lord, Only-begotten but en duo pusesin. The unity then is not in nature or by nature, for the natures are two. They are not confused: asungkhutos. They are not changed: atreptos. But neither are they separated (akhoristos) or divided (adairetos). For there is one prosopon, one hypostasis, namely the prosopon and hypostasis of one and the same son, our Lord, Jesus Christ, the same perfect in divinity, the same perfect in humanity.

487 The proprietates utriusque naturæ are the predicates or attributes of Christ in Scriptural and traditional language

One misunderstands the council if one supposes it to be constructing a system of thought. It is endeavoring to clarify an ~~ix~~ issue that had been obscured.

Their work will lead later theologians towards systematic thinking, but their meaning of person and nature and hypostasis is to be found, not by subsequent systematic thinking, but by reading the first paragraph of the decree.

488 Can one interpret Chalcedon's prosopon in terms of the Stoic-Cappadocian theory, namely, that the prosopon arises inasmuch as the idiotēs is added to the ousia. The answer has to be negative: salva proprietate utriusque naturæ, sozomenes de mallontes idiotetos hekateras phuseos.

489 While Nestorius might accept the Chalcedonian definition he would have been unable to have vindicated it is a systematic analysis

490 Chalcedon leaves no doubt that it is the Logos that is the subject of both the divine and the human nature in Christ. "... one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ.. the same perfect in divinity and the same perfect in humanity."

493 It is not Nicea, Ephesus, Chalcedon that represent a hellenization of Xtianity. That is found in the christological heresies that represent a mixture of the Gospel and with alien elements