† Blessed is our God always, as it is now, was in the beginning, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen. ... in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Through the prayers of our holy Ancestors, Lord Jesus Christ our God, have mercy on us and save us. Amen. Glory to You, our God, glory to You.

O Heavenly King, the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, You are everywhere and fill all things, Treasury of blessings, and Giver of life: come and abide in us, and cleanse us from every impurity, and save our souls, O Good One.

† Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us (three times).

† Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, as it is now, was in the beginning, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

Discord 5

*Reevaluating*

Let us retrace some of our steps to see if we can sharpen the picture

As great as the Mystery of God is: “Whose dominion is incomprehensible, Whose mercy is infinite, and Whose love toward mankind is ineffable”: men persist at trying to find words to describe God.[[1]](#endnote-1)

For better or worse, Nicaea chose the word ὁμο-ούσιον (same-essence), in preference over ὁμοι-ούσιον (similar-essence), and ἑτερο-ούσιον (different-essence). Given John’s high Christology in 2 John there is little doubt what the outcome might be: the only question might be that Jesus’ humanity might somehow reshape the Divine essence as it cloaks or veils it, making it a similar-essence. We have been led to believe that no Christians advocated ἑτερο-ούσιον: only pagan (mostly Greek) philosophers and rebellious Jews denied the Deity of Christ.[[2]](#endnote-2)

This ὁμο-ούσιον was not distributed over Father, Son, and Spirit; we cannot speak of three ὁμο-ούσιον: there is only One ὁμο-ούσιον, which is equally and inseparably shared by Father, Son, and Spirit: One God means only One ὁμο-ούσιον. Since God is a Spirit, we believe that this word for God’s indefinable and ineffable nature applies only to the spiritual realm of Eschaton; it defines the Eschaton: because God created both the spiritual and the physical universes. In any case, we do not believe that God has any kind of natural or physical body.

So, a different word was necessary to describe any distinction we might discover between Father, Son, and Spirit. The word ultimately chosen was ὑπόστασις: so, we eventually arrived at the expression of One ὁμο-ούσιον in three ὑπόστασιες.

Thus, when we read, “μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη,” we are somewhat puzzled by Cyril’s choice of words: for to us, “μία φύσις”, means one physical material [instance]. Cyril may have a completely different understanding of the word, φύσις, than our understanding of the word. On the other hand, Cyril may have in mind John’s words as John also leads with the fleshly tangibility of Christ:

“That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life: for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew to you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested to us. That which we have seen and heard we declare to you, that you also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.”[[3]](#endnote-3)

Cyril continues, “One physical material [instance] of the Word of God”, which is very close to John’s expression. Σεσαρκωμένη[[4]](#endnote-4): being enclothed in flesh. “One concrete instance of the Word of God enclothed in flesh.” Evidently, the expression, Word of God, caused no difficulty: for it seems ever to refer to the pre-incarnate eternal Son; never to the Bible. Then, “ἕνωσις καθ’ ὑπόστασιν”, united according to the standard of basis, or united by basis.[[5]](#endnote-5) This is not a carefully laid out theological argument; it is a well-designed slogan that encapsulates years of theological thinking: to understand it we will have to dig more deeply into the Alexandrian thinking, thus escaping the standard summary statements.[[6]](#endnote-6) While Cyril’s choice of words seems strange, we cannot impeach him over them. This was the dogma of the Church at Ephesus in 431. How could it possibly be wrong? What is wrong with it? Nothing that we can see. We can only understand Cyril to mean that there is, only “One concrete instance of the [eternal] Word of God, Who made that instance [in time] by becoming enfleshed.”

Eutyches changes “μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη”, “One concrete instance of the Word of God enclothed in flesh”, to “μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένου”, One concrete instance of the Word of God made of flesh”. The subtle change from a nominative to a genitive makes σεσαρκωμένου modify τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου; rather than σεσαρκωμένη, which modifies μία φύσις: so now Eutyches has “the Word of God is flesh”, or “the fleshly Word of God”; rather than “a fleshly concrete instance”, or “One concrete instance in flesh”. Evidently, Eutyches fails to understand the implications of his grammatical modification.[[7]](#endnote-7) We understand Eutyches to say that there is, only “One concrete instance of the fleshly Word of God”, which completely undermines the eternality of the Word of God, or God the Word.

Evidently, Cyril himself used this word φύσις in two or more ways: one, as a concrete instance of things as they exist in this material, physical universe (which is the way that we, at first, understand the word); two, by connotative or implicit use, a reference to the properties of things in this material universe; finally, by a further extension of connotative or implicit use, a reference to any properties… spiritual or physical. Hence, an extended concept of δύο φύσεις gradually emerges. Thus, one concrescence, come to be further explicated as having two distinct natures.[[8]](#endnote-8) Possibly, this transition of terms was aided by the loss of the distinction between “forms” and “physis” prevalent in Greek philosophy.

So, we cannot honestly retain the orthodoxy of Chalcedon’s (451) Dyophysite theology, if we do not also, at the same time, embrace Ephesus Ⅰ’s (431) earlier Miaphysite expression. Both are ecumenical councils; both have been repeatedly ratified; both are true.[[9]](#endnote-9) It is precisely this dynamic energy of the inseparable union of both Divine and human natures, this miracle of incarnation, which transforms us by grace into what Christ is by nature: it is nothing less than the restoration of perfect manhood: it is our salvation in Christ.[[10]](#endnote-10)

*Interjecting*

But, it is exactly at this point that we must interject with our proposed solution and reject Chalcedon in its entirety.

“πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.”

“God is Spirit: and those who worship Him, in spirit and in truth must worship.” — John 4:24

Πνεῦμα and φύσις speak if two distinct, incompatible realms; albeit they parallel each other and intermingle with each other, because both are created. Even though ὁ θεός is not part of the realm of πνεῦμα, being its Creator, He is described as πνεῦμα, definitely not in any way, shape, or form ever to be described as φύσις. So, the linguistic slide from “μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη” to “μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένου”; from the denotative and explicit meaning for φύσις as a concrete instance of things as they exist in this material, physical universe, into the connotative and implicit of properties of things in this material universe, to infinity and beyond into the chaos of loosely speaking any properties… spiritual or physical. Such a linguistic slide may suffice for common street conversation; but, it will never do for the precision required by theology, or any philosophical or otherwise sensitive field where every argument, every logic structure, every reason hangs on the mathematically precise, hairsplitting, meanings of words. We may have explained how Dyophysite theology (451) became the popular, trendy, buzzword theology; but, we have done so at great damage and expense to Ephesus Ⅰ’s (431) earlier Miaphysite expression. Miaphysitism is correct; Dyophysitism is incorrect; Dyophysitism is just sloppy theological expression: “πνεῦμα ὁ θεός” cannot be made into “φύσις ὁ θεός.”

For us, there can only be one correct theological statement of St. John’s high Christology as expressed in John 4:24; 1 John 2; 2 John; and elsewhere: namely, that the Son, Himself a divine Spirit or πνεῦμα changed His ὑπόστασις by adding to Himself a complete and perfect, now inseparable, human φύσις; without mixing the πνεῦμα and the φύσις; without diminishing or eliminating the properties of either the πνεῦμα or the φύσις: He is therefore Miaphysite or Monophysite in nature: He became and is forevermore, the mono-πνεῦμα-mia-φύσις, The God-man, Theanthropos, Theandros.

Of course, we do not speak for The Church; so, we await the approval or condemnation of the whole Christian Church on earth; yet, if we fail of such ratification, we quickly repent and denounce all our words: for we have no desire to be innovators, renegades, or heretics; we only seek to ferret out the Truth in history… which, we hope we have found, and this discussion adequately explains.

We begin again, where our previous discussion was interrupted:

*Resuming*

Twelve Anathemas[[11]](#endnote-11)

Quote:

1. If anyone will not confess that the Emmanuel is very God, and that therefore the Holy Virgin is the Mother of God, inasmuch as in the flesh she bore the Word of God made flesh [as it is written, “The Word was made flesh”] let him be anathema.

2. If anyone shall not confess that the Word of God the Father is united hypostatically to flesh, and that with that flesh of his own, he is one only Christ both God and man at the same time: let him be anathema.

3. If anyone shall after the [hypostatic] union divide the hypostases in the one Christ, joining them by that connection alone, which happens according to worthiness, or even authority and power, and not rather by a coming together, which is made by natural union: let him be anathema.

4. If anyone shall divide between two persons or subsistences those expressions which are contained in the Evangelical and Apostolical writings, or which have been said concerning Christ by the Saints, or by himself, and shall apply some to him as to a man separate from the Word of God, and shall apply others to the only Word of God the Father, on the ground that they are fit to be applied to God: let him be anathema.

5. If anyone shall dare to say that the Christ is a Theophorus [that is, God-bearing] man and not rather that he is very God, as an only Son through nature, because “the Word was made flesh,” and “has a share in flesh and blood as we do:” let him be anathema.

6. If anyone shall dare say that the Word of God the Father is the God of Christ or the Lord of Christ, and shall not rather confess him as at the same time both God and Man, since according to the Scriptures, “The Word was made flesh”: let him be anathema.

7. If anyone shall say that Jesus as man is only energized by the Word of God, and that the glory of the Only-begotten is attributed to him as something not properly his: let him be anathema.

8. If anyone shall dare to say that the assumed man ought to be worshipped together with God the Word, and glorified together with him, and recognized together with him as God, and yet as two different things, the one with the other (for this “Together with” is added [i.e., by the Nestorians] to convey this meaning); and shall not rather with one adoration worship the Emmanuel and pay to him one glorification, as [it is written] “The Word was made flesh”: let him be anathema.

9. If any man shall say that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Holy Ghost, so that he used through him a power not his own and from him received power against unclean spirits and power to work miracles before men and shall not rather confess that it was his own Spirit through which he worked these divine signs; let him be anathema.[[12]](#endnote-12)

10. Divine Scripture says, that Christ became High Priest and Apostle of our confession, and that he offered himself for us a sweet-smelling savor to God the Father. Whosoever shall say that it is not the divine Word himself, when he was made flesh and had become man as we are, but another than he, a man born of a woman, yet different from him, who is become our Great High Priest and Apostle; or if any man shall say that he offered himself in sacrifice for himself and not rather for us, whereas, being without sin, he had no need of offering or sacrifice: let him be anathema.

11. Whosoever shall not confess that the flesh of the Lord giveth life and that it pertains to the Word of God the Father as his very own, but shall pretend that it belongs to another person who is united to him [i.e., the Word] only according to honor, and who has served as a dwelling for the divinity; and shall not rather confess, as we say, that that flesh giveth life because it is that of the Word who giveth life to all: let him be anathema.

12. Whosoever shall not recognize that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, that he was crucified in the flesh, and that likewise in that same flesh he tasted death and that he is become the first-begotten of the dead, for, as he is God, he is the life and it is he that giveth life: let him be anathema.

It would seem that the reason Leo’s *Tome* was scrutinized carefully by evaluation with these *Twelve Anathemas* is that Leo’s *Tome* was known to be based on “Tertullian and Augustine”, not at all current with the fifth century drift of meanings.[[13]](#endnote-13)

*In Other Words*

We can discuss the physical creation (φύσις) as a whole; related to one object in it (Cyril); by the characteristics (φύσις) of an object (Jesus has a complete human body, mind, soul, and spirit); or, by a very extended figure of speech, talk about characteristics (φύσις) in general, some of which may only exist outside of the physical creation. Already, we are on dangerous ground: such connotations and implicit uses indicate sloppy, and imprecise speech habits, which are intolerable in any professional technical discussion: I may call my disease something, but my doctor cannot; I may call my legal predicament something, but my lawyer cannot; I may call my edifice something, but my architect cannot.

We believe from the Bible that the physical creation (φύσις) is paralleled by a complete spiritual (πνεῦμα), immaterial creation (ἀ-φύσις). We believe that God has created both of these; and thus, God is independent and outside of both of these creations. Since, Nicaea begins to talk about the ὁμο-ούσιον, it is important for us to see that this ὁμο-ούσιον is also completely outside of the spiritual (πνεῦμα), immaterial creation (ἀ-φύσις). So, even though God is described as spirit; He is, in no way, part of His spiritual (πνεῦμα), immaterial creation (ἀ-φύσις). Angels are part of that spiritual (πνεῦμα), immaterial creation (ἀ-φύσις): God is not.

We think of mankind as primarily a set of objects within the physical creation as a whole. However, the Scripture records that God endowed mankind equally with an immaterial human spirit; it is therefore necessary that this human spirit be part of the spiritual (πνεῦμα), immaterial creation (ἀ-φύσις). Any description of this human spirit in terms of physical creation is really off track; nor, can it be measured by any scientific instruments or means: yet, millions of people attest to its existence.

Moreover, God enters His spiritual and physical creations freely, by means that only He understands: we call this entry or communication of God, Revelation. Without Revelation, we could not know God at all. Similarly, angels traverse the spiritual and physical boundaries as part of their duties as servants of the human race. This differs quite a bit from the Greek idea of a perfect triangle; for instance, a perfect triangle cannot possibly exist in the physical creation (φύσις): only corrupt copies can exist in the physical creation (φύσις).

When Jesus add to Himself a complete and perfect human nature, a physis, it is incredible to us that the word physis would also be used to describe that ὁμο-ούσιον, which the Son shares inseparably with the Father, and the Spirit, which ὁμο-ούσιον exists only outside of and distinct from creation. That we should pick a new word to describe the members of the Trinity individually, seems obviously necessary: that word is properly ὑπόστασις. Yet, three three ὑπόστασιες are still entirely outside of creation. When Jesus adds to Himself a complete and perfect human nature, He is inseparably uniting that which is uncreated (His ὑπόστασις), with what is created (His physis), to make one new and changed ὑπόστασις, the hypostatic union. We are appalled to discover that Chalcedon has drafted the word physis to describe or name that which is uncreated (πνεῦμα and ἀ-φύσις): namely, the pre-incarnate ὑπόστασις (πνεῦμα) of the Son: Dyophysitism has always been incorrect….

*Leo’s Tome*

Leo’s *Tome* [[14]](#endnote-14) is far too lengthy to consider in its entirety; moreover, it is written in Latin: so, the linguistic barriers between English, Greek, and Latin are too formidable to breach with any certain outcome. It is obvious why the reading of Leo’s *Tome* was delayed; these same linguistic barriers prohibited instant understanding and analysis: it took days to perform a careful analysis of the *Tome*. Officially reading any uninspected manuscript with approval has all the risks of lighting a fuse attached to a keg labeled dynamite: the fuse may not be lit until the contents of the keg are certified to be nonexplosive. Similarly, it is obvious why Leo’s *Tome* was evaluated from the *Twelve Anathemas*, and not the other way around: again, the sheer length of Leo’s *Tome* prohibits the reverse procedure; the Latin language prohibits the reverse procedure, since Greek was the standard language: the Latin vocabulary required evaluation for correct nuances of all sorts. In addition, Leo’s *Tome* is primarily concerned with Eutyches, and is not central to the present discussion. We found this one sentence of interest.

“Therefore, in consequence of this unity of person which is to be understood in both natures[[15]](#endnote-15), we read of the Son of Man also descending from heaven, when the Son of God took flesh from the Virgin who bore Him.”

We do not know what words Leo selected to represent the English ideas of person, natures, or took flesh. What is repugnant to us that the uncreated ὁμο-ούσιον, and the uncreated ὑπόστασιες could possibly be described by any words connected to the created φύσις or the equally created human spirit. The amazing, even miraculous, event of incarnation is spectacular precisely because two such spectacularly different things are joined in the hypostatic union. It is impossible to conceive of any more completely different things than that which is created in contrast with that which is uncreated. To learn that these are joined is unimaginable. How can we hear of such a great mystery without our mouths agape and our lower jaws on the ground in astonishment? How can we be told such wonders, without falling on our faces in awe and worship?

“But when during your cross-examination Eutyches replied and said, ‘I confess that our Lord had two natures before the union but after the union I confess but one,’”

Here, at least in English, Eutyches appears to apply the same word to both uncreated ὁμο-ούσιον, and the uncreated ὑπόστασιες: which we can’t support at all. Still, it is possible to get tangled up in the word, ὑπόστασις; so, insofar as the uncreated ὑπόστασις of the Son and God the Word, becomes the miraculous ὑπόστασις, by the addition of a complete and perfect, sinless man, called the hypostatic union that the word ὑπόστασις might also be attached directly to the physis. In all honesty, this language is murky, confusing, and driven too much by runaway emotions and empirical power politics. The extant fracturing presses for immediate solution, and attendant empirical peace. It is possible that Eutyches was thrown under the bus to satisfy a hidden agenda. The outcome was too hastily drawn. The outcome was further tragic fracturing.

Oxford Scholarship Online opines:

“Leo's decision to write letters offering theological teaching was a new departure for the papacy. The Tome was his most ambitious theological project; arguments against his authorship are weak. It is uncharacteristic of the main emphases of his theological development in previous years, where he had sought to coordinate rather than distinguish the two natures of Christ. It can best be understood as a response to what he thought to be the opposite errors of Eutyches and Nestorius. He revised his understanding of Nestorius when he was accused of Nestorianism in the aftermath of Chalcedon, and produced a more characteristic and satisfactory Christological statement in the Letter to the Palestinian monks.”[[16]](#endnote-16)

[[17]](#endnote-17)

1. We easily recall that it was God Himself Who committed us to this first task (Genesis 2:19-20). In this profound vignette, we find that man is to study, evaluate, quantify, identify, and name each animal pair and their attributes. Thus, man is started on the path of endlessly searching, studying, and naming all things.

   However, this profound vignette is set in the center of a discussion about man’s loneliness; wherein the outcome is inextricably interweaved with human sexuality, which is one of the first things Adam would have observed about behavior from the animal pairs.

   Man’s first obligation is to love God, his Father. Man’s second obligation is to love his wife, which a distinctly sexual, and procreative matter.

   Three things follow logically: First, man is to love all of the human race that will be produced. Second, man is to nurture this animal kingdom; indeed, this universe, which he has just begun to name. Third, it is inevitable that man would also assign names to God, his Father, as part of this ongoing process: naming God is a normal part of the ongoing communicative process between the Father and His children.

   It is the emotional intensity, the pseudo-importance of love names, that gets us into disputes and other troubles. As apophatic thinking develops, we discover that it’s often safer to name what God is not, rather than what God is. That being conceded, we cannot give up Father, Almighty, Creator and replace them with Kabbalah’s dead, impersonal abomination, Ein Sof.

   We have now crossed a barrier from Christianity into Judaism: but, it is impossible that a discussion about discord not confront that master center of division and discord, Judaism itself.

   We struggle to avoid prejudices against individual Jews themselves; let each person’s merits, and evil deeds stand on their own behavior: some Jews are wicked; some Jews are not wicked; some Jews have sincerely converted to Christianity; not all Jews are Marranos; not all Jews are Kabbalah advocates; not all Jews are usurers, and extortioners.

   Let each Christian, Jew, and Pagan answer for his/her own actions: let us by every means possible, strive to free ourselves from our prejudices, without becoming naïve in the process.

   Judaism has, down through the ages, been the deadliest enemy of Christianity: to think otherwise is exceedingly naïve. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. According to John in 1 John 2, and in 2 John [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. 1 John 1:1-3 [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Σεσαρκωμένη: perfect passive participle, feminine masculine singular related to σαρκάω – to tear flesh, or σαρκόω – to make flesh or strong (Liddell-Scott-Jones) σαρκοῦμαι (Valsamis), σαρκέω, σάρξω, or σαρξέω: to make flesh; to clothe or wrap in flesh (modern: incarcerate).

   Symbol of Nicaea (325), “καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.” “and being enfleshed by the Holy Spirit and Mary, The Virgin, He was also made man.”

   Origen (184-253), “κρισιν, θείαν δίδωσι, παρεμφαίνων, ὅτι Θεὸς εἴη σεσαρκωμένος. Ἢ τοίνυν οὕτω νοήσεις· ὅτι ὄρη μὲν καὶ βουνοὶ” “criticize, He gives divine, showing, that God is incarnate. You know all that; you know how many times”

   Athanasius of Alexandria (296-373),

   “μονεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐκθαμβεῖται θεότης τὸν θάνατον, ἢ τὸ ἄψυχον σῶμα.… Δηλονότι ἡ θεότης σεσαρκωμένη. Ἀνόμοιος ἄρα ἡ τοῦ Υἱοῦ θεότης τῇ τοῦ Πατρὸς θεότητι…. Μὴ γένοιτο!” “Now, he is to be left alone; he is also astonished at the death of Godhead, which is the lifeless soul…. Visibly, the Godhead being enfleshed. Strangely, therefore, the Son of the Godhead [is] in the Fathers Godhead…. Inconceivable!”

   “Διὸ καὶ τοὺς λέγοντας μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, καὶ μὴ ἐπιφέροντας ἐψυχωμένην, λογικήν τε και….” “Wherefore, also the saying, ‘One concrete instance of God the Word enclothed in flesh’, and should not be carried on by futile (?), either logic(al) or…. Before Cyril is born, Athanasius casts this identical phrase in its accusative form.

   “Αὐτὸς ἐπικαλέσεταί με Πατήρ μου εἶ σὺ, Θεός μου. Πάλιν ἐνταῦθα οἰκονομικῶς ὁ σεσαρκωμένος Θεὸν ἑαυτοῦ τὸν Πατέρα καλεῖ, λέγων Πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα μου καὶ Πατέρα ὑμῶν,” “He himself said to me, ‘You are my Father, my God.’ Again, at that very time, the steward-like enfleshing of God Himself calls [to] the Father, saying, ‘I go to my Father and your Father’,”

   “τότε ὑπάρχων, ὡς ἄνθρωπος αὐτοῖς πολλάκις ἐφαίνετο σεσαρκωμένος. Ὅθεν πρόδηλον ὅτι, οὐ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔβλεπον, ἀλλὰ τὴν δόξαν.” “then existing, as a man in these many times was revealed being flesh. Whence, it was clear, that they were seeing not the essence of God, but the Glory.”

   “διότι ἐχρίσθη, ἤτοι ἐφόρεσε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ  
   ἀνθρώπου. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται σεσαρκωμένος  
   Θεὸς, καὶ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ” “because he was anointed, whenever he watched over the flesh of man. Also through this he said, ‘God [is] enfleshed, and the Son [is] Christ, and Word of God”

   “[βα]σιλεὺς ὑπάρχων ὡς Θεὸς εἰς βασιλείας ἀρχὴν λέγεται   
   ἔρχεσθαι διὰ τὸ σεσαρκῶσθαι αὐτόν οὕτω καὶ ἅπερ οἶδε φυσικῶς ὡς Θεὸς, ταῦτα πάλιν ἀκούειν λέγεται διὰ” “the king existing as God in the first kingdom said, ‘to work through his enfleshment’, in this way also, which indeed this [is] physically as God, to hear these again, he said, ‘through’”

   “βασιλεὺς, καὶ ὥσπερ βασιλεὺς ὑπάρχων καὶ Θεὸς, εἰς βασιλέως ἀρχὴν λέγεται ἔρχεσθαι, διὰ τὸ σεσαρκῶσθαι. Οὕτω καὶ ἅπερ οἶδε φυσικῶς, ὡς Θεὸς, ταῦτα πάλιν ἀκούειν λέγεται διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον” “king, and as king and God existing, in the first of kings said, ‘to come through the enfleshment.’ In this way also, which indeed this [is] physically, as God, to hear these again, he said, ‘through the human nature’”

   “Ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱόν· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ συνδοξάζεσθαι Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ σεσαρκῶσθαι, πεπονθέναι, ἀναστῆναι, εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνεληλυθέναι, ἥξειν κριτὴν ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.” “[The] same essence exists in the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, in the Father and in the Son, you are together-glorified, true God, the son of God enfleshed, suffered, raised, into heavens ascended, he will come to judge living and dead, in whose glory [is] into the ages of the ages.”

   “κείαν εὐλάβειαν χαλινοῦσαν τοὺς λογισμοὺς ἔχοντες (μέγα γὰρ καὶ κατ’ ἀλήθειαν ὂν τὸ σεσαρκῶσθαι Θεὸν ὑπελάμβανον), ἔτι τὸν νοῦν κλονούμενον εἶχον” “This was the reason why the people in the world were bruising (a great deal and indeed a sense of belonging Thou hast done, that thou wilt be worshiped

   “Μὴ λέγε ἐνηνθρωπηκέναι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σεσαρκῶσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔλαβεν ἔμψυχον σῶμα, οὐδὲ ἐνηνθρώπησε.”

   “Θεοῦ εὐπρέπειαν δὲ τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ γένους φησίν. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ σεσάρκωται, τὴν ἡμετέραν δίχα τῆς ἁμαρτίας λαβὼν φύσιν, δηλονότι οὐκ ἂν ἡμῖν”

   Gregory of Nazianzus (329-390), “μία ὑπόστασις, μία θέλησις, μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, καὶ προσκυνουμένη. Σταυρωθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ὁμολογήσας….”

   Cyril of Alexandria (376-444),

   “Θεὸς γάρ. Ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ μίαν φύσιν εἰρηκὼς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, οὐ μιᾶς φύσεως τὸν Κύριον ἐδογμάτισε.”1

   “τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, οὐ μιᾶς φύσεως τὸν Κύριον ἐδογμάτισε. Τὸ γὰρ σεσαρκωμένην προσθεὶς, τὴν τοιαύτην ἀνεῖλεν ὑπόνοιαν.”2

   “ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα καὶ σεσαρκωμένον τεθέανται τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱὸν, κακόνοι τε καὶ ὀλιγογνώμονες,”3

   “Ὅτι δὲ τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, καὶ σεσαρκωμένον, ἐπέγνωσαν μὲν καὶ τετιμήκασιν οἱ νομομαθέστεροι,”4

   “ὄμμασιν αὐτὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, τὸν δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα, σεσαρκωμένον τε καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα θεωρῶν, καὶ εἰς ἑκούσιον ἑαυτὸν”5

   “Σωτῆρά γε μὴν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὀνομάζουσιν αὐτὸν τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα καὶ σεσαρκωμένον, αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον εἶναι πιστεύσαντες, ὃς καὶ πάλαι τοῖς ἐξ”6

   “Κύριον ἴσμεν, τουτέστι μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον σεσαρκωμένον οὐκ ἀνὰ μέρος τιθέντες ἄνθρωπον καὶ Θεὸν, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγον,”7

   “συναμφοτέρου Χριστὸν ὀνομάζομεν, καὶ Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ ταυτὸν καὶ Θεὸν σεσαρκωμένον. Ποτὲ δὲ ἐξ ἑνὸς τῶν μερῶν, Θεὸν μόνον καὶ Υἱὸν Θεοῦ,”8

   “γὰρ Θεὸς ἦν ἀποῤῥήτως σεσαρκωμένος, μόνος ᾔδει τὸ ἀγαθὸν, καὶ πονηρίας τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις”9

   Apollinaris (d. circa 390), “

   Epiphanius of Salamis (310-403), “Ἀριστοτέλην σοφίσαντα, ἀλλὰ Θεὸν τὸν εἰς τέλη τῶν αἰώνων σε σώσαντα. Πέπτωκε Κρόνος, ὅτι σεσάρκωται Θεὸς Λόγος οὐ μὴν ἀνδρὸς ἐκ παθείας, ἀλλὰ θεανδρικῶς ἐκ Μαρίας ἐπιφανείς.”

   Chrysostom (349-407),

   “καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ δειχθέντων, ἐτόλμησάν τινες λέγειν, δοκήσει καὶ φαντασίᾳ αὐτὸν σεσαρκῶσθαι· εἰ μὴ ταῦτα ἐγεγόνει, ποῦ οὐκ εἶχον ἐξοκεῖλαι ἀσεβείας; Πᾶς οὖν ὁ ταῖς ἁγίαις Γραφαῖς”

   δὲ τῇ σαρκί. Οὐδὲ γὰρ κατὰ φαντασίαν, ὥς τινες τῶν αἱρετικῶν δοκοῦσιν, ἀληθείᾳ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος σεσάρκωται. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἑρμηνεύων ὁ Δαυῒδ πάλιν ἔλεγεν, Ἀλήθεια ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀνέτειλε, τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τοῦ”

   Chalcedon (451), “ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, υἱόν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐκ δύο φύσεων [ἐν δύο φύσεσιν], ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως … εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπὸστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον”, Crudely, “One and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in two “natures” (δύο φύσεις: note how the meaning of the word has shifted from meaning concrete instance to meaning nature), unconfounded, unchanged, without exception, inseparable … in one face and one basis, not one in two faces divided or separated. Εἰς πρόσωπον has taken over the use of μία φύσις: they mean approximately the same thing.

   <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/demo/tsearch.jsp#s=10σεσαρκω>

   <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/atσεσαρκωμένη> (nominative), σεσαρκωμένην (accusative or rare dual?),σεσαρκωμένον (masculine accusative), etc.

   <http://reasonablechristian.blogspot.com/2012/12/the-definition-of-chalcedon-in-english.html> [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cyril_of_Alexandria>

   <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Miaphysitism>

   <http://classicalchristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/St.-Cyril-of-Alexandria%E2%80%99s-Miaphysite-Christology-and-Chalcedonian-Dyophysitism.pdf>

   <https://afkimel.wordpress.com/2016/01/11/st-cyril-of-alexandria-the-one-incarnate-nature-of-christ/> [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. ibid, especially:

   <http://classicalchristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/St.-Cyril-of-Alexandria%E2%80%99s-Miaphysite-Christology-and-Chalcedonian-Dyophysitism.pdf> [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. ibid [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. ibid [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. ibid [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. ibid [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Some spellings were changed: [www.earlychurchtexts.com/public/cyrilofalex\_twelve\_anathemas.htm](http://www.earlychurchtexts.com/public/cyrilofalex_twelve_anathemas.htm) [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. This is doubtless true; yet, difficult to discern: since, the Son and the Spirit seem to be inseparable companions. Indeed, the indivisible oneness of the ὁμο-ούσιον suggests that Father, Son, and Spirit always participate together in some mystical way. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. <http://classicalchristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/St.-Cyril-of-Alexandria%E2%80%99s-Miaphysite-Christology-and-Chalcedonian-Dyophysitism.pdf> [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3604028.htm> [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. But this very word could hide the subtlety of φύσις, which we protest. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199534951.001.0001/acprof-9780199534951-chapter-6>

    The following somewhat biased summary does epitomize the historic setting. It is evident that Leo was moving to establish and solidify his power base in Rome: he is setting the stage for Old Rome to again be the Capital of the Empire. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. If you have been blessed or helped by any of these meditations, please repost, share, or use any of them as you wish. No rights are reserved. They are designed and intended for your free participation. They were freely received, and are freely given. No other permission is required for their use. [↑](#endnote-ref-17)