

Epistula Synodica*

Δεσπότη τὰ πάντα ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ Σεργίῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Σωφρόνιῳ ἀχρεῖος δοῦλος τῆς ἀγίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πόλεως.

2.1.1. Βαβαί, βαβαί, παμμακάριστοι, πῶς μοι φίλον νῦν τὸ ἡσύχιον καὶ πολὺ τοῦ πρὶν προσφιλέστερον, ἀφ' οὐπερ ἐξ ἡσυχίας ἀπράγμονος εἰς πραγμάτων τύρβην ἐλήλυθα καὶ χερσαίοις τισι καταντλοῦμαι τοῖς κύμασι· βαβαί, βαβαί, θεοτίμητοι, πῶς μοι νῦν ἡδὺν τὸ ἐλάχιστον καὶ τοῦ πρὶν οὐ μετρίως ἡδύτερον, ἀφ' οὐπερ ἐκ κοπρίας καὶ γῆς καὶ ἀφάτου καὶ πολλῆς ταπεινότητος εἰς θῶκον ἱεραρχικὸν ἀνελήλυθα καὶ πολὺν ὁρῶ συνεζευγμένον τὸν κλύδωνα καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι παρομαρτοῦντα τὸν κίνδυνον· οὐχ οὕτω γὰρ ἡδιστα καθοράται τὰ ἡδιστα πρὸ τῆς τῶν ἀηδῶν πείρας καὶ γνώσεως, ὥς ὅταν [412] μετὰ πείραν καὶ ἔφοδον τῶν λυπηρῶν καταφαίνεται. οὕτως ὑγεία τοῖς μεθ' ὑγείαν νοσοῦσι τριπόθητος, οὕτω γαλήνη τοῖς μετὰ γαλήνην χειμαζομένοις ἐπίχαρτος, οὕτω πλοῦτος τοῖς μετὰ πλοῦτον πενομένοις ἐράσμιος, καὶ πάντα τις οὕτως ἂν ἴδοι τυγχάνοντα, αὐτὰ μὲν ὄντα καὶ μένοντα φυσικῇ καὶ οὐσιώδει ποιότητι, ὅποιαπερ καὶ πρὸ τῆς τῶν ἐναντίων πείρας ἐφαίνετο, κομψότερα δὲ μετὰ τὴν τούτων γνώσιν γινόμενα καὶ τοῖς αὐτὰ δεδεγμένοις πολὺ τιμιώτερα, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ποθεινότερα καὶ τερπνότερα.

2.1.2. Καὶ τοῦτο ἡμῖν Ἰωβ ὁ ἀοίδιμος συμψηφιεῖται λαμπρότατα διὰ πείρας ἐκατέρων γενόμενος καὶ τὰς ψήφους ὀρθὰς ὀρίζόμενος, καὶ δίκαιος ἂν εἴη κριτῆς τῶν λεγομένων ἡμῖν προερχόμενος καὶ κρίσιν ὀρίζων ἀπροσκληνῇ καὶ ἀδέκαστον. τί οὖν ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἀθλητής

* Numbers between square brackets refer to pages in Riedinger's text; otherwise brackets mark a word or letter that should be deleted; pointed brackets signal an insertion, more often than not supplied from the Latin translation of the conciliar *acta* edited by Riedinger.

To the most holy Master in all things, and most blessed brother and fellow minister, Sergius,¹ archbishop and patriarch of Constantinople, Sophronius, useless servant (cf. Luke 17: 10) of the holy city of Christ our God [sends greetings].

2.1. INTRODUCTION

1. Oh! Oh! most blessed One, how dear to me now is tranquillity, and how much dearer than before, now that I have come from tranquil freedom into a turmoil of affairs and am engulfed by waves on land, as it were. Oh! Oh! one honoured by God, how sweet to me now is a lowly estate, and not a little sweeter than before, now that I have risen up from the dung-heap and the earth and from unspeakable and great lowliness to the high-priestly chair; and I see the great waves surging about it and the danger accompanying the waves. For delights are not perceived as delights in the same way before the experience and knowledge of vexations, as when they appear after the experience and onslaught of sorrows. So to those who are ill after having been healthy, health is thrice longed for; so to those tossed about in a storm after calm weather, calm weather is longed-for joy; so to those poor who were once wealthy, wealth is wholly desirable. And one may see that everything happens in this way—the very things that exist and remain in their natural and essential quality even as they appeared to be before the experience of their contraries, become more pleasant after one does have knowledge of them [sc. their contraries], and much more precious, not to say more longed for and more enjoyable, to those who have received them.

2. And in this regard, the celebrated Job will most clearly vote in our favour. Since he has experience of both and defines correct judgments, he would also be a just judge of what we have said, were he to come forward and determine a sentence which is impartial and unbribed. What, then, does that undefeated athlete

¹ This is the only occasion in the entire letter where Sergius is mentioned by name.

φησιν ὁ ἀδάμαστος ἰδὼν τῶν παθῶν τὴν μετάβλησιν καὶ τῶν λυπούντων ἐλθὼν εἰς ἐπίκλυσιν;

2.1.3. Τίς ἂν με θείῃ κατὰ μῆνα ἔμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν,
ὦν με ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλαξεν;
ὥς ὅτε ἡὔγει ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μου,
ὅτε τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπορευόμην ἐν σκότει·
ὅτι ἡμην ἐπιβρίθων ὁδοῖς,
ὅτε ὁ κύριος ἐπισκοπὴν ἐποιεῖτο τοῦ οἴκου μου·
ὅτε ἡμην ὑλώδης λίαν κύκλω δέ μου οἱ παῖδες·
ὅτε ἐχέοντό μου αἱ ὁδοὶ βουτύρῳ,
τὰ δὲ ὄρη μου ἐχέοντο γάλακτι·
ὅτε ἐξεπορευόμην ὁρθριος ἐν πόλει,
ἐν δὲ πλατείαις ἐτίθετό μου ὁ δίφρος.
ἰδόντες με νεανίσκοι ἐκρύβησαν,
πρεσβῦται δὲ ἐπανεστήσαν·
ἄδρῳ δὲ ἐπαύσαντο λαλοῦντες δάκτυλον ἐπιθέντες ἐπὶ στόματι,
οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐμακάρισάν με.

2.1.4. Οὐκοῦν εἰκότως καὶ γὰρ, μακαριώτατοι, σὺν Ἰωβ τῷ πεντάθλῳ βοήσομαι τῶν πάλαι μοι προσόντων καλῶν τῇ μνήμῃ βαλλόμενος· γαληνὸς ταῦτα βίος ἦν καὶ ἡσύχιος καὶ ταπεινότης οὐδένα γινώσκουσα κλύδωνα.

τίς ἂν με θείῃ κατὰ μῆνα ἔμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν,
ὦν με ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλαττεν ἄθλιπτον;
ὥς ὅτε ἡὔγει ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μου
εἰρηναίαν βιοῦντος ζωὴν καὶ ἀκύμαντον,
[414] ὅτε τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπορευόμην ἐν σκότει,
ὅτε τῆς ἡσυχίας ἐτρύγων τοὺς βότρυας,
ὅτε γαλήνης ἐβριθόμην γενήμασιν,
ὅτε ἀταραξίας ἐτρύφων βλαστήμασιν,
ὅτε ἀμεριμνίας ἡγαλλίων τοῖς ἄνθεσιν,
ὅτε ἀφοβίας ἐστεφανούμην τοῖς κάλυξιν,
ὅτε ἀπραγμοσύνην ἡστιώμην ταῖς χάρισιν,

say on seeing the change of fortunes and on approaching a flood of sorrowful events?²

3. *Who will bring me back to the month of former days,
the days when God safeguarded me;
as when his lamp shone over my head;
when in darkness I walked by his light;
when I was steadfast in my ways;
when the Lord kept oversight of my house;
when I was exceedingly prosperous,
with my children circled around me;
when my paths flowed with butter,
and the mountains flowed for me with milk;
when I went out early to the city
and my seat was placed in the squares;
on seeing me the young men retired,
the old men rose to their feet;
the leaders stopped talking, putting a finger on their lips,
and my hearers deemed me blessed (Job 29: 2–10).*

4. Surely, then, it is reasonable, O most blessed One, that I too should cry out with Job, winner of the pentathlon, since I am struck by the memory of the good things that once belonged to me. Life was calm with these things and tranquil, and my lowly position knew of no flood.

*Who will bring me back to the month of former days,
the days when God safeguarded me from oppression?
As when his lamp shone over my head (Job 29: 2–3)
when I was leading a peaceful and unbuffeted life,
when in darkness I walked by his light (Job 29: 4),
when I gathered the grape-clusters of tranquillity;
when I was weighed down by the produce of calm weather;
when I fared sumptuously on the fruits of serenity;
when I delighted in the blossoms of freedom from care;
when I was crowned with the buds of fearlessness;
when I feasted on carefreeness with the graces;*

² On the representation of Job as an athlete in Patristic literature see M. B. Poliakov, 'Jacob, Job, and Other Wrestlers: Reception of Greek Athletics by Jews and Christians in Antiquity', *Journal of Sport History*, 11 (1984), 48–65, at 48–52.

ὅτε τῆς ἐπιγείου πενίας ἀπήλαυον,
 ὅτε τῆς ἀκινδύνου κοπρίας ἤρουν τοὺς αὐλακας,
 ὅτε τῆς ἀκυμάντου πτωχείας τὴν θάλατταν ἔπλεον,
 ὅτε τῆς χθαμαλῆς ἐστίας ἐγαννύμην τοῖς κάλλεσιν,
 ὅτε τῆς χαμαιτρόφου διαίτης μάννα τὸ μελίρρυτον ἤσθιον·

ἄλλος τις Ἰσραὴλ καὶ αὐτὸς θεωρούμενος καὶ τρυφήν τρυφῶν
 εἰρηνικὴν καὶ οὐράνιον ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ καὶ γνώμης ἀγνώμονος.

2.1.5. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ταῦτα καὶ τούτων πέρα, σοφώτατοι, εἰς ἐμὲ τὸν
 τρισάθλιον ἀνάγκη μεγάλη καὶ βία θεοφιλῶν κληρικῶν καὶ εὐλαβῶν
 μοναστῶν καὶ πιστῶν λαϊκῶν, τῶν πάντων πολιτῶν τῆς ἀγίας
 ταύτης Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πόλεως, τῶν χειρὶ με βιασαμένων
 καὶ τυραννίδι δρασάντων, γεγένηται, οἷοις οὐκ οἶδα οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι
 κρίμασιν, ἀξιῶ τοὺς πανιέρους ὑμᾶς καὶ προτρέπομαι μὴ μόνον
 εὐχαῖς καθαραῖς ταῖς πρὸς κύριον ἐπικουρεῖν ἐμοὶ βιωτικῶς
 θαλαττεύοντι εἶτα δὲ καὶ κινδυνεύοντι καὶ στηρίζειν με μικροψυ-
 χίαις ὀκλάζοντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοπνεύστοις διδάγμασι ποδηγεῖν πρὸς
 τὴν τῶν πρακτέων ἐγχείρησιν, τοῦτο μὲν ὡς πατέρες καὶ φύσαντες,
 τοῦτο δὲ ὡς ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ὁμαίμονες. δότε γοῦν ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ πατρικῶς
 τε καὶ ἀδελφικῶς τὰ αἰτήματα δίκαιά τε τυγχάνοντα, καὶ γὰρ ταῖς
 ὑμετέραις ποδηγίαις ἐφέψομαι καὶ συμπλοκὴν τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐμπο-
 ρεύσομαι, ἣν ἡ πίστις συνδεῖ τοὺς ὁμόφρονας καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς συναινοῖ
 τοὺς εὐθύφρονας καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη συνδεσμοῖ τοὺς θεόφρονas· ὧν τὸ
 σχοινίον τὸ ἔντριτον καὶ τριῶν τουτωνὶ τῶν θείων ἀρετῶν [416]
 συμπλεκόμενον οὔτε λύσιν ἐπίσταται οὔτε ῥῆξιν ὑφίσταται οὔτε
 χωρισμὸν παραδέχεται, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθῶς ἀδιάρρηκτον εἰς μίαν
 συνάγων εὐσέβειαν τοὺς τὴν πλοκὴν αὐτοῦ πλουτοῦντας τὴν
 ἔνθεον.

2.1.6. Ἐπειδὴ δέ τις ἀποστολικὴ καὶ ἀρχαία παράδοσις ἐν ταῖς
 κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀγίαις <τοῦ θεοῦ> ἐκκλησίαις
 κεκράτηκεν, ὅπως οἱ πρὸς ἱεραρχίαν ἀγόμενοι τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν τὰς

when I enjoyed earthly poverty;
 when I tilled the furrows of the dung-heap without danger;
 when I sailed the sea of penury unbeset by waves;
 when I was happy with the adornments of a lowly hearth;
 when I ate the manna, flowing with honey (Exod. 16), of the diet
 which nourishes us below—
 another Israel, as it were, myself both contemplating and faring
 plentifully on peaceful and heavenly fare *without murmuring* (1 Pet.
 4: 9) and unfeeling judgment?

5. These things, then, most wise One, and more besides have come upon me, thrice afflicted by great necessity and by force on the part of the God-loving clerics and devout monks and faithful laity—all the citizens of this holy city of Christ our God—who forced me by hand and used tyrannous methods, due to judgments of a kind I do not know or understand.³ I therefore beseech and urge Your All-holy Self not only to come to my help by your pure prayers to the Lord as I sail on life's sea, and am hence also in peril, and support me as I labour in weakness of spirit, but also to guide me by God-inspired teachings to undertake deeds, doing the one as father and begetter, the other as brother and kin by blood.⁴ Do You therefore both paternally and fraternally grant me my petitions, which are just ones, and I shall follow Your guidance and so secure the bond with you, in which faith ties together those of like mind, and hope brings into agreement those of right mind, and love binds together those of godly mind (cf. 1 Cor. 13: 13). Their three-stranded cord, woven together from those three divine virtues, neither knows undoing, nor admits of rending, nor allows separation, but truly cannot be rent asunder, leading together into one pious belief those who are enriched by its divine weaving.

6. An apostolic and ancient tradition⁵ has prevailed in the holy churches of God throughout the whole world, whereby those acceding to the hierarchy frankly refer in all respects to those who

³ This appears to be a modesty topos. See sec. 1.4.1, above.

⁴ The recurring contrast between father and brother, referring to two patriarchs, belongs to the genre of the synodical letter. See sec. 1.5.1, above.

⁵ The origins of the custom are obscure. See sec. 1.5.1, above. On the implications of the following passage for Sophronius' stance with regard to Rome see sec. 1.2, above. Sophronius implicitly proves his orthodoxy by comparing himself to Paul in going to Jerusalem, sharing in apostolic teaching, and passing it on safe and sound.

ἱεραρχίας χειρίζουσι πάντα εἰλικρινῶς ἀνατίθενται, ὅπως φρονοῖεν
 καὶ ὅπως πίστεως ἔχοιεν, ἣν Παῦλος αὐτοῖς ὁ σοφώτατος ἄγαν
 ἀσφαλῶς παραδέδωκεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κενὸν τὰ δρομήματα τεύχοιεν,
 κενὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἅπας ὁ δρόμος ἐγένετο ἀδικουμένης κατὰ τι τῆς
 πίστεως. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὁ θεσπέσιος ὁ θεοῦ φωνῶν ἀκροασάμενος
 καὶ οὐρανὸν αὐτὸν ἐσχηκὼς παιδευτήριον καὶ παραδείσου θεωρὸς
 γενόμενος πρόωρος καὶ ῥημάτων ἐτέροις ἀρρήτων ἀνθρώποις
 πυθόμενος ἐδεδίει καὶ ἔτρεμε καί, ὡς αὐτός φησιν, ἐπεφοβείτο
μήπως ἄλλοις κηρύξας Χριστοῦ τὸ σωτήριον κήρυγμα αὐτὸς
ἀδόκιμος γένηται. ὅθεν καὶ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀνήρχετο ὁ Χριστοῦ
 μαθητὴς ἐπουράνιος καὶ τοῖς πρὸ αὐτοῦ θείοις μαθηταῖς ὑπεκλίνετο
 καὶ τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν ὅπερ ἐκήρυττε δίδαγμα τοῖς τῶν ἄλλων δοκοῦσι
 προὔχειν ἐγνώριζε καὶ κοινωνοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐποιεῖτο τοῦ δόγματος
 τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἑαυτῷ μνηστευόμενος καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν δεχομένοις
 αὐτοῦ τὰ διδάγματα τύπος ἅπασι σωτηρίας γενόμενος ἄριστος τοῖς
 ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτοῦ βουλομένοις τοῖς ἴχνεσι. τούτῳ τοιγαροῦν καὶ
 ἡμεῖς τῷ ἔθει δουλεύοντες καὶ νόμον ἡγούμενοι κάλλιστον πᾶν τὸ
 τοῖς πάλαι πρεπόντως γενόμενον ἀποστολικῶς μάλιστα κρατυνθὲν
 ἐγχειρήματι, τὸ ὅπως ἔχομεν περὶ πίστεως γράφομεν καὶ τοῖς
 θεοσόφοις ὑμῖν πρὸς δοκιμὴν ἀποστέλλομεν, ἵνα μὴ ὅρια μετατιθέν-
τες αἰώνια, ἅπερ ἡμῶν οἱ πατέρες ἔθεντο, δόξωμεν, οὐ διακρίνειν
 μόνον εἰδόσιν ἀπὸ τῶν νόθων τὰ δόκιμα δόγματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ
προσαναπληροῦν τὰ λείποντα [418] διὰ τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ τελείαν
 ἀγάπησιν δυναμένοις ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἰσχύουσιν. ἐκεῖνα γοῦν λέξων
 ἐλεύσομαι, ἅπερ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ καθολικῇ
 τεχθεὶς καὶ τραφεὶς ἐκμεμάθηκα καὶ ἐξ ἀπαλῶν φρονεῖν ὀνύχων
 παρείληφα καὶ κηρυττόντων ὑμῶν τῶν θεοπνεύστων ἀκήκοα.

have administered the high-priesthood before them, as to how they should think and maintain the faith which the most wise Paul has handed on to them with the utmost safeguards, lest they *run their course in vain* (Gal. 2: 2), for their entire course becomes vain if the faith is harmed in any respect. For that prophetic man, who listened to God's utterances and had heaven itself as his school, and became a beholder of paradise before his time, and *heard things that could not be told* (2 Cor. 12: 4) to other human beings, was in dread and trepidation, and, as he says himself, was thoroughly afraid lest, *after announcing to others* the saving message of Christ, *he himself should be disqualified* (1 Cor. 9: 27). Hence Christ's heavenly disciple also went up to Jerusalem and submitted himself to the divine disciples who were before him, and made known the Gospel teaching which he preached to those who seemed to be superior to others, and made them party to his doctrine, ensuring a safeguard for himself and for those after him who receive his teachings, becoming an excellent model of salvation for all those who wished to follow in his footsteps.⁶ Accordingly we also observe this custom, and, because we deem an excellent law all that was done fittingly by older generations, especially when confirmed by apostolic practice, we write how it stands with us concerning the faith, and we send it to You, wise in the things of God, to be tested, lest we seem to have *changed the ancient landmarks which our fathers positioned* (Prov. 22: 28). You not only know how to distinguish acceptable teachings from spurious ones but also are able, through the perfect love of Christ, to *supply what is lacking* (2 Cor. 9: 12) accurately and firmly. It is those teachings, then, of which I shall discourse, teachings which I, having been born and reared in the holy catholic church, learned thoroughly from the beginning and received as the way to think from childhood, and heard You, who are inspired by God, preach.⁷

⁶ On the position of Jerusalem vis-à-vis Rome and Constantinople at this time see Conte, *Chiesa e primato*, 126–7, n. 22.

⁷ Probably we are not to take the word 'preaching' as meaning that Sophronius was inspired by Sergius' homilies. Rather, by claiming that his profession of faith has been influenced by Sergius, the patriarch of Jerusalem intends to demonstrate his oneness of belief with the patriarch of Constantinople.

2.2.1. Πιστεύω τοίνυν, μακάριοι, καθάπερ ἀρχήθεν πεπίστευκα, εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ἄναρχον παντελῶς καὶ αἰδίον, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν αἰδίως καὶ ἀπαθῶς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατὴρ καὶ οὐκ ἄλλην ἀρχὴν ἢ τὸν πατέρα γινώσκοντα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἄλλοθεν ποθεν ἢ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔχοντα, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς ὁμοούσιον, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ συναἰδίον. καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ αἰδίως ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ φῶς καὶ θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸ γνωριζόμενον καὶ ὃν ἀληθῶς πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συναἰδίον, ὁμοούσιόν τε καὶ ὁμόφυλον καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας τε καὶ φύσεως, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ θεότητος.

2.2.2. Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὁμότιμον καὶ ὁμόθρονον, συμφυᾶ καὶ συγγενῇ καὶ ὁμόφυλον, εἰς μίαν συγκεφαλαιουμένην θεότητα καὶ εἰς μίαν συναγομένην κοινὴν κυριότητα ἄνευ προσωπικῆς ἀναχύσεως καὶ ὑποστατικῆς ἐκτὸς συναιρέσεως. τριάδα γὰρ ἐν μονάδι πιστεύομεν καὶ μονάδα ἐν τριάδι δοξάζομεν, τριάδα μὲν ταῖς τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσι, μονάδα δὲ τῷ μοναδικῷ τῆς θεότητος· ἢ τε γὰρ ἁγία τριάς ἀριθμητὴ ταῖς προσωπικαῖς ἐστὶν ὑποστάσεσιν, ἢ τε παναγία μονὰς πάσης ἐκτὸς ἐστὶν ἀριθμήσεως, καὶ ἡ μὲν ἀδιαίρετον ἔχει διαίρεσιν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον φέρει συνάφειαν. διαιρουμένη γὰρ ταῖς ἀριθμηταῖς ὑποστάσεσι καὶ ἀριθμουμένη ταῖς προσωπικαῖς [420] ἐτερότησι τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἦνεται καὶ τὸν παντελῆ μερισμὸν οὐ προσίεται. ἢ τε μονὰς ἐνιαῖα τέ ἐστὶν καὶ ἀσύζυγος καὶ πᾶσαν φεύγει τὴν κατ' οὐσίαν ἀρίθμησιν. εἰς γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῖν ἀραρότως πιστεύεται, ὅτι καὶ θεότης μία διαπρυσίως

2.2. TRINITARIAN PROFESSION OF FAITH⁸

1. I believe then, O blessed One, as I have believed from the beginning: in one God, Father almighty, entirely without beginning⁹ and eternal, maker of all things both seen and unseen; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten eternally and impassibly from the same God and Father, and acknowledging no other beginning than the Father, nor having his hypostasis¹⁰ from any other source than from the Father; consubstantial light from light, co-eternal true God from true God; and in one Holy Spirit, who issues eternally from the God and Father,¹¹ the light that is itself recognized as being likewise God and is truly co-eternal with Father and Son, and both consubstantial and of the same stock, and of the same substance and nature and likewise also of Godhead.¹²

2. [I believe] in a Trinity that is consubstantial, and of the same honour and of the same throne, sharing nature, sharing kinship, and of the same stock, in one consummate Godhead and in one united common lordship without confusion of persons, and with no contraction of hypostasis. For we believe in a Trinity in unity, and we glorify unity in trinity, a Trinity in the three hypostases and a unity in the singleness of the Godhead; for the holy Trinity has number in the hypostases of persons, whereas the all-holy unity is wholly without number, and has an indivisible division and sustains an unconfused conjunction.¹³ For while it is divided in its numerable hypostases and numbered in the differences of its persons, it is united in the identity of its essence and its nature, and does not admit of complete partition. The unity is both unitary and unaggregate and shuns all numeration according to substance. For we believe in one God unshakeably, because both one

⁸ For another trinitarian profession of faith in Sophronius see *Homily on the Annunciation*, PG 87, 3217B–3224B. Cf. von Schönborn, *Sophrone*, 119–56.

⁹ The Greek *ἀναρχον* indicates that the Father is identified as the one who has no principle, no source, no cause, himself being the principle, the source, and the cause of the Son and the Spirit.

¹⁰ A philosophical term, hypostasis was used particularly in Chalcedonian christological discourse in the sense of concrete reality, as opposed to nature (*physis*). By anti-Chalcedonians it was seen as the equivalent of nature and of person (*prosopon*). See further PGL s.v., 1459, B 2.

¹¹ Cf. Symbol of Constantinople, ACO II, 1, 2, 128, 2–11; trans. Tanner, i. *24.

¹² The foregoing is inspired largely by the creed of Nicaea. Cf. Tanner, i. *5.

¹³ Cf. Justinian, *On the Right Faith*, 72, 16–19; trans. Wesche, 164.

κηρύττεται, κὰν τριάδι προσώπων γινώσκειται καὶ εἰς κύριος ἡμῖν ἀναγγέλλεται, ὅτι καὶ κυριότης μία βεβαίως διέγνωσται, κὰν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσι δείκνυται.

2.2.3. Οὐτε καθὸ εἰς θεὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ μία θεότης, ἐστὶ διαιρούμενος καὶ εἰς τρεῖς θεοὺς μεριζόμενος ἢ εἰς τρεῖς θεότητας ἐκφερόμενος· οὐτε καθὸ εἰς κύριος, ὁ εἰς κύριος διυστάμενος καὶ εἰς κυρίους τρεῖς εὐρυνόμενος ἢ κυριότητας τρεῖς πλατυνόμενος. Ἀρειανῶν τὸ δυσσέβημα εἰς ἀνίσους θεοὺς τὸν ἕνα κατατέμνον θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἀνομοίους θεότητας τὴν μίαν μερίζον θεότητα καὶ εἰς ἑτερογενεῖς τρεῖς κυριότητας τὴν μίαν διυστῶν κυριότητα· οὐτε καθὸ τριάς ὁ εἰς θεός ἐστι καὶ γνωρίζεται καὶ ὑποστάσεις τρεῖς καταγγέλλεται καὶ τρία πρεσβεύεται πρόσωπα, καὶ πατήρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, λέγεται συσσελλόμενος ἢ συντιθέμενος ἢ συγχεόμενος, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἑαυτὸν συναλείφων ὑπόστασιν καὶ εἰς ἓν συγκρίνων οὐκ ἀριθμούμενον πρόσωπον. Σαβελλιανῶν τὸ ἀνόμημα εἰς μίαν τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις συγχέον ὑπόστασιν καὶ εἰς ἓν τὰ τρία συμφῦρον πρόσωπα πρόσωπον. ποῦ γὰρ τριάς, ὧ δυσσεβέστατοι, εἰ πρὸς ἓν καθ' ὑμᾶς ἢ τριάς συναχθήσεται πρόσωπον καὶ πρὸς μίαν δράμοι συγκεχυμένην ὑπόστασιν; ἢ ποῦ μονάς, ὧ μανικώτατοι, εἰ πρὸς οὐσίας τρεῖς ἢ μονὰς ἐξαχθήσεται καὶ πρὸς φύσεις τρεῖς πλατυνθήσεται καὶ πρὸς θεότητας τρεῖς πληθυνθήσεται; ἀσεβὲς γὰρ παρ' ὀρθοδόξοις ἐκάτερον καὶ πάντῃ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐξώκειλε τό τε μοναδικὸν καθ' ὑπόστασιν τό τε τριαδικὸν ἐν ταῖς φύσεσι. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς Ἰουδαϊσμὸν εὐθὺς ἀποφέρεται καὶ ἑαυτῷ συναποφέρει τὸν λέγοντα, τὸ δὲ πρὸς Ἑλληνισμὸν ἐκκυλίνεται καὶ ἑαυτῷ συνεκκυλίνει τὸν φάσκοντα· καὶ ἡ πάντως ἑλληνίζει ὁ τοῦτο μανικῶς

Godhead is manifestly proclaimed, although it is acknowledged in a trinity of persons, and one Lord is announced to us, because one lordship too is firmly discerned, although it is shown forth in three hypostases.

3. Neither is God as one God and one Godhead divided and partitioned into three gods or drawn out into three godheads; nor is the Lord as one Lord separated and extended into three lords or widened into three lordships.¹⁴ (The Arians' impiety divides the one God into unequal gods and partitions the one Godhead into dissimilar godheads, and separates the one lordship into three heterogeneous lordships.¹⁵) Nor as the one God is a Trinity and is recognized and proclaimed as three hypostases and worshipped as three persons, Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, is he said to be contracted or compounded or confused, that is, by coalescing himself into one hypostasis and combining [himself] into one person that cannot be numbered. (The unlawful view of the Sabellians confuses the three hypostases into one hypostasis and mixes up the three persons into one person.¹⁶) For where is the Trinity, you most impious people, if, according to you, the Trinity is assembled in one person and comes together into one confused hypostasis? Or where is the unity, you maddest of men,¹⁷ if the unity is drawn out into three essences and widened into three natures and multiplied into three godheads? For with the orthodox each of these is impious and drifts wholly astray from pious belief, whether unitarian in respect of hypostasis or triadic in the natures. The former is carried off directly into Judaism and carries off the speaker with it,¹⁸ the latter rolls aside towards paganism and rolls the exponent away with it.¹⁹ And either the one who

¹⁴ A similar argument is found in Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 39. 11 (cf. *CPG* 3010); *SC* 358, 170–2.

¹⁵ This charge is based on an Arian position that Christ was a kind of demigod, not fully divine but created, and therefore not consubstantial with the Father.

¹⁶ Sabellius, an obscure theologian probably of the early third century, gave his name to a doctrine whereby the unity of the Godhead was so stressed that it was viewed in terms of 'modes' rather than persons distinguishable in it. See *EEC* 2, 748–9.

¹⁷ The Arians are meant here.

¹⁸ By exaggeration the Sabellians are said to approach Judaic monotheism because of their emphasis on unity within the Trinity.

¹⁹ Also by exaggeration the Arians are described as approaching pagan polytheism because they assimilate the sophistications of late pagan philosophy by reckoning the Trinity in terms of neo-Platonic emanationism.

σὺν Ἀρείῳ φθεγγόμενος ἢ ἰουδαΐζει ὁ ἐκεῖνο δυσσεβῶς σὺν Σαβελλίῳ δεχόμενος.

2.2.4. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καλῶς τοῖς θεολόγοις τεθέσπισται μονάδα μὲν ἡμᾶς φρονεῖν μιᾷ καὶ ἐνιαίᾳ θεότητι καὶ τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς οὐσιώδους τε καὶ φυσικῆς κυριότητος, τριάδα δὲ ταῖς ἀσυγχύτοις τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσι καὶ τῷ διαφόρῳ τῆς τρισαρίθμου προσωπικῆς ἐτερότητας, ἵνα μήτε τὸ ἐν μείνῃ Σαβέλλιον πάντῃ ἐν θεωρούμενον καὶ πᾶσαν ὑποστατικὴν πληθὺν ἐκτρεπόμενον, μήτε τὰ τρία σεμνύνοι τὸν Ἀρειὸν τρία διαμπὰξ προσνοούμενα καὶ πᾶσαν μοναδικὴν φωνὴν διωθούμενα θεότητος καὶ οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως. ὥσπερ οὖν ἓνα θεὸν φρονεῖν ἐδιδάχθημεν, οὕτω καὶ μίαν θεότητα καθομολογεῖν παρειλήφαμεν, καὶ ὥσπερ ὑποστάσεις τρεῖς πρεσβεύειν ἐμάθομεν, οὕτω καὶ πρόσωπα τρία δοξολογεῖν ἐπαιδεύθημεν, οὐκ ἄλλον τὸν ἓνα θεὸν παρὰ τὰ τρία γινώσκοντες πρόσωπα, οὔτε τὰ τρία τῆς τριάδος ὁμοούσια πρόσωπα, ἅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ, ὁ υἱός, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἕτερα παρὰ τὸν ἓνα θεὸν ἐπιστάμενοι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τὰ τρία τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ θεότης κηρύττομεν καὶ τὰ τρία ἐν ὧν ἡ θεότης ἐστὶν ἐξαγγέλλομεν—ἡ τό γε ἀκριβέστερον εἰπεῖν καὶ σαφέστερον, ἃ ἡ θεότης ἐστὶ καὶ γινώσκεται. τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐν ἐστὶ καὶ τρία πιστεύεται καὶ τρία δοξάζεται καὶ ἐν ἀληθῶς ἀναγγέλλεται, καὶ οὔτε τὸ ἐν, ἢ ἐν ἐστὶ, τρία λαμβάνεται, οὔτε τὰ τρία, καθὸ τρία τυγχάνει, ἐν ἐξακούεται, ὃ καὶ παράδοξον καὶ πάσης ὄντως γέμον ἐκπλήξεως. τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ καὶ ἀριθμητὸν ἐστὶ καὶ διαφεύγει τὴν ἐξαρίθμησιν· ἀριθμητὸν μὲν ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ τρισαῖς ὑποστάσεσι, διαφεύγον δὲ τὴν ἀρίθμησιν τῷ ἐνικῷ τῆς [424] θεότητος, τὸ γὰρ ἐνικὸν αὐτοῦ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ἀριθμεῖσθαι παντελῶς οὐκ ἀνέχεται, ἵνα μὴ καὶ διαφορὰν εἰσοίσοι θεότητος καὶ λοιπὸν οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως καὶ πολυθεΐαν τὴν μοναρχίαν ἐργάσοιτο. πᾶς γὰρ ἀριθμὸς τὴν διαφορὰν κέκτεται σύνοικον καὶ πᾶσα διαφορὰ καὶ διάκρισις τὸν ἀριθμὸν συνεπάγεται σύμφυτον.

asserts the latter madly with Arius is a thoroughgoing pagan, or the one who impiously accepts the former with Sabellius is a Judaizer.

4. On this account it has been well decreed by the theologians that we should think of the unity in one, single Godhead and in the identity of essential and natural lordship, but of the Trinity in three unconfused hypostases and in the difference of the three-fold distinction of persons, so that neither should the one await Sabellius by being perceived as wholly one and shunning all plurality of hypostasis, nor should the three make Arius vain by being conceived through and through as three while repudiating every unitarian expression of Godhead and essence and nature. As, therefore, we have been taught to think of one God, so too have we received the tradition of confessing one Godhead; and just as we have learned to worship three hypostases, so too have we been instructed to glorify three persons, not acknowledging the one God apart from the three persons, nor understanding the three consubstantial persons in the Trinity—that is, Father, Son, Holy Spirit—as being distinct from the one God. This is why we proclaim as one the three in whom the Godhead is, and we announce as one the three of whom is the Godhead; or, to speak more accurately and more clearly, the three whom the Godhead is and as whom it is recognized. For the same thing is both one and is believed in as three and is glorified as three and is announced in truth as one.²⁰ And neither is the one, by virtue of being one, taken to be three, nor are the three, inasmuch as they are three, understood as one, which is both paradoxical and truly replete with utter amazement. For the same thing is both numerable and shuns numeration: it is numerable in its triple hypostases, but shuns numeration in the singularity of the Godhead, in that the singularity of its essence and nature is utterly intolerant of being numbered, in order that one may neither introduce a difference of Godhead and, further, of essence and nature, or render the monarchy as a polytheism.²¹ For all number possesses difference as a corollary, and all difference and distinction brings with it an associated number.²²

²⁰ Cf. Justinian, *On the Right Faith*, 72, 16–17; trans. Wesche, 164.

²¹ This is an allusion to the Arian and tritheist positions, which are made explicit in what follows.

²² The same citation, which is transmitted anonymously, is found in *Doctrina Patrum*, 252, 2–4.

2.2.5. Ἀριθμείται γοῦν ἡ μακαρία τριάς οὐκ οὐσίαις καὶ φύσεσι καὶ διαφόροις θεότησιν ἢ τρισσαῖς κυριότησιν, ἅπαγε, ὥς Ἄρειοι μαίνονται καὶ οἱ τῆς νέας τριθεΐας λυττώσιν ἡγούμενοι, οὐσίας τρεῖς καὶ φύσεις τρεῖς καὶ τρεῖς κυριότητας καὶ τρεῖς ὁμοίως κενολογούντες θεότητας, ἀλλ' ὑποστάσεις καὶ ἰδιότησι νοεραῖς τελείαις καθ' ἑαυτὰς ὑφειστώσαις, ἀριθμῶ διαιρεταῖς καὶ οὐ διαιρεταῖς τῇ θεότητι. διαιρεῖται γὰρ ἀδιαιρέτως ἡ παναγία τριάς καὶ διηρημένως πάλιν συνάπτεται· τοῖς γὰρ προσώποις τὴν διαίρεσιν ἔχουσα ἀδιαίρετος μένει καὶ ἄτμητος οὐσία καὶ φύσει, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ θεότητι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε τρεῖς θεοὺς λέγομεν οὔτε τρεῖς φύσεις ἐπὶ τῆς τριάδος δοξάζομεν οὔτε τρεῖς οὐσίας ἐπ' αὐτῆς κηρύττομεν οὔτε τρεῖς ὁμολογοῦμεν θεότητας, οὐχ ὁμοουσίους, οὐχ ἑτεροουσίους, οὐχ ὁμοφύλους, οὐχ ἑτεροφύλους, οὐδ' ὅσα μοναδικῶς ἐπ' αὐτῆς προσκηρύττεται εἰς πλῆθος ἐκφέρειν ἀφίεμεν ἢ τινα τὴν αὐτῆς διαιρεῖν συγχωροῦμεν ἐνότητα. οὔτε δὲ τρεῖς τινας θεοὺς ἐπιστάμεθα ἢ τρεῖς τινας φύσεις ἢ τρεῖς τινας οὐσίας ἢ τρεῖς τινας θεότητας οἶδαμεν, οὐχ ὁμογενεῖς οὐχ ἑτερογενεῖς, οὐχ ὁμοειδεῖς, οὐχ ἑτεροειδεῖς, ἀλλ' οὔτε ὅλως θεοὺς ἢ φύσεις ἢ οὐσίας ἢ θεότητας ἔγνωμεν ἢ γινώσκοντας οἶδαμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα ἢ φρονοῦντα ἢ γινώσκοντα τοῖς ἀναθέμασι βάλλομεν. ἡμεῖς γὰρ μίαν ἀρχὴν τῆς μιᾶς ἴσμεν θεότη[424]τος, μίαν βασιλείαν, μίαν ἐξουσίαν, μίαν δύναμιν, μίαν ἐνέργειαν, μίαν βούλησιν, μίαν θέλησιν, μίαν δεσποτείαν, μίαν κίνησιν—εἴτε τῶν μετ' αὐτὴν ὄντων ἀπάντων δημιουργικήν, εἴτε προνοητικήν εἴτε συστατικήν καὶ συντηρητικήν—μίαν κυριότητα, μίαν αἰδιότητα καὶ ὅσα ἅττα μοναδικὰ καὶ ἀσύζυγα τῆς μιᾶς οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ἐν τρισὶν ἐστὶ προσωπικαῖς ὑποστάσεις, οὔτε τὰς ὑποστάσεις συγχέοντες καὶ εἰς μίαν αὐτὰς ὑπόστασιν ἄγοντες, οὔτε τὴν οὐσίαν τὴν μίαν μερίζοντες καὶ εἰς οὐσίας τρεῖς αὐτὴν κατατέμνοντες καὶ τὴν μίαν διὰ τοῦτο διαιροῦντες θεότητα. ἀλλ' ἔστιν εἷς θεός, μία θεότης ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεις λάμπουσα καὶ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις καὶ πρόσωπα ἐν θεότητι μιᾷ γνωριζόμενα. διὰ

5. Hence the blessed Trinity is not numbered in essences and natures and different godheads or triple lordships (heaven forbid!), as the Arians assert in their madness,²³ and the leaders of the new tritheism maintain in their fury,²⁴ when they babble about three essences and three natures and three lordships and likewise three godheads, but [it is numbered] in hypostases and perfect intellectual properties, subsisting by themselves, divisible in number and indivisible in Godhead. This is because the all-holy Trinity is divided indivisibly and is joined together again dividedly.²⁵ Although it possesses divisibility in its persons, it remains indivisible and unsevered in essence and in nature and likewise also in Godhead. Because of this we neither speak of three gods, nor do we glorify three natures in the Trinity, nor do we proclaim three essences in it, nor do we confess three godheads, whether consubstantial or of another substance, whether of the same kind or of another kind, nor do we permit what is proclaimed in regard to it as a unity to be drawn out into a multiplicity, or allow anyone to divide its unity. Nor do we understand any kind of three gods or know any three natures or any three essences or any three godheads, whether homogeneous or heterogeneous, whether of the same stock or of another stock; but neither have we at all recognized gods or natures or essences or godheads or know those who recognize them,²⁶ but rather strike with anathemas the one who accepts or thinks or recognizes such. For we know one principle of one Godhead, one kingship, one authority, one power, one activity, one intent, one will, one dominion, one movement—whether creating all that exists after it, be it providing or sustaining or preserving—one lordship, one eternity, and whatever else of the one essence and nature in three personal hypostases is unitary and unaggregate. Neither do we confuse the hypostases and reduce them to one hypostasis, nor do we portion the one essence and separate it into three essences and so divide the one Godhead. But there is one God, one Godhead shining forth in

²³ There are numerous examples in the *Synodical Letter* of the commonplace that heretics are mad or frenzied. Cf. N. Brox, 'Häresie', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 13 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1986), 283, on polemical rhetoric against heretics, and see further the heresiologies at 2.6 below.

²⁴ By this are meant Peter of Callinicum and his followers. See further sec. 1.1, above.

²⁵ Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 39. 11; SC 358, 172, 18–19.

²⁶ Peter of Callinicum and his followers are again meant here.

τοῦτο τέλειος θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, τέλειος θεὸς ὁ υἱός, τέλειος θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐπειδὴ τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ μίαν ἑκάστον πρόσωπον ἀμέριστον καὶ ἀνελλιπὴ καὶ τελείαν ἔχει θεότητα· καὶ ὥς μὲν θεὸς τὸ αὐτὸ καθέστηκεν ἑκάστον καθ' ἑαυτὸ θεωρούμενον τοῦ νοῦ χωρίζοντος τὰ ἀχώριστα· ὥς δὲ πατήρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ πνεῦμα πανάγιον ἕτερον καὶ ἕτερον καὶ ἕτερον λέγεται, κἀντεῦθεν ταῦτα τοῖς θεολήπτοις κηρύττεται θεὸς καὶ θεὸς καὶ θεός, ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ τρία θεός—οὐ γὰρ ἄλλος θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ ἄλλος θεὸς ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ ἄλλος πάλιν θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐπεὶ μηδ' ἄλλη φύσις ὁ πατήρ, μηδ' ἄλλη φύσις ὁ υἱός, μηδ' ἄλλη πάλιν φύσις τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ διαφόρους θεοὺς ἐκτεχνάζεται καὶ τὰς πολλὰς καὶ διαφόρους ἐκτίκει θεότητας· ἀλλὰ θεὸς μὲν ὁ πατήρ, θεὸς δὲ καὶ ὁ υἱός, ὁμοίως δὲ θεὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὥς μιᾶς ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀνελλιπῶς τὰ τρία πρόσωπα πληρούσης θεότητος καὶ ἐν ἐκάστω οὔσης ὁλοτελῶς καὶ ὀλικῶς· θεότης γὰρ μερισμὸν οὐχ ὑφίσταται καὶ ἐν τοῖς τρισὶ προσώποις πληρωτικῶς καὶ ἐντελῶς, οὐ μεριστῶς ἡγουν ἐκ μέρους πληροῦσα τὰ πρόσωπα, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκάστω πληρεστάτως ὑπάρχουσα καὶ μία γε μένουσα, καὶ εἰ ἐν προσώποις τρισὶ διαφαίνοιτο, καὶ πρὸς θεοτήτων πληθυσμὸν οὐκ ἐκτρέχουσα, καὶ εἰ ἐν τρισὶν ἐστὶν ὑποστά[428]σεις, ἵνα μὴ σωματικὴν τινα πάθοι διαίρεσιν ἢ ὄντως ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀσώματος καὶ πάσχειν οὐκ εἰδυῖα τὰ κτίσεως ἴδια.

2.2.6. Ἐστὶν οὖν μετὰ τὸ εἶναι θεὸς πατήρ ὁ πατήρ καὶ οὔτε υἱὸς οὔτε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ὁ υἱὸς κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν τὸ πνεῦμα τυγχάνει τὸ ἅγιον· καὶ ἔστι μετὰ τὸ εἶναι θεὸς υἱὸς ὁ υἱὸς καὶ οὔτε πατήρ οὔτε πνεῦμα πανάγιον, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ὁ πατήρ κατὰ φύσιν κηρύττεται καὶ ὁ κατ' οὐσίαν τὸ πνεῦμα καθοράται τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ἔστι μετὰ τὸ εἶναι θεὸς πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ οὔτε πατήρ θεωρούμενον οὔτε υἱὸς λαμβανόμενον, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ὁ πατήρ κατ' οὐσίαν πιστεύεται καὶ ὅπερ ὁ υἱὸς κατὰ φύσιν

three hypostases, and three hypostases and persons revealed in one Godhead. Because of this the Father is perfect God, the Son is perfect God, the Holy Spirit is perfect God, since each person has one and the same unportioned and unfailing and perfect Godhead. And as God each exists itself, contemplated individually when the mind separates the inseparable, but as Father and Son and all-holy Spirit each is given a different name, and hence these components are proclaimed by divines as being individually God, and yet the three are proclaimed to be a single God, for the Father is not one God, nor the Son another God, nor the Holy Spirit yet another God, since neither is the Father one nature, nor the Son another nature, nor the Holy Spirit yet another nature. For this²⁷ [doctrine] both invents many different gods and spawns many different godheads, but the Father is God, the Son too is God, and likewise the Holy Spirit too is God, since one Godhead fills the three persons without division or deficiency and is in each wholly perfectly and completely. For the Godhead does not admit partition, and is fully and perfectly in the three persons, that is, not partially or by filling persons in part, but subsists in each person most fully while remaining one, even if it is manifested in three persons although not indeed proceeding into a multiplicity of godheads, and even if it is in three hypostases, so that what is truly free of passion and without corporeality and unacquainted with suffering, which are qualities of the created world, should not suffer any corporeal division.

6. Besides being God,²⁸ therefore, the Father is Father and not Son or Holy Spirit, but that which the Son is according to essence and what the Holy Spirit is according to nature. And besides being God, the Son is Son and not Father or all-holy Spirit, but that which the Father is proclaimed to be according to nature, and the Holy Spirit discerned to be according to essence. And besides being God, the Holy Spirit is Holy Spirit and is neither contemplated as Father nor apprehended as Son, but that which the Father is believed to be according to essence and the Son

²⁷ Sophronius is referring here to the Arian and tritheist positions.

²⁸ This passage is conceptually very difficult. Although the phrase *μετὰ τὸ εἶναι* would normally be translated 'after being God', this would suggest a temporal sequence in the godhead that has Arian overtones. Consequently, I have translated 'besides being God'.

ἀγγέλλεται, τὸ μὲν διὰ τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα καὶ τὸ συγγενὲς τῆς ὑπάρξεως, τὸ δὲ διὰ τὰς ἑτεροίας τῶν τριῶν ιδιότητος καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀσυγχύτως ἕκαστον πρόσωπον χαρακτηριζόντων ιδιωμάτων ἀνόμοιον. ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ <εἶναι> θεὸς ἕκαστον ἀμετάπτωτον κέκτῃται, οὕτω καὶ τὴν τοῦ προσώπου χαρακτηριστικὴν ιδιότητα ἀμετάβλητον καὶ ἀκίνητον λέλαχε τὴν αὐτῷ καὶ μόνῳ προσοῦσαν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προσώπων αὐτὸ διακρίνουσαν καὶ τὴν ὁμοφυᾶ καὶ ὁμότιμον, ὁμοούσιόν τε καὶ ὁμόθρονον τριάδα τηροῦσαν ἀσύγχυτον. τριάς οὖν ἢ τριάς, οὐ τελεία μόνον τῇ τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος τελειότητι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερτελὴς καὶ ὑπέρθεος ᾧ δόξη καὶ ἀϊδιότητι καὶ βασιλείᾳ, μὴ μεριζομένη μηδὲ ἀπαλλοτριουμένη. οὔτε οὖν κτιστόν τι ἢ δούλον ἐν τῇ τριάδι οὔτε ἐπείσακτον, ὡς πρότερον μὲν οὐχ ὑπάρχον, ὕστερον δὲ ἐπείσελθόν, οὔτε οὖν ἐνέλευσε πατρὶ υἱὸς οὔτε υἱῷ πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος ἡ αὐτὴ τριάς αἰεί'.

2.2.7. [430] Καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς ἀγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου, αἰδίου τε καὶ ἀρχικῆς καὶ πάντων δημιουργοῦ καὶ βασιλίδος τριάδος τὸ ὅπως φρονῶ καὶ δοξάζω καὶ σέβομαι ὡς ἐν βραχέσιν εἰπεῖν δῆλον ὑμῖν καὶ σαφὲς διατέθεικα—οὐ γάρ τι πλέον συνεχώρει τούτων φάναι τῶν συνοδικῶν συλλαβῶν τὸ ἐπίτομον. ὅπως τε καὶ περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς τῆς αὐτῆς πανσέπτου τριάδος θεοῦ λόγου καὶ υἱοῦ φιλανθρωποῦ τε καὶ παραδόξου σαρκώσεως, ταυτὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν ὑπερτάτης κενώσεως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιγείους ἡμᾶς θεϊκῆς καὶ θεοποιοῦ καταβάσεως ἔχω καὶ φρονῶ καὶ κρατεῖν ἐκ πατέρων ἀγίων καὶ τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς θεοπνεύστων παρέλαβον, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς τῆς ἐφορώσης τὰ σύμπαντα γράμμα τουτὶ τὸ συνοδικὸν γράφων ἐκτίθημι καὶ πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν ἐκπέμπω τῶν πανσόφων ἀκρόασιν.

2.3.1. Πιστεύω καὶ περὶ ταύτης, θειότατοι, ὡς ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων καὶ χρόνων ἀπαθῶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεννηθεὶς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς οἶκτον λαβὼν καὶ

announced to be according to nature. The one is the case because of the nature and the identity of essence and the kinship of existence, the other because of the differing properties of the three and the dissimilarity of the particularities which characterize each person without confusion. For just as each one possesses being God unchangeably, so too he has obtained immutably and unmoveably the property characteristic of the person which belongs to it and to it alone and distinguishes it from the other persons, and preserves unconfused the Trinity which is both of the same nature and of the same honour, both of the same substance and of the same throne. Therefore the Trinity is a trinity not only perfect in the perfection of the one Godhead, but also supremely perfect and supremely divine 'in glory and eternity and kingship, neither partitioned nor alienated. Neither, therefore, is there anything created or servile in the Trinity, nor introduced, as if previously it did not exist, but subsequently accruing. Neither is the Son inferior to the Father nor the Spirit to the Son, but it is the same Trinity always, unchangeable and unalterable'.²⁹

7. I have expounded to you clearly and plainly, speaking in a few words, how I think of, glorify, and revere the Trinity, holy, of the same substance, both eternal and primary and creator of all and royal. The concise form of the synodical letter has not permitted me to say more than this.³⁰ And, as if in the presence of that truth itself which oversees all, I expound by writing this synodical letter, and I dispatch to your all-wise ears what I hold and what I think and have received as prevailing from the holy Fathers—those who according to you are inspired by God—the benevolent and astounding incarnation of one of the same, all-revered Trinity, God the Word and Son; that is to say the immeasurable emptying and the divine and deifying descent to us on earth.

2.3. CHRISTOLOGICAL PROFESSION OF FAITH³¹

1. I believe also concerning this, most holy One, that God the Word, the only-begotten Son of the Father, the one who before all ages and times was begotten impassibly from the same God and

²⁹ Cf. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Confession of Faith* (CPG 1764); ACO III, 3, 10–13.

³⁰ This is the first of several references by Sophronius to the dimensions of the synodical letter, which he certainly exceeds.

³¹ On Sophronius' christology see further Cosma, *De 'oeconomia' incarnationis*, 81–151; von Schönborn, *Sophrone*, 157–224.

φιλόανθρωπον ἔλεον τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου ἡμῶν ὀλισθήματος, ἐκουσίῳ θελήματι καὶ θεοῦ βουλήσει τοῦ φύσαντος καὶ συνευδοκία θεία τοῦ πνεύματος κόλπων οὐ χωρισθεὶς τοῦ γεννήσαντος πρὸς τοὺς ταπεινοὺς ἡμᾶς καταβέβηκεν. ἔστι γάρ, ἔστιν ὥσπερ τῆς αὐτῆς βουλῆς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, οὕτω καὶ οὐσίας ἀπείρου· καὶ φύσεως περιγραφῆς οὐδαμῶς ἀνεχόμενος ἢ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς τοπικῆς μεταβάσεως, κατὰ φύσιν δρᾶν εἰδὼς θεϊκὴν τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ μήτρان εἰσδὼς ἀπειρόγαμον παρθενίας ἀγλαϊζομένην ἀγνότητι Μαρίας τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φαιδρᾶς καὶ θεόφρονος καὶ παντὸς ἐλευθέρας μολύσματος τοῦ τε κατὰ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ διάνοιαν σαρκούται ὁ ἄσαρκος, καὶ μορφοῦται τὸ ἡμῶν ὁ κατ' οὐσίαν τὴν θείαν ὅσον εἰς σχῆμα καὶ εἶδος ἀμόρφωτος, καὶ [432] σωματοῦται καθ' ἡμᾶς ὁ ἀσώματος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γίνεται ὁ αἰεὶ θεὸς γνωριζόμενος, καὶ μητρικῆς κοιλίας ἐγγάστριος ὁ τοῦ αἰδίου πατρὸς ἐγκόλπιος δείκνυται, καὶ ὁ ἄχρονος ἀρχὴν χρονικὴν καταδέχεται, οὐ φαντασία ταῦτα γινόμενος ἅπαντα, καθὰ Μανιχαίοις καὶ Οὐαλεντίνοις δοκεῖ τοῖς παράφροσιν, ἀλλ' ἀληθεία καὶ πράγματι ὅλον ἑαυτὸν κενώσας πατρικῶ καὶ οἰκείῳ θελήματι καὶ ὅλον προσλαβὼν τὸ ἡμέτερον φύραμα, σάρκα φημὶ τὴν ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον καὶ ψυχὴν λογικὴν, τὴν ψυχαῖς ταῖς ἡμετέραις ὁμόφυλον, καὶ νοῦν τῷ νῶ τῷ ἡμῶν παραπλήσιον. ταῦτα γὰρ ἄνθρωπός ἐστι καὶ γινώσκεται, καὶ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέγονεν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἄκρας τῆς ἐν παρθένῳ τῇ παναγίᾳ συλλήψεως. ἄνθρωπος γὰρ χρηματίζειν ἐβούλετο, ἵνα τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἀνακαθάροι τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ τῷ συγγενεῖ τὸ συγγενὲς ἀνασώσῃται καὶ τῷ συμφυεῖ τὸ συμφυὲς ἐκλαμπρύνει.

Father, having compassion and benevolent pity for our human fall, with free will and by the intent of the Father who begat him and with the joint and divine consent of the Spirit, although not separated from the bosom of the one who begat him, descended to us wretched ones. Indeed, just as he is of the same intent as the Father and the Spirit, so too is he of infinite essence. Admitting in no way of a circumscribed nature or, as we do, of a change of place, knowing how to effect divine activity³² in accordance with his nature, he enters a womb innocent of marriage, radiant with the purity of virginity, that is, of Mary, holy and bright and of godly mind and free of every taint, whether in body or soul or thought. The fleshless one becomes flesh; the one who in conformity with the divine essence is without shape as far as form and frame are concerned takes on our shape; and the bodiless one is embodied as we are; and the one revealed as always God in truth becomes a human being; and the one who is in the bosom of the eternal Father is disclosed in the womb of his mother's belly; and the timeless one receives a beginning in time. He became all of these things not in illusion, as it seems to the frenzied Manichaeans and Valentinians;³³ but in truth and in fact, having emptied himself completely, by a will that was both his Father's and his own, he assumed our human substance³⁴ completely, I mean flesh consubstantial with ours and an intellectual soul of the same stock as our souls, and a mind comparable to our mind.³⁵ In these things he is and is recognized as a human being, and he became in truth a human being from the very point of his conception in the all-holy Virgin. He wished to be reckoned as a human being, so that he might cleanse like with like and rescue kin by kin, and illuminate the cognate by cognate. This is why the holy

³² Here we have Sophronius' first use in the *Synodical Letter* of the word 'activity' (*energeia*) in a christological framework.

³³ Both the Valentinians, a Gnostic group, and the Manichaeans were believed to have taught that Christ was neither truly human nor truly divine, although Sophronius is suggesting that they were docetists, i.e. that they believed that Christ's humanity was apparent, not real. This was more commonly alleged of Apollinaris, Eutyches, and Dioscorus, as in the *Synodical Letter* itself, below, secs. 2.3.5 and 2.5.1.

³⁴ The Greek word *φύραμα* means literally 'mixture', 'dough', or 'paste'.

³⁵ The emphasis here on the true humanity of Christ and on his rational soul is a tacit rebuttal of the doctrine of Apollinaris of Laodicea, who taught that the Logos took the place of the human mind in Christ.

διὰ τοῦτο παρθένος ἁγία λαμβάνεται καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἁγιάζεται καὶ οὕτως ὑπουργεῖ τῇ σαρκώσει τοῦ κτίσαντος ὡς καθαρὰ καὶ ἄγνή καὶ ἀμόλυντος.

2.3.2. Σαρκοῦται γοῦν ὁ λόγος καὶ θεὸς τὸ ἡμέτερον, οὐ προπλασθείση σαρκὶ συναπτόμενος ἢ προμορφωθέντι καὶ καθ' αὐτὸ προϋποστάντι ποτὲ προσπλεκόμενος σώματι ἢ προϋποστάση ψυχῇ συντιθέμενος, ἀλλὰ τότε τούτοις παραγενομένοις πρὸς ὑπαρξιν, ὅτε αὐτοῖς ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς καὶ θεὸς φυσικῶς συνετίθετο σύγχρονον ἔχοντα τῇ ὑπάρξει τὴν ἔνωσιν καὶ οὐ πρὸ τῆς πρὸς τὸν λόγον ἀληθεστάτης συμβάσεως καθ' ἑαυτὰ γενόμενα πώποτε ἢ τινος ἀνθρώπου τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐτέρου τὸ παράπαν ὑπάρξαντα, ἀλλὰ σύνδρομον ἔχοντα τῇ φυσικῇ τοῦ λόγου συμβάσει τὴν ὑπαρξιν καὶ οὐκ ἐκείνης οὐδὲ ὡς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῦ ῥιπῇ ταυτηνὶ προτερεύουσιν ἔχοντα, ὡς Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεὺς βομβεῖ καὶ Νεστόριος. 'ἅμα' γὰρ 'σὰρξ, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ, ἅμα σὰρξ ἔμψυχος λογική, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ ἔμψυχος λογική.' ἐν αὐτῷ [434] γὰρ καὶ οὐ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἔσχε τὴν ὑπαρξιν. ἅμα γὰρ τῇ συλλήψει τοῦ λόγου ταῦτα παρήχθη πρὸς σύστασιν καὶ ἠνώθη αὐτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, ἅμα τῷ πρὸς σύστασιν ἄγεσθαι τὴν ὄντως ἀληθῆ καὶ ἀμέριστον, τὴν μήτε διαίρεσιν πάσχουσιν μήτε τροπὴν εἰσδεχομένην καὶ σύγχυσιν, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ παραγόμενα καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ συνιστάμενα καὶ αὐτῷ συντιθέμενα καὶ χρόνον οὐδένα τὸ σύνολον τῆς οἰκείας συστάσεως προτερεύοντα, φέροντα τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀσυγχύτου τε καὶ ἀτμήτου συνθέσεως.

Virgin was taken and sanctified in both body and soul, and thus assisted in the incarnation of the Creator because she was pure and undefiled and without taint.

2. Hence the Word and God became flesh with our flesh, not being conjoined to flesh that had been moulded or formed previously, or knitted with a body which at some time subsisted previously by itself, or joined to a soul which subsisted previously, but these elements came into existence at the time when the Word himself and God was joined to them by nature, possessing³⁶ the union simultaneously with the existence. These things never came into existence in themselves before their most true coming together with the Word, or have any existence as part of some human being different from our species, but they had their existence concurrently with the natural coming together of the Word, and did not have it even, as it were, in a *twinkling of an eye* (1 Cor. 15: 52) sooner than that coming together, as Paul of Samosata and Nestorius babble: 'at the one time there is flesh, at the one time there is flesh of God the Word; at the one time there is flesh endowed with an intellectual soul, at the one time there is flesh of the God-Word endowed with a rational soul.'³⁷ For in him and not on its own account did the flesh have its existence. For at the same time as the conception of the Word these elements were brought into consistence and united to him in hypostasis; at the same time there was brought into existence that which is genuinely true and without partition, neither suffering division nor admitting change and confusion.³⁸ They were brought in by him and were formed in him and were joined to him, and for no time at all did they exist in their own entirety prior to their composition in him, which is both unconfused and unsevered.³⁹

³⁶ This is an anacoluthon in Greek.

³⁷ Cf. Ps. Athanasius, *Letter to Emperor Jovinian* (CPG 2253); PG 28, 532A; also cited by Cyrus of Alexandria, *Announcement*, ch. 7 (CPG 7613); ACO ser. sec. II, 2, 600, 3–4; document 3 in the monoenergist dossier, Part 3. This text is much used in christological debate: see Anastasius of Sinai, *Hodegos* II, 5; ed. Uthemann, 13–14; apparatus fontium, 51. Paul of Samosata and Nestorius were accused of maintaining that in the incarnation the Word was united with an already existing body.

³⁸ Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, ACO II, 1, 2, 129, 30–1; trans. Tanner, i. *86.

³⁹ 'Unconfused' is a rejection of the supposed position of Eutyches, 'unsevered', of that of Nestorius. Here I have amended Riedinger's punctuation.

2.3.3. Ἐκ τῶν οὖν ἀχράντων καὶ παρθενικῶν αἱμάτων τῆς παν-
 αγίας καὶ ἀχράντου παρθένου Μαρίας ὁ λόγος σαρκωθείς κατὰ
 ἀλήθειαν γέγονε καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος καὶ τῇ παρθενικῇ
 γαστρὶ κυοφορούμενος καὶ τὸν χρόνον πεπληρωκὼς τῆς ἐννόμου
 κυήσεως· ὥς ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ φέρουσι τοῖς
 ἀνθρώποις ἡμῖν ὁμοιούμενος καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν οὐκ ἀπαξιῶν
 ἐμπαθεστάτην εὐτέλειαν τίκτεται θεὸς ἀνθρωπείῳ τῷ σώματι,
 ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῷ σχήματι ψυχὴν λογικὴν καὶ ἀσώματον ἔχοντι,
 ὅπερ αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ οὐχ ἕτερος λογικῶ ἐνεψύχωσε πνεύματι
 καὶ παρθένον τηρεῖ τὴν γεννήσασαν καὶ θεοτόκον αὐτὴν κυρίως καὶ
 ἀληθῶς ἀναδείκνυσι, καὶ Νεστόριος ὁ παράφορος ῥήσσεται καὶ
 τούτου τὸ θεομάχον στρατόπεδον δακρύει καὶ θρηνεῖ καὶ ὀδύρεται
 καὶ σὺν ἐκείνῳ πάλιν σπαράττηται.

2.3.4. Θεὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ ἐκ παρθένου τῆς ἀγίας θεοτόκου Μαρίας
 τικτόμενος καὶ δευτέραν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ χρονικὴν προσδεχόμενος
 γέννησιν μετὰ τὴν πρώτην αὐτοῦ καὶ αἰῶδιον τὴν ἐκ πατρὸς φυσικὴν
 καὶ ἀνέκφραστον γέννησιν, καὶ σεσαρκωμένος ἐτίκτετο διὰ τὴν
 πρὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς σαρκικοὺς ὁμοιότητα, ὅλος θεὸς ἀνυμνούμενος,
 ὅλος ὁ αὐτὸς προσφαινόμενος ἄνθρωπος, τέλειος θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς γιν-
 ωσκόμενος καὶ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος ὁ αὐτὸς γνωριζόμενος. ἐκ δύο γὰρ
 φύσεων ἔσχε τὴν ἔνωσιν θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ ἐν δυσὶ
 τελείαις ἐγνωρίζετο φύσεσι, θεότητί τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι. οὔτε γὰρ
 τῇ ἐνώσει τροπὴ τις ἢ φυρμὸς ἐμεσίτευσεν, οὔτε τῇ διαφορᾷ καὶ
 δυάδι τῶν μορφῶν ἦτοι τῶν οὐσιῶν μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν διαίρεσις τις ἢ
 τομὴ εἰσεκρίνετο, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν λυπῇ τὸν μεμνηνότα Νεστόριον,
 ἐκεῖνο δὲ [436] τήκη Εὐτυχῇ τὸν κακόφρονα· τὰ γὰρ καθ' ὑπόστα-

3. And so from the undefiled and virgin blood of the all-holy and undefiled Virgin Mary the Word became truly flesh and truly a human being, even being carried in the virginal womb and fulfilling the nine months' period of gestation. Just as in all natural respects which do not involve sin, he was like us human beings, and not despising our mean estate, so subject to passion,⁴⁰ God was born in a human body, so too he was in a frame that possessed an intellectual and incorporeal soul,⁴¹ a frame which he himself, in himself and no other, animated with an intellectual spirit. And he preserved his mother as a virgin and showed that she was properly and in truth Theotokos,⁴² even if the frenzied Nestorius is shattered [by this] and his army which fights God is in tears, and laments and mourns and is torn to pieces again with him.

4. I say this because it was God who was born of a virgin, the holy Theotokos Mary, and accepted on our account a second birth in time after his first eternal birth,⁴³ which was a natural and ineffable birth from the Father, even though he was born in the flesh, on account of his likeness to us fleshly beings. Whole is the God who is hymned, whole is the same who appeared as a human being; perfect is the same God who is acknowledged and perfect is the same human being who is revealed. For from two natures he possessed the union of Godhead and humanity, and was recognized in two perfect natures, Godhead and humanity. Neither did any change or mingling intervene in the union, nor was any division or severing admitted into the difference and duality of the forms or essences after the union, even if this latter troubles the mad Nestorius, and the former causes the perverse Eutyches to waste away. For⁴⁴ the elements that are united hypostatically to

⁴⁰ By 'passion' (πάθος) or 'passions' (πάθη) are meant normal human feelings and emotions. See further below, sec. 2.3.13.

⁴¹ Cf. n. 35, above.

⁴² Cf. Justinian, *On the Right Faith*, 76, 8; trans. Wesche, 167. The expression is anti-Nestorian in intention and derives from Ephesus I. Cf. Anastasius of Sinai, *Hodegos* V; ed. Uthemann, 43–5 and p. 90.

⁴³ Cf. Justinian, *On the Right Faith*, 76, 18; trans. Wesche, 167. Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, *ACO* II, 1, 2, 129, 27–30; trans. Tanner, i. *86.

⁴⁴ The passage from here down to 'pit of division' a few lines further on is found as a citation in Nicephorus I of Constantinople, *Against Eusebius*, in J. B. Pitra (ed.), *Spicilegium Solesmense complectens Sanctorum Patrum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum anecdota hactenus opera* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1852), 486.

σιν ἀλλήλοις ἐνούμενα οὔτε τροπὴν συνεισδέχεται οὔτε γνωρίζει διαίρεσιν, οὔτε συγχύσεως οἶδε τὰ ἴδια οὔτε τομῆς μανθάνει τὰ σύμβολα. ὅπερ ὡς ἔοικεν Εὐτυχῆς ἀγνοῶν καὶ Νεστόριος καὶ τῆς καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἐνώσεως μὴ μαθόντες τὴν δύναμιν, καθ' ἣν ὁ λόγος ἀτρέπτως σεσάρκωται καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ἡ ἔμψυχος καὶ ἔννοος ἀμεταβλήτως τεθέωται. ὁ μὲν εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀναχύσεως ἀκοντίζεται πέλαγος, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως καταφέρεται βάραθρον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ μὲν φεύγει καθομολογεῖν τὴν δυάδα τῶν φύσεων, ὁ δὲ μίαν κηρύττειν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην συστέλλεται ἢ καὶ μίαν αὐτοῦ σύνθετον λέγειν ὑπόστασιν δέδοικε, φόβον οἱ δραπέται φοβούμενοι, οὗ φόβος οὐδεὶς πολιτεύεται.

2.3.5. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ῥωμαλέω φρονήματι τὴν ἐκατέρου τούτων δούλην παρελάσαντες ἄνοιαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐστῶτες ἀδείμαντοι καὶ τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν τοῦ λόγου πρὸς σάρκα τὴν ἐξ ἡμῶν τὴν ἔννοον καὶ ἔμψυχον κηρύττομεν σύμβασιν, καὶ ἓνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν τὸν σαρκωθέντα λόγον πρεσβεύομεν, καὶ μίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν λέγομεν σύνθετον, καὶ ἐν δυσὶν αὐτὸν ἀγορεύομεν φύσεσι, καὶ δύο τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ λόγου γεννήσεις πιστεύομεν—μίαν μὲν τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ πατρός, ἣν καὶ ἄχρονον καὶ αἰδῖον οἶδαμεν, καὶ δευτέραν τὴν ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου μητρός, ἣν καὶ πρόσφατον καὶ χρονικὴν ἐπιστάμεθα—καὶ ‘μίαν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φύσιν’ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ‘σεσαρκωμένην’ δοξάζομεν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὡς Ἀπολινάριος καὶ Εὐτυχῆς καὶ Διόσκορος λέγουσιν, ἀλλ’ ὡς ὁ σοφὸς ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε Κύριλλος, καὶ τὰ τῶν φύσεων σώζεσθαι φάσκομεν ἴδια καὶ τὴν τῶν ἡνωμένων διαφορὰν ἀπαγγέλλομεν τὴν ὡς ἐν φυσικῇ μὲν λεγομένην καὶ οὖσαν ποιότητι, ἐν οὐσιώδει δὲ νοουμένην καὶ οὖσαν

each other do not admit change or recognize division, or know the properties of confusion, or learn the marks of severance. This, it seems, Eutyches was ignorant of, and Nestorius too, and they did not know the power of the hypostatic union, in accordance with which the Word became flesh without change, and the flesh, endowed with soul and mind, was divinized without undergoing change.⁴⁵ The former is hurled into the sea of confusion, while the latter is borne down into the pit of division. This is why the former avoids confessing the duality of the natures, while the latter holds back from proclaiming the incarnate nature of God the Word as one, or shrinks from speaking of his composite hypostasis as one. The runaway slaves are *fearful with a fear where no fear is indicated* (Ps. 13: 5).

5. Having passed by with robust mind the servile folly of each of these men, and standing dauntless on the rock (cf. Matt. 16: 18) of pious belief, we both proclaim the coming together of the Word hypostatically with the flesh from us which has both mind and soul; and we worship one Christ and Son, the incarnate Word; and we speak of his one, composite hypostasis, and declare him in two natures, and we believe in two births of the same God the Word⁴⁶—the one from God the Father, which we know is both timeless and eternal, and the second from his mother, the Theotokos, which we know is both recent and temporal—and we glorify ‘one nature of God the Word’ in him, ‘made flesh’.⁴⁷ But we do not talk like Apollinaris and Eutyches and Dioscorus,⁴⁸ but as the wise Cyril has imparted to us, and we maintain that the properties of the natures are preserved, and we declare the difference of the united elements which is spoken of and is, in relation to the natural quality,⁴⁹ but which is conceived of and is in

⁴⁵ Both Eutyches and Nestorius are portrayed here as having underestimated the hypostatic union in different ways.

⁴⁶ Cf. sec. 2.3.4, above.

⁴⁷ This is the famous expression of Cyril of Alexandria, on which see McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, 207–12.

⁴⁸ i.e. as the three classic representatives of the docetic school, who are portrayed as maintaining that the union of the two natures in Christ resulted in a merger, a third substance.

⁴⁹ ‘Natural quality’ (ποιότης φυσικῇ) was a Cyrillian term, used also by anti-Chalcedonians like Severus of Antioch. See Lebon, ‘La Christologie du monophysisme sévérien’, 538–9.

ποσότητι· καὶ οὐτε [438] τὴν Νεστοριανὴν τομὴν δεδιπτόμεθα, οὐτε τὴν Εὐτυχιανὴν τροπὴν εὐλαβούμεθα, ἐπεὶ μήτε ὡς ὁ ματαιόφρων Νεστόριος σχετικὴν τὴν ἔνωσιν λέγομεν ἢ ἰσοτιμίαν καὶ ταυτοβουλίαν, καὶ θελημάτων ῥοπῇ καὶ ταυτότητι παραληροῦμεν τὴν σύμβασιν, μήτε ὡς Εὐτυχῆς ὁ θεήλατος κατὰ σύγχυσίν τινα καὶ ἀλλοίωσιν θεοῦ λόγου καὶ σαρκὸς ἐμψυχωμένης νοερῶς ἦτοι τῶν φύσεων καὶ οὐσιῶν καὶ μορφῶν φληναφοῦμεν τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν ἐξ ὧν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ ἡ θαυμασία γεγένηται σύμβασις.

2.3.6. Ὅθεν τὴν βασιλικὴν ὁδὸν καὶ μέσην ὁδεύοντες καὶ ἀποστυγοῦμεν τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ τὴν τομὴν μυσσαπτόμεθα, μόνην δὲ κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀσπαζόμεθα τὴν ἀσύγχυτον ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀμέριστον θεότητός τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος ἔνωσιν, ἣν μόνην γνωρίζειν ἐπίσταται ἡ φυσικὴ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν σύνοδος· ταύτην γὰρ ἀλλήλαις ἐνούμεναι θεότης τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότης ἐσχήκασιν, ἵνα μήτε τροπὴν ὑπομείνοιεν μήτε διαίρεσιν πάθοιεν. ὁ γὰρ τῆς ἐνώσεως λόγος, τῆς φυσικῆς, φημί, καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν—οὐτε γὰρ ἑτέραν ἔνωσιν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ παρὰ ταύτην ἐπίσταμαι—οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ μὲν τὴν διαφοράν, ἐξίστησι δὲ διαμπὰξ τὴν διαίρεσιν καὶ τηρεῖ τὰ συνδραμόντα πρὸς ἔνωσιν ἄτρεπτα, καὶ τῶν ἠνωμένων μερισμὸν οὐκ εἰσδέχεται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων τὸν Χριστὸν ὀνομάζοντες καὶ θεὸν τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον καὶ διφυᾶ καὶ διπλοῦν κατὰ τὰς φύσεις κηρύττομεν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν θεότητι τέλειον καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιστάμεθα τέλειον· διὸ καὶ ἐν δυσὶν αὐτὸν δογ-

the essential quantity.⁵⁰ Neither do we fear Nestorius' 'severing' nor do we pay any court to Eutyches' 'change'.⁵¹ This is because we neither say, like the empty-headed Nestorius, that the union is incidental or one of equal honour and of a convergence of will, and rave that the coming together is by the inclination and convergence of wills;⁵² nor do we blabber, like the God-pursued Eutyches, in terms of some sort of confusion and alteration of God the Word and of his intellectually ensouled flesh, or of the synthesis of the natures, essences, and forms from which the wondrous coming together in Christ occurred.

6. For this reason, travelling the royal road and keeping to the centre (cf. Num. 20: 17),⁵³ we both abhor the confusion and feel disgust at the severing, and embrace with our soul only the unconfused and at the same time indivisible union of Godhead and humanity, which only the natural and hypostatic union is capable of making known. Once united to each other, Godhead and humanity possessed this [sc. indivisible union], so that they should neither undergo change nor suffer division. The principle of the union, I mean the natural and hypostatic union (for I do not recognize a union in Christ other than this one⁵⁴), is not ignorant of difference, but eliminates division totally, and preserves unchanged the elements which converge in the union, and does not admit the partition of what is united. Because of this, while designating Christ as being from Godhead and humanity and⁵⁵ from two natures, we proclaim also the same one as God and as a human being, and as having two natures and being twofold in respect of natures. Likewise we know the same one to be both perfect in Godhead and perfect in humanity.⁵⁶ This is why we

⁵⁰ 'Essential quantity' (ποσότης οὐσιώδης) reinforces the two-nature christology of Chalcedon.

⁵¹ Once again Sophronius, like Justinian, is at pains to dissociate himself from the extreme christological positions of both Nestorius and Eutyches.

⁵² These are Nestorian terms for expressing the union in Christ.

⁵³ This biblical image is much used in Patristic literature. See Uthemann, *Hodegos* VIII. 5, 99–100, 132.

⁵⁴ That is, Sophronius rejects both a union by conjunction, as Nestorians would accept, and a union of merger, such as was attributed to Eutyches.

⁵⁵ Here begins a series of citations in Nicephorus I of Constantinople, ed. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, 350, which runs as far as 'duality of natures' in sec. 2.3.15.

⁵⁶ Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, *ACO* II, 1, 2, 129, 24–5; trans. Tanner, i. *86; and Justinian, *On the Right Faith*, 76, 34–5; trans. Wesche, 168.

ματίζομεν φύσει, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ὡς θεὸν τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναγράφομεν καὶ ὁμοούσιον τῇ μητρὶ καὶ ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν ὡς ἄνθρωπον φάσκομεν, ὁρατὸν τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀόρατον, κτιστὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ὡσαύτως καὶ ἄκτιστον, σῶμα τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀσώματον, [440] ἀπτόν τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέπαφον, περιγραπτὸν τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπερίγραπτον, ἐπίγειον τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ οὐράνιον, σάρκα τὸν αὐτὸν ἐμψυχωμένην λογικῶς καὶ θεότητα πρόσφατον τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ αἰῶδιον, ταπεινὸν τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπέρτατον, καὶ ὅσα διττῆς ἀμερίστως εὐρίσκεται φύσεως, καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑπῆρχεν αἰεί, ὡς φύσιν ἔχων αἰῶδιον, τὰ δὲ δι' ἡμᾶς ἐν χρόνοις ἐσχάτοις ἀτρέπτως ἐγένετο, ὡς φύσιν προσλαβὼν τὴν ἀνθρώπειον.

2.3.7. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἔνωσις ἄτρεπτος ἦν καὶ ἀμέριστος, ὥσπερ καὶ ἄτρεπτός ἐστι καὶ ἀμέριστος μένει, καὶ τὰ δύο δύο ἀναλλοιώτῳ διαφορᾷ σημαινόμενα καὶ ἀμερίστῳ ἑτερότητι λάμποντα, φύσεις ταῦτα καὶ οὐσίαι καὶ μορφαὶ καθεστήκασιν, ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἀπόρρητος γέγονεν ἔνωσις, καὶ ἐν αἷς εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Χριστὸς κατοπτεύεται, μένει καὶ τὸ ἐν ἑν, τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν γεγονὸς ἀποτέλεσμα, μηκέτι δίχα διαιρούμενον, καὶ τὰ ἐξ ὧν ἐστὶν ἄνευ τομῆς καὶ τροπῆς ἐνδεικνύμενον· ὑπόστασις τοῦτο τυγχάνει καὶ πρόσωπον σύνθετον ἐξ ἀσυγχύτου συστᾶν ἀνακράσεως καὶ μερισμὸν οὐκ εἰδυῖα συμβάσεως καὶ τὸ εἶναι ἐν καὶ μένειν ἐν λαχὸν ἀδιαίρετον, καὶ οὔτε δύο καθὸ ἐν ὑπάρχει γινόμενον οὔτε συγγέον καὶ πρὸς μίαν ἄγον ἐνότητα καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ταυτότητα τὰ ἐξ ὧν φυσικῶς συνενήνεκται, ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἐν καὶ δύο τὸ αὐτὸ γνωριζόμενον, ἐν μὲν κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τε καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, δύο δὲ κατὰ τὰς φύσεις αὐτὰς καὶ τὰς φυσικὰς αὐτῶν ιδιότητας, ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὸ εἶναι ἐν διεκλήρωσε καὶ τὸ μένειν τῇ φύσει διπλοῦν διεφύλαξεν. ὅθεν ὁ αὐτὸς μένων εἰς Χριστὸς καὶ υἱὸς καὶ μονογενὴς ἀδιάτμητος ἐν ἑκατέραις καθορᾶται ταῖς φύσεσι καὶ τὰ ἑκατέρας φυσικῶς οὐσίας εἰργάζεται κατὰ τὴν ἑκατέρα προσοῦσαν οὐσιώδη ποιότητα ἢ καὶ φυσικὴν ιδιότητα.

both teach that he is in two natures, and describe the same as God, consubstantial with the Father, and speak of the same as a human being, consubstantial with his mother and with us. We maintain that the same one is visible and invisible, that the same one is likewise created and uncreated, that the same one is corporeal and incorporeal, that the same one is tangible and untouchable, that the same one is circumscribed and uncircumscribed, that the same one is earthly and heavenly, that the same one is flesh endowed with an intellectual soul, and Godhead, that the same one is lately appeared and eternal, that the same one is lowly and sublime; and whatever is found [to be] inseparably of dual nature, even though some parts exist forever because he has an eternal nature, yet others on our account came into being without change *in the last times* (Heb. 1: 2) when he assumed human nature.

7. For if the union was unchanging and unpartitioned, as indeed it abides unchanging and remains indivisible, and the two are indicated as two by an unaltered difference and are conspicuous by an unpartitioned otherness, these were established as natures and essences and forms from which the mysterious union came about and in which one and the same Christ is perceived. The one indeed remains one, what is produced from them is no longer divided in two, and those elements from which it is composed are demonstrated to be without severance and change. This is the hypostasis and the composite person, which is composed from an unconfused blending and does not know a segmentation of coming together, and it obtains an undivided existence that is one and remains one, neither becoming two in so far as it exists as one, nor confusing and leading to one unity and an identity of nature and essence those elements from which it is naturally constituted. The⁵⁷ same thing is acknowledged to be both one and two, one according to both the hypostasis and the person, but two according to the natures themselves and their natural properties, from which it was allotted the state of being one and preserved the state of remaining dual in nature. Hence the same one, remaining one Christ and Son and only-begotten, is discerned not severed in each nature, and performs the acts of each essence naturally, according to the essential quality belonging to each or to its natural property. If he had a single and simple nature, as in his

⁵⁷ Here begins the French translation of von Schönborn, *Sophrone*, 201–9.

ὅπερ εἰ τὴν φύσιν ἔσχε μοναδικὴν καὶ ἀσύζυγον καθὰ καὶ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τε [442] καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, οὐκ ἂν διεπράξατο καὶ οὐκ ἂν ὁ εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς υἱὸς καὶ Χριστὸς τὰ ἐκατέρας ἐντελῶς κατειργάζετο φύσεως. πότε γὰρ θεότης ἀμέτοχος σώματος ἔργα φυσικῶς κατειργάσατο σώματος, ἢ πότε σῶμα χηρεῦον θεότητος πράξεις ἐνήργησεν οὐσιωδῶς γνωριζόμενας θεότητος;

2.3.8. Ὁ δὲ Ἐμμανουήλ, εἰς ὧν καὶ ἐν ταυτῷ τὰ ἐκάτερα, τουτέστι θεός τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος, τὰ ἐκατέρας ἔδρα κατὰ ἀλήθειαν φύσεως, κατ' ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο ἐνεργῶν τὰ πραττόμενα, καθὸ μὲν θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς τὰ θεία, καθὸ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὁ αὐτὸς τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, ἑαυτὸν τοῖς πᾶσι δεῖξαι βουλόμενος ὡς θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς εἶη καὶ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ αὐτὸς τὰ τε θεία ποιεῖ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, ὁμοίως καὶ λέγει καὶ φθέγγεται, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος μὲν τὰ θαύματα πέπραχεν, ἄλλος δὲ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τέτευχε καὶ τὰ παθήματα πέπονθεν, ὡς Νεστόριος βούλεται, ἀλλ' εἰς μὲν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Χριστὸς καὶ υἱός, ὁ τὰ θεία δεδρακὼς καὶ ἀνθρώπινα κατ' ἄλλο δὲ καὶ ἄλλο, ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐπρέσβευσε Κύριλλος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν ἀμφοτέροις ἔσχε τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἀσύγχυτον οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀμέριστον. καθὸ μὲν γὰρ θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς ὑπῆρχεν αἰῶδιος ἔδρα τὰ θαύματα, καθὸ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐγνωρίζετο πρόσφατος ἐποίει τὰ ταπεινὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ ἐκάτερα φυλάττει φύσις ἀνελλιπῶς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ιδιότητα, οὕτω καὶ ἐνεργεῖ ἐκάτερα μορφὴ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἴδιον ἔσχηκε, τοῦ μὲν λόγου κατεργαζομένου τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου, μετὰ τῆς κοινωνίας δηλονότι τοῦ σώματος, τοῦ δὲ σώματος ἐκτελοῦντος ἅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ σώματος, κοινωνοῦντος αὐτῷ δηλαδὴ τοῦ λόγου τῆς πράξεως, καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ὑποστάσει μιᾷ γνωριζόμενα καὶ ἐν προσώπῳ ἐνὶ θεωρούμενα καὶ τὴν βδελυρωτάτην τομὴν διωθόμενα. οὕτε γὰρ διηρημένως ἐνήργουν τὰ ἴδια, ἵνα καὶ μερισμὸν αὐτῶν ὑποπτεύσωμεν.

hypostasis and person, he would not have accomplished, and the one and the same Son and Christ would not have performed, the acts of each nature perfectly. For when did Godhead, having no share in a body, perform bodily acts naturally, or when did a body, devoid of Godhead, execute actions which are recognized essentially as those of Godhead?

8. Emmanuel, being one and both in the same [person], that is both God and human being, truly performed the acts of each nature, executing what was done according to one or the other: as God, the same one executes divine acts; as a human being, the same one executes human acts, wishing to show himself to all—that the same one is God and a human being, and consequently that the same one performs both divine and human acts, and likewise in talking and speaking. It was not that one worked the miracles and another wrought the human acts and suffered sufferings, as Nestorius wants,⁵⁸ but one and the same Christ and Son, the one who did the divine and the human deeds according to the one or the other, as the divine Cyril advocated,⁵⁹ since indeed in both he possessed the unconfused, not to say also unpartitioned, power. For in so far as the same one existed eternally as God, he worked the miracles; in so far as the same one was revealed as being of recent times a human being, he performed the lowly and human deeds. For just as in Christ each nature keeps its own property intact, so too does each form, with the participation of the other, effect what it possesses as its own: the Word achieves what is proper to the Word, obviously with the participation of the body, while the body accomplishes what is proper to the body, when of course the Word shares the act with it.⁶⁰ And these things are revealed in one hypostasis, and are beheld in one person, and repudiate the abominable severing. For nor do they effect their own acts in a divided way either, so that we might suspect division in them.

⁵⁸ Nestorius was commonly perceived to have apportioned Christ's actions either to the divine nature or to the human nature, depending on whether they were lofty or banal.

⁵⁹ The Cyrillian term 'according to one or the other' is cited in Article of Faith VII of the *Announcement* drawn up by Cyrus of Alexandria; document 3 in the monoenergist dossier, Part 3 below.

⁶⁰ Cf. Leo, *Letter (Tome) to Flavian* (=Letter 28); *ACO* II, 1, 1, 14, 27–9.

2.3.9. Μὴ σκιρτάτω διὰ τοῦτο Νεστόριος ἑαυτὸν βουκολῶν ὁ παράφορος, ὅτιπερ ἑκάτερα μορφὴ ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ Χριστῷ καὶ υἱῷ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας τοῦθ' ὅπερ [444] ἴδιον ἔσχηκεν ἔπραττεν, οὔτε γὰρ τῆς θατέρας κατ' αὐτὸν διεστῶσα τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἴδιον ἔσχηκεν ἔπραττεν. οὐ γὰρ δύο κατ' αὐτὸν Χριστοὺς καὶ υἱοὺς τοὺς ἐνεργοῦντας δοξάζομεν, ἓνα μὲν κατὰ φύσιν υἱὸν καὶ Χριστὸν τὰ παράδοξα, δεύτερον δὲ κατὰ χάριν υἱὸν καὶ Χριστὸν τὰ πτωχότερα, καὶ εἰ δύο τὰς κοινῶς ἐνεργούσας μορφὰς δογματίζομεν ἑκάστην κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς φυσικὴν ιδιότητα, ἀλλ' ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ Χριστὸν τὸν τὰ ὑψηλὰ καὶ πτωχὰ φυσικῶς ἐργαζόμενον κατὰ τὴν ἑκάστης τῶν δυοῖν αὐτοῦ φύσεων φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ποιότητα λέγομεν. αἱ γάρ τοι φύσεις ἀμετάβλητοι μένουσαι καὶ ἀσύγχυτοι καὶ δύο τηλαυγῶς γνωριζόμεναι καὶ οὐ συγκεχυμένως ἐνωθεῖσαι· τούτων παντελῶς οὐκ ἐστέρηντο, καὶ ἐν ὑποστάσει μιᾷ διεδείκνυντο, μὴ μάτην πηδάτωσαν Εὐτυχῆς καὶ Διόσκορος οἱ τῆς οὐκ οὔσης ἀθέου συγχύσεως πρόβολοι· ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἑκάστη φύσις τὸ ἴδιον ἔπραττε καὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν φεύγουσα καὶ τὴν τροπὴν οὐ γινώσκουσα καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν πρὸς τὴν θατέραν φυλάττουσα καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν καὶ σύνθεσιν ἀδιάλυτον καὶ ἀρραγὴ διασώζουσα. ἔνθεν εὐσεβοῦντες καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρῶν τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἱστάμενοι ὥσπερ τὸν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἑκάτερα λέγομεν, ἐπειδὴ θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς ὑπῆρχε καὶ ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐνθυμούμεθα σύγχυσιν, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἑκάτεραν μορφὴν μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἴδια φάσκοντες, ἐπειδὴπερ δύο μορφαὶ καθεστήκασιν ἐν ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ Χριστῷ φυσικῶς ἐνεργοῦσαι τὰ ἴδια, τινὰ τὸ παράπαν ἐννοοῦμεν διαίρεσιν, ὥς ἐνταῦθα μὲν Εὐτυχῆς, ἐκεῖσε δὲ συκοφαντεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐθέλει Νεστόριος, ἐξ ἐναντίας ἀλλήλων ἱστάμενοι καὶ τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν τῶν εὐσεβῶν δυσσεβῇ μερισάμενοι πόλεμον.

9. Let Nestorius not rejoice on this account, the frenzied man who cheats himself, seeing that each form in the one Christ and Son did what was proper to it with the participation of the other, for neither when separated from the other in him did it do what it possessed as its own.⁶¹ For we do not glorify two Christs and two sons in him, the one who is Son and Christ by nature performing the miracles, and the second who is Son and Christ by grace performing the lowlier actions. Although we teach as two the forms which operate in common, each one according to its own natural property, still we declare as one and the same Son and Christ the one who accomplishes both lofty and lowly acts in a natural way, according to the natural and essential quality of each of his two natures. For the⁶² natures remained unchanged and unconfused⁶³ and were revealed clearly as two, and were united in an unconfused way. They were not deprived of these acts at all, although they were manifested in one hypostasis, lest Eutyches and Dioscorus leap in vain, the promoters of the godless confusion that does not exist. But each nature, with the participation of the other, did what was proper to it,⁶⁴ and avoided division, and did not recognize change,⁶⁵ and preserved the difference with respect to the other, and kept the participation and the composition undissolved and unbroken. We, therefore, believing piously and standing within *the boundaries* of orthodoxy (cf. Prov. 22: 28), say that the one and the same Christ and Son performed both acts, since the same one existed as God and a human being, and we do not entertain the idea of any confusion. So, while maintaining that each form, with the participation with the other, performs what is proper to it, since two forms are constituted in one and the same Christ and effect naturally their proper acts, we do not think at all of a kind of division, as Eutyches in one place, and Nestorius in another, wanted us to misrepresent. They stand at opposite extremes from each other, and are separated in the impious war which they wage against us who are of pious belief.

⁶¹ This again is the language of Leo's *Tome*.

⁶² Here begins another citation from Nicephorus I of Constantinople, *Against Eusebius*, in Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, 487, which runs to the phrase 'in one hypostasis' a few lines further.

⁶³ Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, *ACO II*, 1, 2, 129, 31; trans. Tanner, i. *86.

⁶⁴ Cf. Leo, *Letter to Flavian*, *ACO II*, 1, 1, 14, 27-8; trans. Tanner, i. *79.

⁶⁵ This is an echo of part of the Definition of Chalcedon, *ACO II*, 1, 2, 129, 31; cf. Tanner, i. *86.

2.3.10. Οὓς εἰς οὐδὲν λογιζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἑκατέρας φύσεως ἑκατέραν ἴσμεν ἐνέργειαν, τὴν οὐσιώδη λέγω καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ [446] κατάλληλον, ἀδιαιρέτως ἐξ ἐκάστης προϋούσαν οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως κατὰ τὴν ἐμπεφυκυῖαν αὐτῇ φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ποιότητα καὶ τὴν ἀμέριστον ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀσύγχυτον τῆς θατέρας οὐσίας συνεπαγομένην συνέργειαν. τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ ποιεῖ τὸ διάφορον, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶναι τὰς φύσεις τῶν φύσεων· οὐ ταυτὸν γὰρ θεότης τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότης κατὰ τὴν φυσικῶς ἐκάστη προσοῦσαν ποιότητα, καὶ εἰς ὑπόστασιν μίαν ἀλλήλαις ἀφράστως συνέδραμον καὶ εἰς ἓν ἀσυγχύτως συνετέθησαν πρόσωπον καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἓνα Χριστὸν ἡμῖν καὶ υἱὸν ἀπετέλεσαν διὰ τῆς καθ' ὑπόστασιν πρὸς ἀλλήλας συνδρομῆς καὶ συνθέσεως. ὃ τε γὰρ θεὸς λόγος θεὸς λόγος ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ σὰρξ, καὶ σὰρκα λογικῶς ἐμψυχωμένην προσείληφε καὶ ἐνώσει ταύτην ἑαυτῷ φυσικῇ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἥνωσεν, ἥ τε σὰρξ σὰρξ ἐστὶν ἐμψυχωμένη λογικῶς καὶ οὐ λόγος, καὶ εἰ θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ κατοπτρεύεται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπαράλλακτως ἀλλήλαις ἐνέργειαν μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν τὴν φυσικὴν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον, τουτέστι τὴν ἀληθὴ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἔχουσιν, οὐδὲ μίαν καὶ μόνην αὐτῶν τὴν ἐνέργειαν λέγομεν ἢ οὐσιώδη καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ παντελῶς ἀπαράλλακτον, ἵνα μὴ καὶ εἰς οὐσίαν μίαν καὶ φύσιν μίαν αὐτὰ συνελάσωμεν τὴν Ἀκεφάλων παιζομένην παισὶ καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀναιδῶς προφερομένην τοῖς ῥήμασι σύνθετον.

2.3.11. Ὡσπερ οὖν τὴν ἑκατέρας οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως, ἐξ ὧν ἡμῖν ἡ ἀσύγχυτος ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ γέγονεν ἔνωσις καὶ τὸν ἓνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἀπετέλεσεν ὅλον θεόν, ὅλον τὸν αὐτὸν πιστευόμενον ἄνθρωπον, ἑκατέραν φυσικὴν ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐνέργειαν, ἵνα μὴ τὰς ἀσυγχύτως ἐνωθείσας φύσεις συγχέωμεν, εἴπερ ἐκ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν καὶ μόνον κατὰ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα δεινοὺς αἱ φύσεις γνωρίζονται καὶ τῶν οὐσιῶν ἀεὶ τὸ διάφορον ἐκ τοῦ διαφόρου τῶν ἐνεργειῶν καταλαμβάνεσθαι πέφυκεν, οὕτω καὶ πᾶσαν φωνὴν καὶ ἐνέργειαν, καὶ θεία τις

10. Counting these men as nothing, we know that each activity of each nature (I mean the essential and natural and corresponding activity) proceeds indivisibly from each essence and nature according to its innate natural and essential quality,⁶⁶ and [we know] the inseparable and at the same time unconfused cooperation of the other essence brought in with it. For it is this which makes the difference also in the activities in Christ, just as too the existence of the natures [makes the difference] in the natures. For Godhead and humanity are not identical with regard to the quality which is naturally inherent in each, although they met together inexpressibly in one hypostasis and were composed without confusion into one person, and produced the one and the same Christ and Son for us through the mutual, hypostatic, combination and composition. For God the Word is God the Word and not flesh, although he assumed flesh endowed with an intellectual soul, and united this to himself in a natural and hypostatic union; and the flesh is flesh endowed with an intellectual soul and is not the Word, even if the flesh is discerned as belonging to God the Word. And because of this they neither have the same activity indistinguishably from each other after the natural and unconfused union, that is, the true and hypostatic union, nor do we speak of their one, single activity, that is, one that is essential, natural, and completely indistinguishable, lest we herd them even into one essence and one nature, made sport of by the children of the Headless Ones,⁶⁷ and shamefully put forward by them explicitly as composite.

11. We therefore confess each natural activity of each essence and nature from which the unconfused union in Christ came about for us and brought about the one Christ and Son, wholly God, the same believed to be wholly a human being. [We do this] in order not to confuse the natures which are united without confusion, if as is the fact the natures are revealed from the activities and only from them, according to those who are experts in such matters, and the difference of the essences is always understood from the difference of the activities. Even so we teach that every utterance and activity, whether divine and heavenly or human and earthly, proceeds from one and the same Christ and Son and his one,

⁶⁶ Cf. sec. 2.3.5, above.

⁶⁷ On the Headless Ones see sec. 1.4.4, n. 121.

ἡ καὶ [448] οὐράνιος καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη τε καὶ ἐπίγειος, ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προιέναι Χριστοῦ καὶ υἱοῦ δογματίζομεν καὶ τῆς μιᾶς αὐτοῦ συνθέτου καὶ μοναδικῆς ὑποστάσεως, ὃς σεσαρκωμένος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος ἐτύγχανεν, ὃ καὶ ἑκατέραν ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀσυνγχύτως ἐνέργειαν κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ φύσεις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς προβαλλόμενος, κατὰ μὲν τὴν θείαν αὐτοῦ φύσιν, καθ' ἣν ἦν καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὁμοούσιος, τὴν θεϊκὴν καὶ ἀνέκφραστον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, καθ' ἣν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἡμῖν ὁ αὐτὸς ὁμοούσιος ἔμεινε, τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν καὶ πρόσγειον, τὴν ἐκάστη φύσει φίλην καὶ πρόσφορον καὶ οὐκ ἔων τῶν ὁρώντων τινὰ σκανδαλίζεσθαι, ὥς οὐ θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς εἶη καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ταῦτα καὶ κεῖνα φυσικῶς ἐργαζόμενος, διὰ μὲν τοῦ τὸν αὐτὸν ἓνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἑκάτερα τὴν Νεστορίου μιανὰν ἐμφράττων ἀπόρροian—οὔτε γὰρ δύο κατ' αὐτὸν Χριστοὺς καὶ υἱούς, ὥς εἰρήκαμεν, τοὺς ἐνεργούντας ταῦτά τε καὶ κεῖνα πρεσβεύομεν—διὰ δὲ τοῦ δεικνύναι τὰ ἑκατέρας ἴδια φύσεως ἀσύγχυτα μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν μένοντα καὶ ἑκατέραν τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμοίως προφέρειν ἐνέργειαν τῷ φυσικῷ λόγῳ γνωριζομένην τῶν φύσεων καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν φυσικῶς ἐρμηνεύουσιν, ἀφ' ἧς ἀμερίστως καὶ φυσικῶς ἐπηγάζετο καὶ οὐσιωδῶς ἀνεβλύστανε, τὴν Εὐτυχοῦς ἐκτεφρῶν φιλοσύγχυτον βλάβστησιν.

2.3.12. Ἐντεῦθεν τόκον τεχθεὶς τὸν ἡμέτερον γαλακτοτροφεῖται καὶ αὖξεται καὶ τὰς σωματικὰς μεθελικιώσεις διέρχεται, ἄχρις οὗ πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἡλικίας ἀφίκετο τέλειον, καὶ πείναν τὴν ἡμῶν καὶ δίψαν προσδέχεται καὶ κόπον καθ' ἡμᾶς τὸν ἐξ ὁδοιπορίας ὑπέμεινε. ἐποιεῖτο γὰρ καὶ τὴν πορευτικὴν ἡμῖν ὁμοίως ἐνέργειαν, ἥτις ἀνθρωπίνως ἐνεργουμένη καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν

composite, and single hypostasis. He was the incarnate God the Word, who produced naturally from himself in an inseparable and unconfused manner each activity⁶⁸ according to his own natures: according to his divine nature on the one hand, in accordance with which he was consubstantial with the Father, [he produced] his divine and unutterable activity; while according to his human nature on the other hand, in accordance with which the same one also remained consubstantial with us human beings, [he produced] his human and mundane activity, [each activity being] congenial to and befitting each nature. And he does not allow any of those who see him to be scandalized, on the grounds that the same one, who performs this and that naturally, is not God and a human being. By effecting both actions, the one and the same Christ and Son stops up the foul effluence of Nestorius. (For neither, as we have said, do we worship two Christs and Sons in him, as if it is they who effect this and that.⁶⁹) By showing, on the other hand, that what is proper to each nature remains unconfused after the union, and that the same one [sc. Christ] likewise produces each activity, revealed by the natural principle of the natures, and expressing its own nature naturally, from which it springs forth inseparably and naturally and gushes forth according to its essence, he burns to ashes the sprout of Eutyches, which loves confusion.⁷⁰

12. Hence, being born like us, he [sc. Christ] was fed with milk, and grew, and went through the bodily developments which the years bring, until he reached mature human stature (cf. Eph. 4: 13), and accepted our hunger (cf. Matt. 4: 2) and thirst (cf. John 4: 7, 19: 28) and incurred the fatigue of journeys like us (cf. John 4: 6). He likewise performed the activity of walking like us, accomplished in human fashion, and advancing in accord with human

⁶⁸ Here the adverbs 'indivisibly' and 'unconfusedly' of the Chalcedonian definition are pressed into service to show the necessity of confessing two activities in Christ, who is in two natures.

⁶⁹ That is, according to Nestorius, the human actions stem from the humanity, the divine actions from the divine nature.

⁷⁰ Eutyches supposedly taught that the two natures of Christ merged into a third substance.

προβαίνουσα τῆς ἀνθρωπείας αὐτοῦ φύσεως ἐτύγχανεν ἔνδειξις. ὅθεν καὶ τόπον ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐκ τόπου μετέβαινεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος καὶ φύσιν [450] τὴν ἡμῶν ἔσχεν ἀμείωτον καὶ περιγραφῆς ἡνέσχετο σώματος, καὶ σχῆμα τὸ ἡμῖν ἀρμόζον πεφόρηκε. σωματικὴ γάρ, τουτέστι σώματος, καὶ ἡ μορφή τυγχάνει τοῦ σχήματος, καθ' ἣν ἐν μήτρα συλληφθεὶς διεπέπλαστο καὶ ἦν εἰς αἰὲ διετήρησε καὶ εἰς αἰῶνα διατηρεῖ τὸν ἀπέραντον.

2.3.13. Διὰ τοῦτο πεινῶν διετρέφετο, διὰ τοῦτο διψῶν ἐποτίζετο καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔπινε, διὰ τοῦτο παιδικῶς ἐβαστάζετο ἀγκάλαις παρθενικαῖς ἐποχούμενος καὶ κόλποις μητρικοῖς ἀνακείμενος, διὰ τοῦτο κοπιῶν ἐκαθέζετο καὶ ὑπνου χρήζων ἐκάθευδεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἦλγει τυπτόμενος καὶ μαστιζόμενος ἔπασχε καὶ πόνους ὑπέμεινε σώματος χεῖρας καὶ πόδας τῷ σταυρῷ περονούμενος. ἐδίδου γάρ, ὅτε καὶ ἤθελε, φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ καιρὸν ἐνεργεῖν καὶ πάσχειν τὰ ἴδια, ἵνα μὴ φαντασία τις καὶ θέα διάκενος ἡ αὐτοῦ περιώννυμος κρίνοιτο σάρκωσις. οὐ γὰρ ἀκουσίως ταῦτα ἢ ἀναγκαστῶς προσεδέχετο, καὶ φυσικῶς αὐτὰ καὶ ἀνθρωπίνως προσίετο καὶ ἀνθρωπίναις κινήσεσιν ἐποίει καὶ ἔπραττεν, ἅπαγε τῆς βδελυκτῆς ἐνθυμήσεως· θεὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ ταῦτα πάσχειν σαρκικῶς ἀνεχόμενος καὶ σώζων ἡμᾶς τοῖς οἰκείοις παθήμασι καὶ βραβεύων ἡμῖν δι' αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπάθειαν. ἀλλ' ὅτε πάσχειν καὶ πράττειν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν ἀνθρωπίνως ὁ αὐτὸς ἐβεβούλητο καὶ τοὺς ὁρῶντας ὠφελεῖν ἐψηφίζετο, δι' οὓς καὶ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ἀλήθειαν γέγονε, καὶ οὐχ ὅτε αἱ φυσικαὶ κινήσεις καὶ σαρκικαὶ κινεῖσθαι φυσικῶς πρὸς ἐνέργειαν ἤθελον ἢ οἱ ἐπιβουλευόντες ἄθεοι τὰς ἐπιβουλάς πληροῦν παντόλμως ἐγλίχοντο. σῶμα γὰρ παθητὸν καὶ θνητὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν ἐνεδύσατο καὶ τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ ἀδιαβλήτοις ἡμῶν ὑποκείμενον πάθεσι, καὶ τοῦτο τὰ τῇ οἰκείᾳ φύσει κατάλληλα πάσχειν καὶ δρᾶν συνεχώρησε μέχρι [452] τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ καὶ τὸ παθητὸν ἡμῶν καὶ θνητὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν καταλέλυκε καὶ τὴν ἐκ τούτων ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο.

essence, gave proof of his human nature. For this reason he also went from place to place as we do, since he had become truly a human being and possessed our nature without diminution and was restrained by bodily limitation, and bore an appearance corresponding to ours. The form of his appearance was bodily, that is, belonging to a body, in accordance with which he was conceived and moulded in the womb, and which he preserved for always and will preserve for endless ages.

13. This is why *when he was hungry* (Matt. 4: 2) he was fed, this is why when he was thirsty (cf. John 4: 7, 19: 28) he was given drink and drank as a human being, this is why as a child he was carried as he rested in the Virgin's arms and reposed on his mother's bosom, this is why when he was tired he sat down (cf. John 4: 6), and when he needed sleep he slept (cf. Matt. 8: 24), even so he felt pain when hit (cf. John 18: 23), and when whipped (cf. Matt. 26: 27) he suffered, and underwent bodily pain when his hands and feet were pierced on the cross (cf. John 19: 12). For when he wished he gave his human nature the occasion to activate and suffer what was proper to it, lest his far-famed incarnation be judged some kind of illusion and a hollow spectacle. For he did not take these things upon himself against his will or under necessity, although he did submit to them in a natural and human manner, and did and performed them with human movements: perish the abominable idea! For it was God who endured suffering these things in the flesh and saved us with his own sufferings and through them awarded us freedom from passions. But sometimes the same one decided to suffer and operate and act in a human fashion, and resolved to help those who were watching, on whose account he had in truth become a human being, and not when natural and fleshly movements wished to be moved naturally to activity, or godless conspirators strove with consummate daring to accomplish their plots. For he put on a body that was passible and mortal and corruptible and subject to our natural and blameless passions,⁷¹ and he permitted it to suffer and do what corresponded to its own nature until his resurrection from the dead. There he brought our passibility and mortality and corruptibility to an end and bestowed on us freedom from them.

⁷¹ These are the natural, human emotions or affections which are in themselves innocent; their assumption by Christ does not negate his sinlessness.

2.3.14. Τὰ μὲν οὖν ταπεινὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα οὕτως ἐκουσίως ὁμοῦ καὶ φυσικῶς μένων κὰν τούτοις θεὸς ἐπεδείκνυτο· ταμίας γὰρ ἦν αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ παθῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ πράξεων, καὶ οὐ μόνον ταμίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρύτανις καὶ εἰ φύσιν παθητὴν φυσικῶς ἐσεσάρκωτο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἦν ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, οὐκ ἐπειδήπερ ἡ φύσις ἦν οὐκ ἀνθρώπειος, ἀλλ' ἐπειδήπερ ἐκουσίως γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος. καὶ ἄνθρωπος γεγωνὼς ἐκουσίως αὐτὰ προσεδέχετο καὶ οὐ τυραννικῶς ἢ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἔστιν ὅτε καθ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀβουλήτως, ἀλλ' ἡνίκα καὶ ὅσον ἡβούλετο, καὶ συγχωρεῖν αὐτὸς τοῖς τε τὰ πάθη προσφέρουσι τοῖς τε παθήμασιν αὐτοῖς κατὰ φύσιν ἐνεργουμένοις ἐπένευσε. τὰ δὲ θεῖα καὶ λαμπρὰ καὶ ὑπέρτατα καὶ νικῶντα προδήλως ἡμῶν τὴν εὐτέλειαν, ἅπερ ἦν θαυμαστά τε καὶ τεράστια καὶ τῶν παραδόξων ἔργων ἡ πρόοδος, ὅποιαπερ ἦν

ἡ ἄσπορος σύλληψις,
 ἡ Ἰωάννου ἐγγάστριος σκίρτησις,
 ὁ τόκος ὁ ἄφθορος,
 ἡ παρθενία ἡ ἄχραντος,
 ἡ πρὸ τοῦ τόκου καὶ ἐν τῷ τόκῳ καὶ μετὰ τὸν τόκον ἀλώβητος,
 ἡ τῶν ποιμένων οὐράνιος μήνυσις,
 ἡ τῶν μάγων ἀστροκίνητος ἔλκυσις, δωροφορία τε σὺν αὐτῇ καὶ προσκύνησις,
 ἡ τῶν γραμμάτων ἀμαθήτευτος εἵδησις—πῶς γὰρ οὗτος, φησὶν, οἶδε γράμματα μὴ μεμαθηκώς; μερικῶς ἀπελέγχουσα τῶν τῆς ἀγνοίας ἐραστῶν τὸν κακότροπον ἔρωτα—
 ἡ ἐξ ὑδάτων οἰνώδης ἐμφόρησις,
 τῶν ἀσθενῶν ἡ ἐπίρρωσις,
 τῶν τυφλῶν ἡ ἀνάβλεψις,
 τῶν κυλλῶν ἡ ἀνόρθωσις,
 τῶν παραλύτων ἡ σύσφιγξις,
 τῶν χωλῶν ἡ εὐθύδρομος κίνησις,

14. Thus in this way he exhibited the humble and human things voluntarily and at the same time naturally, remaining God in the midst of them nonetheless. For he was his own steward of human passions and acts, and not merely steward but also governor of them,⁷² although according to nature he became incarnate with respect to a passible nature, and on account of this his human elements went beyond the human, not because his nature was not human, but because he became a human being voluntarily. And having become a human being, he submitted to these [human elements] voluntarily and not through tyranny or necessity, as sometimes happens to us even against our will, but at the precise time and to the extent that he wished, and he himself consented to yield both to those things which brought the sufferings and to the sufferings themselves, which were effected in accordance with nature. [Contrast] the divine and luminous and loftiest actions, on the other hand, and those clearly surpassing our mean estate, namely the miraculous and the extraordinary and the emanation of wondrous deeds, such as:

the conception without seed,
 the leaping of John in the womb,
 the uncorruptive birth,
 the undefiled virginity which was intact before the birth and
 during the birth and after the birth,
 the heavenly message given to the shepherds,
 the drawing of the Magi moved by a star, and the bearing of gifts
 which came with it and the adoration,
 the knowledge of learning by one who had not studied ('For how
 is it', they said, 'that he has learning when he has not studied?'
 (John 7: 15), [the knowledge] which in particular refuted the
 perverse love of the lovers of ignorance),
 the changing of water into wine,
 the invigoration of the sick,
 the restoration of sight to the blind,
 the straightening out of the deformed,
 the bracing of the paralytics,
 the straight course of the lame,

⁷² On the significance of the words 'steward' (*tamias*) and 'governor' (*prytanis*) here see Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, 138–41: they refer to the 'ultimate source of the *energeiai*, from where and by which they are distributed and provided, as well as directed and controlled, evaluated and judged'.

τῶν λεπτῶν ἢ ὑπέρλαμπρος κάθαρσις,
 τῶν πεινῶντων ἢ σχέδιος πλήρωσις,
 τῶν διωκόντων ἢ πῆρωσις,
 τῶν ἀνέμων [454] ἢ κοίμησις,
 τῆς θαλάττης ἢ γαλιναῖα κατάστασις,
 ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων ἐνσώματος βάδις,
 ἢ τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πνευμάτων ἐκδίωξις,
 ἢ τῶν στοιχείων αἰφνίδιος κύκησις,
 ἢ τοῦ ἡλίου παγκόσμιος σκότωσις,
 ἢ τῶν μνημείων αὐτόματος ἀνοιξις,
 ἢ ἐκ νεκρῶν τριήμερος ἔγερσις,
 ἢ τῆς φθορᾶς οὐ τελευτῶσα κατάλυσις,
 ἢ τοῦ θανάτου μὴ πανομένη καθαίρεσις,
 ἢ φυλαττομένη τῆς λίθου καὶ τάφου σφραγίδος ἀκώλυτος ἔξοδος,
 ἢ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ἀκράτητος εἴσοδος,
 ἢ εἰς οὐρανούς ἀπὸ γῆς πολυθαύμαστος καὶ ἐνσώματος ἄνοδος,

καὶ πάντα τὰ τούτοις παρόμοια τὰ καὶ λόγου φύσιν καὶ φωνῆς
 ὑπερβαίνοντα δύναμιν καὶ πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπείαν ὑπερνικῶντα
διάνοιαν, ἅπερ ἅπαντα ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην τελούμενα
 τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου θείας οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ὁμολογουμένως
 ὑπῆρχε τεκμήρια, εἰ καὶ διὰ σαρκὸς ἐνηργεῖτο καὶ σώματος καὶ οὐ
 δίχα σαρκὸς λογικῶς ἐμψυχωμένης ἐπράττετο.

2.3.15. Καὶ οὐ διὰ ταῦτα τὸν θεὸν λόγον τοπάσομεν ἄσαρκον ἢ
 σώματος αὐτὸν ἐκτὸς δογματίσομεν, ὅτι περ ἔδρα τὰ σωμάτων
 ὑπέρτερα, καὶ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ὁ λόγος σεσάρκωτο καὶ ἀψευδῶς
 σαρκωθείς σεσωμάτωτο, καὶ εἰς υἱὸς ἐγινώσκετο ὁ πᾶσαν ἐξ
 ἑαυτοῦ προφέρων ἐνέργειαν, θείαν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπειον, ταπεινὴν καὶ
 ὑπέρογκον, χθαμαλὴν καὶ οὐράνιον, σαρκικὴν καὶ ἀσώματον,
 ὁρατὴν καὶ ἀόρατον, περιγραπτὴν καὶ ἀπερίγραπτον, ἀναλογουσαν
 αὐτοῦ τῇ δυάδι τῶν φύσεων καὶ δι' ἑαυτῆς αὐτὴν ἀσιγήτως
 κηρύττουσαν καὶ διαπρυσίως ἀγγέλουσαν. εἰς γὰρ ὧν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς

the resplendent cleansing of the lepers,
 the prompt satisfying of the hungry,
 the blinding of the persecutors,⁷³
 the stilling of the winds,
 the calm subduing of the sea,
 the bodily walking on the waters,
 the expulsion of the unclean spirits,
 the sudden stirring up of the elements,
 the darkening of the sun over all the world,
 the spontaneous opening of the tombs,
 the rising from the dead after three days,
 the never-ending dissolution of corruption,
 the unceasing destruction of death,
 the unimpeded exit, under guard, from the stone and the sealed
 tomb,
 the unchecked entry through the locked doors,
 the wholly astonishing ascension in the body from earth into
 heaven,

and all deeds comparable to these which surpass the nature of speech and the power of voice and are more than superior to all human understanding (cf. Eph. 3: 20). All of these, accomplished beyond human reason and nature, are confessedly signs of the divine essence and nature of God the Word, even if they are effected through the flesh and the body and are not achieved apart from the flesh endowed with a rational soul.

15. We shall not as a consequence of these considerations conjecture that God the Word is fleshless, or teach that he is without a body, because he performed deeds superior to the body. Indeed, the Word truly became incarnate and, being made incarnate without deceit, took a body and is acknowledged as one Son, he who brings forth every activity from himself, both divine and human, both humble and exceedingly great, earthly and heavenly, fleshly and incorporeal, visible and invisible, circumscribed and uncircumscribed, corresponding to his duality of natures, and unfailingly proclaiming the duality through itself, and loudly announcing it. For since the same Son, indivisible in regard to his

⁷³ This is apparently a reference to the blinding of the persecutor Saul (Acts 9: 1-9), and thus quite out of chronological sequence.

καθ' ὑπόστασιν υἱὸς ἀδιαίρετος καὶ δύο φύσεις ὁ αὐτὸς γνωριζόμενος, κατ' ἄλλην μὲν τὰς θεοσημείας εἰργάζεται, κατ' ἄλλην δὲ τὰ ταπεινὰ παρεδέξατο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτό φασιν οἱ θεόφρονες οἱ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῖς ἄθλοις στεψάμενοι καὶ τὸ φάσκειν θεόθεν δεξάμενοι τὰς θειοτάτας συνέσεις ἡμῖν ἐξυφαίνοντες, ὥς ὅταν ἀκούσης τοῦ ἐνὸς υἱοῦ τὰς ἐναντίας φωνάς, καταλλήλως μέριξε ταῖς φύσεσι τὰ λεγόμενα, ἂν μὲν τι μέγα καὶ θεῖον τῇ θείᾳ φύσει προσνέμων, ἂν δέ τι μικρὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπινον τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ λογιζόμενος. οὕτω γὰρ [456] καὶ τὸ τῶν φωνῶν ἀσύμφωνον διαφεύξῃ ἐκάστης ἃ πέφυκεν ἴδια δεχομένης φύσεως καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἓνα καὶ πρὸ πάντων <τῶν> αἰώνων καὶ πρόσφατον κατὰ τὰς ἁγίας γραφὰς ὁμολογήσεις.' ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς υἱοῦ φασιν 'πάσαν μὲν ἐνέργειαν οὐκ ἂν τις χωρίσειε τῆς μιᾶς υἰότητος, τῆς δὲ φύσεως ἧς ἔστιν οἰκείον τὸ γινόμενον τῷ λόγῳ γνωρίσειεν.'

2.3.16. Οὐκοῦν κάλλιστα λίαν αὐτοῖς δεδογμάτισται τὸ ἓνα μὲν ὁμολογεῖν τὸν Ἑμμανουήλ, οὕτως γὰρ ὁ θεὸς λόγος σαρκωθεὶς ὀνομάζεται, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἅπαντα δρᾶν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον τά τε ὑψηλὰ καὶ ἐλάχιστα παντοίας ἐκτὸς διαστάσεως, δι' ὧν καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φύσεων ἀσύγχυτος ἢ διπλόη γνωρίζεται καὶ εἰς ὑποστάσεις δύο καὶ πρόσωπα διαμπαῖς ὁ αὐτὸς οὐ μερίζεται, ἀλλ' ἔστιν εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς υἱὸς καὶ Χριστὸς ἀδιάτμητος ἐν δυσὶν ἀδιαιρέτως γνωριζόμενος φύσεσι· καὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα τοῦ ἐνὸς υἱοῦ διαβεβαιούμεθα καὶ πάσας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς φωνὰς καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας πιστεύομεν, κἂν αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἰσιν θεοπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ οὕτω πάλιν ἀνθρωποπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ μέσην τινὰ τάξιν ἐπέχουσιν ὥς ἔχουσαι τὸ θεοπρεπὲς ἐν ταυτῷ

hypostasis and the same one revealed as two natures, is one, he performed the miracles according to one [nature], and admitted the lowly acts according to the other. Because of this those who have godly thoughts, who have been crowned in the contests by Christ God and have received the gift of speaking from God, and have together woven for us most godly understanding, say: 'When you hear contrary expressions about the one Son, divide what is said correspondingly between the natures. If something is great and divine, assign it to the divine nature, but if something is small and human, reckon it to the human [nature].'⁷⁴ 'For in this way you will both avoid discordant vocabulary, each nature receiving what is proper to it, and you will confess the one Son, both before all ages and lately appeared, in accordance with the holy scriptures.'⁷⁵ But they also say the following about the one Son: 'One should not separate every activity from the one sonship, but should recognize the event by the principle of the nature to which it is proper.'⁷⁶

16. Surely, then, it has been exceedingly well taught that one should confess as one the Emmanuel (for so the incarnate God the Word is called), and that the same one, and not one and another, performed all activities, both the lofty and the least, without distension of any kind. Through these activities also the unconfused, twofold character of his natures is revealed, and the same one is not separated through and through into two hypostases and persons, but is one and the same unrent Son and Christ, revealed inseparably in two natures. And we confirm that all these things belong to this one Son, and we believe that the words and the activities all belong to him, although some of them befit the Godhead, while others again befit the humanity, while still others occupy a middle rank, inasmuch as they possess in the same activity what befits both God and the human,⁷⁷ while we attribute to

⁷⁴ Theodoret, *Exposition of the Right Faith* (CPG 6218), ch. 11; PG 6, 1225BC; ed. Otto, III, 1, 38–40.

⁷⁵ Ibid., ch. 10; PG 6, 1225A; ed. Otto, III, 1, 36.

⁷⁶ Ibid., ch. 12; PG 6, 1232A; ed. Otto, III, 1, 48–50.

⁷⁷ An almost verbatim quotation from Cyril's letter to Acacius of Melitene, ch. 16; see Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria*, 52, ll. 14–17. Cyril was himself simply paraphrasing the conclusion of the Formula of Reunion.

καὶ ἀνθρώπινον, ταύτης δὲ φάμεν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τὴν καινὴν καὶ θεανδρικήν· λεγομένην ἐνέργειαν, οὐ μίαν ὑπάρχουσαν ἀλλ' ἑτερογενὴ καὶ διάφορον, ἣν ὁ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου Παύλῳ τῷ θείῳ θείως ζωγρηθεὶς θεηγόρος Διονύσιος ἔφησεν, ὡς τὸ θεοπρεπὲς ἐν ταυτῷ καὶ ἀνθρώπινον ἔχουσιν καὶ διὰ τῆς χαριεστάτης τε καὶ συνθέτου προσρήσεως τὴν ἐκάστης οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ἐκάστην ἐντελῶς δηλοῦσαν ἐνέργειαν.

2.3.17. Προαιώνιον τοίνυν τὸν θεὸν λόγον δοξάζοντες καὶ τῷ πατρὶ συναΐδιον χρονικὴν ὑπομεῖναι πρεσβεύομεν γέννησιν, ἣν ἐκ παρθένου τῆς κυρίως [468] καὶ ἀληθῶς θεοτόκου Μαρίας σαρκωθεὶς ἀπετίκτετο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δύο τὰς γεννήσεις γεγεννησθαι πρὸς τῶν εὐσεβούντων εἰκότως πιστεύεται· καὶ τέλειος ὢν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν θεότητι τέλειος ἦν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, οὔτε τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν οὐσιῶν διαιρούμενος, οὔτε τῇ τῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ τοῦ προσώπου ταυτότητι τὰς φύσεις ἄγων πρὸς οὐσιώδη ταυτότητα, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν καθ' ὑπόστασιν πέφηνε φύσεων, ἐν αὐταῖς ἀδιαίρετος ἔμεινε, πάντα σοφῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς ὑπελθὼν τὰ ἡμέτερα ἔργα καὶ πάθη, φυσικὰ καὶ ἀδιάβλητα πράγματα τὰ μῶμου μακρὰν καὶ μολύσματος καὶ ἐν οἷς ἀμαρτίας ἵχνος τινὸς μὴ εὐρίσκεται. ἀμαρτίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδέ τις δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ τὸ σύνολον εὔρηται. καὶ συναναστραφεὶς ἀνθρωπίνως ἡμῖν, ἅτε τέλειος γνωριζόμενος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ θεὸς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπαραλείπτως ἐτύγγανε καὶ θαυματουργήσας ὡς ἔπρεπε—τέλειος γὰρ θεὸς ἐγινώσκετο καὶ ἀνθρωπείᾳ νοερῶς ἐμψυχωμένη σαρκὶ συνεκέκρατο. ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος τὸ ἐκούσιον ἄνεισι καὶ ἐκουσίως Ἰουδαίοις προδίδεται, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς δι' ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν ἐκουσίως προδίδωσι καὶ δεσμεύεται καὶ κολαφίζεται καὶ ἐμπτύεται καὶ μαστίζεται καὶ χλευάζεται καὶ

this power the activity called 'new and theandric',⁷⁸ which is not one but heterogeneous and differentiated. This was the term Dionysius the Areopagite, who spoke of God, expressed to the divine Paul when he had been divinely taken captive by him (cf. Acts 17: 34), since it holds both the God-befitting and the human in the same one, and because the term is both elegant and composite, demonstrating perfectly each activity of each essence and nature.

17. Therefore in glorifying God the Word who is before the ages and co-eternal with the Father, we profess that he underwent a birth in time, in respect of which he was born incarnate from the Virgin Mary, who is properly and truly Theotokos,⁷⁹ and because of that he is rightly believed by those of pious belief to have had two births.⁸⁰ And the same being perfect in Godhead was, the same, perfect in humanity,⁸¹ neither being divided by the difference of the essences, nor by the identity of the hypostasis and the person leading the natures to an identity of essence, but he remained undivided in the natures from which he appeared hypostatically, in wisdom and in truth undergoing all our works and passions—those natural and blameless matters which are far from censure and defilement and in which no trace of sin is found. *For he did not commit sin nor could any guile be found in his mouth at all* (1 Pet. 2: 22; cf. Isa. 53: 9). And he lived with us in human fashion, inasmuch as he was revealed as a perfect human being, although the same one was flawlessly God and performed miracles as was appropriate; for he was revealed as perfect God, although he was bound fast to a human flesh that was intellectually ensouled. He gave access to voluntary passion and was given up voluntarily to the Jews—or rather he gave himself up voluntarily to them because of the salvation of human beings, and he was bound, and slapped, and spat on, and whipped and scoffed and mocked, and

⁷⁸ Ps. Dionysius, *Letter 4 to Gaius the Monk* (CPG 6607); PG 3, 1072C; ed. G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, *Corpus Dionysiacum*, vol. 2, Patristische Texte und Studien, 36 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991), 161, l. 9. See sec. 1.3.2 on the use of this expression in Sergius and Cyrus, and cf. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus* 2/3, 309–6, for a discussion of the concept in Ps. Dionysius.

⁷⁹ The same expression has already been used. See sec. 2.3.4, above.

⁸⁰ Cf. Definition of Chalcedon, ACO II, 1, 2, 129, 27–9; trans. Tanner, i. *86.

⁸¹ Once again we have the echo of the Definition of Chalcedon: ACO II, 1, 2, 129, 24–5; trans. Tanner, i. *86.

ἐμπαίζεται καὶ χλαμύδα πορφυρᾶν ὡς βασιλεύων τῶν ὅλων ἐνδύεται καὶ κάλαμον ὡς σκῆπτρον βασιλικὸν βασιλικῶς ἐγχειρίζεται καὶ Πιλάτου κατακρίνεται κρίνοντος καὶ τέλος ἱκρίῳ προσπῆγνυται καὶ χεῖρας καὶ πόδας αἱμάσσεται τῷ σωτηρίῳ σταυρῷ προσηλούμενος· καὶ λησταῖς συνεπαίρεται καὶ ὄξος ποτίζεται καὶ χολῆς ἀπογεύεται καὶ μέγα βοήσας τῷ πατρὶ τὴν ψυχὴν παραδίδωσι καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν τῇ λόγχῃ τιτρώσκεται καὶ αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ σωτήριον μετὰ θάνατον προχέει καὶ νέκρωσιν· καὶ νεκρὸς [460] τοῦ σταυροῦ καταφέρεται καὶ κηδεύεται καὶ σμυρνίζεται καὶ ταφὴν τριήμερον θάπτεται καὶ τριταῖος ἀναστὰς τοῦ τάφου προέρχεται καὶ πάντας ἑαυτῷ τοὺς νεκροὺς συνανίστησιν ἐκ τάφου καὶ φθορᾶς πρὸς τὴν οὐ τελευτῶσαν αὐτοὺς ζωὴν ἐπαγόμενος διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως· καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστὰς ἐμφανίζεται καὶ πιστοποιεῖται βρώσει καὶ πόσει καὶ ἀφῇ χειρῶν ἀποστολικῶν τῆς οἰκείας σαρκὸς τὴν ἀνάστασιν καὶ πνεῦμα τούτοις παρέχει πανάγιον, ὡς συγγενὲς αὐτῷ καὶ ὁμόφυλον, καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναφέρεται, μᾶλλον δὲ ὡς καὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν δεσπόζων ἀνέρχεται καὶ δεξιὸς τοῦ τεκόντος καθέζεται θῶκον ἔχων τὸν πατρικὸν καὶ βασιλικὸν καὶ ὑπέρτατον· ὅθεν καὶ πάλιν ἐλεύσεται κρίσιν ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν ποιησόμενος καὶ ἀποδώσων ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰς πράξεις, ὥσπερ ἕκαστος πέπραχεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὰς τις πράξεις καὶ καλὰς, εἴτε φαύλας καὶ ψεκτὰς κατειργάσατο. ὃν σὺν πατρί τε καὶ πνεύματι <ἀγίῳ> βασιλεύειν τῶν ὅλων πιστεύομεν βασιλείαν ἀληθῶς ἀτελεύτητον καὶ τέλος οὐ δεχομένην καὶ πλήρωμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας ταυτὸν δὲ φάναι παραδόξου τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σαρκώσεως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ταπεινοὺς ἡμᾶς ὁμοιώσεως, ὡς λέγω καὶ φρονῶ διὰ βραχέων ἐγνώρισα.

was clad in a *purple cloak* (Math: 27: 28) like one who was king of all, and in kingly fashion a reed was put into his hand like a kingly sceptre, and was condemned by Pilate acting as judge, and finally he was fixed to the scaffold and his hands and feet were bloodied as he was nailed to the saving cross. And he was raised up with robbers and was given vinegar to drink and tasted gall, and with a great cry gave up his soul to the Father, and was pierced in the side with a lance, and poured forth saving *blood and water* (John 19: 34) after his dying and death. And when dead he was taken down from the cross and tended and embalmed and buried in a tomb for three days, and rising on the third day he went forth from the tomb, and with himself he raised up all the dead, through his own resurrection from the dead leading them from the tomb and corruption to the life which has no end. And when he had risen from the dead, he appeared to the disciples, and validated his resurrection by means of eating and drinking and the touching of the apostles' hands on his own flesh, and he bestowed on them the all-holy Spirit, because it was of the same kin and of the same stock as himself, and was taken up into the heavens—or rather he went up as lord of the heavens, and is seated at the right hand of the one who begat him, possessing the royal and sublime throne of his Father. From thence he will come again to make judgement of the living and the dead,⁸² and to repay each one according to the actions which each has performed, whether someone has effected good and beautiful deeds, or foul and blameworthy. We believe that he reigns over all with both the Father and the Holy Spirit, with a reign which is truly without end and does not accept finality and completion.⁸³ But with regard to the dispensation of the flesh, that is to say of the wondrous incarnation of God the Word and his becoming like us lowly beings, I have briefly made known what I say and think.⁸⁴

⁸² Cf. Symbol of Nicæa; trans. Tanner, i. *5.

⁸³ Cf. Symbol of Constantinople I, ACO II, 1, 2, 80; trans. Tanner, i. *24. The attribution of an endless reign to Christ together with the Father and Spirit, which was not articulated in the creed of Nicæa in 325, was necessitated by Marcellus of Ancyra's doctrine. According to this teaching, after his earthly life Christ was subsumed back into the divinity: thus there was no question of the Emmanuel reigning endlessly. This addition was included in the creed of Constantinople in 381.

⁸⁴ Once again Sophronius claims to be brief. At this point von Schönborn's French translation ceases.

2.4.1. *Περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ ὁρωμένου κόσμου γεγονυίας ἀρχήθεν συστάσεως καὶ συντελείας, ἣν οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ὑποδέξοιτο, ὁμολογῶ, θεοτίμητοι, ὡς πάντα οὐ μόνον τὰ ὁρατὰ ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ἀόρατα ὁ εἰς θεὸς ἐτεκτῆνατο, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ υἱός, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἡ αἰδῖος φύσις καὶ ἄναρχος, καὶ μὴ ὄντων εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρήγαγε καὶ οὐκ ὄντα πρὶν ἐσχεδίασε καὶ τὰς τούτων μυρίας διαφορὰς σοφῶς προεβάλλετο· πάντα γὰρ διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἀγίῳ πεποίηκε πνεύματι, ἃ καὶ προνοία σοφῇ συγκρατεῖ τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων ὡς θεὸς προϊστάμενος, ἀρχὴν τε τοῖς πᾶσι χρονικὴν ὀρισάμενος, τὰ μὲν αἰσθητὰ τέλει χρονικῶ καθυπέβαλε, τὰ δὲ νοητὰ καὶ ἀόρατα τούτων ἀξίας ἡξίωσε μείζονος. καὶ θνήσκει μὲν οὐδαμῶς οὐδὲ φθείρεται κατὰ τὸ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ρευστὸν καὶ εὐπάροιστον, [462] οὐ μὴν ἐστὶ τὴν φύσιν ἀθάνατα ἢ πρὸς οὐσίαν μετελήλυθεν ἀφθαρτον, ἀλλὰ χάριν αὐτοῖς ἐχαρίσατο φθορᾶς αὐτὰ καὶ θανάτου διείργουσαν. οὕτως ἀνθρώπων ψυχαὶ διαμένουσιν ἀφθαρτοι, οὕτως ἄγγελοι διατελοῦσιν ἀθάνατοι, οὐ φύσιν ἀληθῶς, ὡς ἔφημεν, ἀφθαρτον ἢ οὐσίαν κυρίως ἀθάνατον ἔχοντες, ἀλλὰ χάριν ἐκ θεοῦ κληρωσάμενοι ἀθανασίας χορηγὸν καὶ ἀφθαρσίας αὐτοῖς ὑπάρξουσιν πρόξενον.*

2.4.2. *Ἀλλ' οὐκ, ἐπεὶπερ αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαὶ θεοῦ χάριτι τὴν φθορὰν ἀπεώσαντο τὴν πᾶσι κτιστοῖς φυσικῶς ἐμφωλεύουσιν. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸ σωμάτων αὐτὰς ὑποπτεύσομεν ἢ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ ὁρωμένου κόσμου παραγωγῆς καὶ συμπήξεως ἐν αἰδίῳ τινὶ ζωῇ τελεῖν ἐννοήσομεν καὶ βίον ἔχειν οὐράνιον φήσαιμεν ἄσαρκόν τε καὶ ἀσώματον ζώσας ζωὴν τὴν αἰδίῳ ἐν οὐρανῷ ποτε μὴ ὑπάρχοντι, ὡς Ὁριγένης ὁ παράφορος βούλεται καὶ οἱ τούτου συμμύσται καὶ*

2.4. PROFESSION OF FAITH IN CREATION

1. Concerning the coming into being of the visible world, its establishment at the beginning of time, and its consummation, which it may receive before long, I confess to you, honoured by God [sc. Sergius], that the one God framed everything, not only the visible but also the invisible—the one God, Father, Son, Holy Spirit, that is, the nature which is eternal and without beginning—and brought from non-existence into existence and created what previously was not, and wisely brought into being the myriad varieties of them. The Father made everything through the only-begotten Son in the Holy Spirit, [everything] which he holds in being through wise foresight, presiding as God over his own works, and establishing a beginning in time for everything, he subjected the perceptible to an end in time, while to the intellectual and unseen he awarded greater honour than to these: they will not die at all or corrupt in the way that perceptible things flux and easily dissipate, not that they are immortal by nature or have changed into an incorruptible essence, but he has granted them this grace which keeps them from corruption and death. Thus the souls of human beings remain incorruptible, thus the angels continue immortal, not that they are truly incorruptible in nature, as we have said, or in an essence which is properly immortal, but because they have been allotted a grace from God which bestows immortality and will grant them an incorrupt existence.

2. But⁸⁵ it is not because the souls of human beings, by the grace of God, have thrust off the corruption lurking naturally in all created things that we shall suppose therefore [that they existed] before bodies, or that we shall think that they existed in some eternal life before the creation and the compacting of the visible world. Nor would we allege that they had a heavenly way of life, living a fleshless and incorporeal life eternally in a heaven which once did not exist, as the frenzied Origen would have it, and his confederates who are of like mind with him, Didymus and

⁸⁵ Here I have adopted a punctuation different from Riedinger's.

σύμφρονες Δίδυμος καὶ Εὐάγριος καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς αὐτῶν μυθομέριμνος ὄμιλος, οἵπερ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον πεπλανημένως δοξάζουσιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐμφυρόμενοι δόγμασι καὶ τὴν Χριστιανῶν καταρπουῖντες εὐγένειαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν σωμάτων τούτων, ὧν νυνὶ περικείμεθα, ἀνοήτως ἀναιροῦσιν ἀνάστασιν, μυρία δεινὰ βατταρίζοντες τῆς δυσσεβοῦς αὐτῶν μυθοπλαστίας ἐπάξια, οἷς ἀρκεῖ πρὸς ἐπίπληξιν τὸ Παύλῳ πρὸς Κορινθίους λεγόμενον, ὡς εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται. καὶ λοιπὸν οὕτως αὐτοῖς τοῖς λογισμοῖς ματαιάζουσι τό· καὶ ἄρα μάταια ἢ πίστις ὑμῶν προστεθήσεται. ἢ οὐ μέρος, ὧ οὗτοι, τῆς ἡμῶν σεπτῆς ὁμολογίας γεγένηται καὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ἢ ἀνάστασις; καὶ ‘σαρκὸς’ γὰρ ‘ἀνάστασιν’ ὁμολογεῖν ἀπαιτούμεθα τῷ σωτηρίῳ προσιόντες βαπτίσματι. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καθά [464] τινι τῶν σοφῶν τεθεώρηται καὶ πᾶσα τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἢ λαμπρὰ καὶ διάσημος οἰκονομία λαμπρῶς πεπραγμάτευται, ‘ἵνα καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα σώση καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀθανατίσῃ’.

2.4.3. Οὐ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον οἱ παράφρονες σφάλλονται καὶ τῆς εὐθείας ὁδοῦ παρακρούονται—ἣν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὡς ἐν συγκρίσει κακῶν καὶ φορητὸν τὸ δυσσέβημα—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερα μυρία παρὰ τὴν

Evagrius and the rest of their crowd that pays heed to fables.⁸⁶ In their error they do not only hold this belief, mixing it up with pagan teachings⁸⁷ and sully the noble race of Christians, but they also mindlessly do away with the resurrection of these bodies with which we are now invested,⁸⁸ stammering myriads of terrible things worthy of their impious, fabulous invention. To confound them what was said by Paul to the Corinthians is sufficient: '*If the dead are not raised, nor has Christ been raised*' (1 Cor. 15: 16–17). And finally, when in this way they loitered vainly in their reasoning, he added: '*And indeed your faith is vain*' (1 Cor. 15: 17). Or is it, you people, that you have had no part in our sacred confession and the resurrection of the flesh in it?—for indeed the confession of the 'resurrection of the flesh'⁸⁹ is required of us as we approach saving baptism. This is why, as it appeared to one of the sages, the entire resplendent and conspicuous dispensation of the only-begotten was put into effect so splendidly, 'so that he might save the image (cf. Gen. 1: 27) and make the flesh immortal'.⁹⁰

3. But it is not only on this point that the deranged err and go astray from the straight road (such impiety would be tolerable in comparison with [their other] evils), but they also make myriads

⁸⁶ Like many other writers, Sophronius seems to be inspired by the Origenist anathemata of 553 in his condemnation of not only Origen but also of Didymus and Evagrius. On these see A. Guillaumont, *Les 'Képhalaia Gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les grecs et chez les syriens*, Patristica Sorbonensia, 5 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1962), 136–40; B. E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology* (Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 188–90. There are two sets of anathemata, those nine contained in Justinian's edict of 543 (ACO III, 189–214 at 213–14; amended edition by Amelotti and Zingale, *Scritti teologici*, 67–119 at 116–18, with summary in Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 400), and the fuller set of fifteen from the council of 553 (ACO IV, 1, 248–9; English trans. in Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 404–5). On the juxtaposition of Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius in Sophronius see the heresiology below and *Homily on the Annunciation*, PG 87 (3), 3240B–3241A. On the 'fabulous' pre-existence of souls in Origenist doctrine see Anathema 1, ACO IV, 248, 3–4; trans. Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 404.

⁸⁷ The charge that Origenist doctrine embodies pagan elements is commonly found in Greek writers after 553 and is no doubt inspired by Justinian's writings, e.g. the edict of 543; ACO III, 191, 15–18; Amelotti and Zingale, 72, 5–9. This charge against Origen was first made by Porphyry, according to Eusebius, HE VI.19.7.

⁸⁸ According to Anathema 10 of 553; ACO IV, 1, 249, 19–22; trans. Grillmeier, CCT 2/2, 405, Origenists believed in a spherical, ethereal, risen body. Cf. Daley, *The Hope*, 189–90.

⁸⁹ Cf. Symbol of Chalcedon, ACO II, 1, 2, 128, 1–12; trans. Tanner, i. *85.

⁹⁰ Gregory of Nazianzus, Or. 38. 13; SC 358, 134, 37.

ἀποστολικὴν καὶ πατρῶαν ἡμῶν παράδοσιν λέγουσι, παραδείσου φυτείαν ἐκβάλλοντες, ἐν σαρκὶ πεπλάσθαι τὸν Ἀδὰμ οὐ βουλόμενοι, τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τῆς Εὐᾶς διάπλασιν ψέγοντες, τὴν ἡχὴν ἀθετοῦντες τοῦ ὄψεως, τὰς τῶν οὐρανίων ταγμάτων ταξαρχίας (οὕτως μὲν ἀρχῆθεν ἐκ θεοῦ κεκτίσθαι) κωλύοντες, ἐκ καταδίκης δὲ προγενεστέρας καὶ παρατροπῆς αὐτὰς φανταζόμενοι, ὥς ἐν ἐνάδι τε νόων πάντα παρήχθαι τὰ λογικὰ ἀθέως ὁμοῦ καὶ μυθικῶς ὀνειρώττοντες, τῶν ὑπερουρανίων ὑδάτων τὴν κτίσιν κακίζοντες, τέλος εἶναι κολάσεως θέλοντες, καὶ πάντων μὲν τῶν αἰσθητῶν παντελῆ φθορὰν παρεισφέροντες, πάντων δὲ τῶν λογικῶν, ἀγγέλων, ἀνθρώπων, δαιμόνων ἀποκατάστασιν φάσκοντες, καὶ πάλιν εἰς ἐνάδα μυθικὴν τὰς τούτων διαφορὰς ἀναχέοντες, ὅτε καὶ μηδὲν ἡμῶν διαφέρειν τὸν Χριστόν, ὃν αὐτοὶ ληρωδῶς δογματίζουσιν, οὐχ ὃν ἡμεῖς εὐσεβῶς προσκηρύττομεν ὁδῶν ἢ τιμῇ ἢ βασιλείᾳ ἢ δεσποτείᾳ, δαιμονιωδῶς ἀναβράττουσι, καὶ μυρία ἄττα προφέροντες πρὸς τοῦ διαβολικοῦ καὶ δυσσεβοῦς τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν θησαυρίσματος, οὐ μὴ μόνον ἀνατροπῇ θολερᾷ, ἀλλὰ μυρίαις τὸν πλησίον ποτίζοντες καὶ ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων θανατοῦντες οἱ δαίμονες, ὑπὲρ ὧν Χριστὸς ἀποθανεῖν κατηξίωσε καὶ λύτρον αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα τὸ θεῖον ἐξέχεε καὶ δῶρον ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀξίαν [466] θειότατον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν κατεβάλετο.

of other statements contrary to the tradition of the apostles and our Fathers. They throw out the planting of paradise, they do not want Adam fashioned in the flesh, they object to the moulding of Eve from him, they reject the utterance of the snake,⁹¹ they forbid the ranks of heavenly armies as they were created to be in the beginning by God,⁹² imagining that they resulted from a primordial condemnation and deviation. They dream up, both godlessly and mythically, that all rational things were produced in a henad of minds,⁹³ and they abuse the creation of the waters above heaven,⁹⁴ and want an end to punishment,⁹⁵ and they introduce besides total corruptibility of all perceptible things,⁹⁶ while alleging the restoration of all rational creatures, angels, human beings, demons,⁹⁷ and again confounding their differences into one mythical unity, when Christ will be different from us in no respect, whom they preach in a foolish manner,⁹⁸ not the one whom we proclaim in pious belief 'in glory or honour or kingship or lordship'.⁹⁹ They seethe like demons and bring forth myriads of things from the diabolical and impious store of their heart, not with one foul perversion only but giving their neighbour myriads of draughts to drink (cf. Hab. 2: 15), and, wretches that they are, doing to death the souls of human beings for whom Christ deigned to die and poured out the ransom that was his divine blood and laid down his own life as a most divine gift exceeding all worth.

⁹¹ These aspects seem to be Sophronius' interpretation of Origenist doctrine. However, the mention of Adam and Eve was probably inspired by Justinian's *Edict Against Origen*; *ACO* III, 194, 18–33; Amelotti and Zingale, 78, 18–38.

⁹² Cf. Anathema 2 of 553; *ACO* IV, 1, 248, 5–13; trans. Grillmeier, *CCT* 2/2, 404.

⁹³ Cf. *ibid.*

⁹⁴ Nothing comparable to this charge is found in the anathemata, but Justinian in his *Edict Against Origen* denounces Origenist doctrine for its claim that the 'waters above heaven' are ensouled: Anathema 6, *ACO* III, 213, 27–8; Amelotti and Zingale, 116, 54–5.

⁹⁵ Cf. Justinian, Anathema 9; *ACO* III, 214, 4–5; Amelotti and Zingale, 118, 4–6.

⁹⁶ Cf. Anathema 11 of 553; *ACO* IV, 1, 249, 15–18; trans. Grillmeier, *CCT* 2/2, 405.

⁹⁷ This refers to the Origenist doctrine of restoration or *apokatastasis* at the end of time. See Anathema 9 of 543; *ACO* III, 214, 5–6; Amelotti and Zingale, 249, 15–18; and Anathema 1 of 553; *ACO* IV, 1, 248, 3–4; trans. Grillmeier, *CCT* 2/2, 404.

⁹⁸ Cf. Anathemata 10, 12, 13 and 14 in *ACO* IV, 1, 249; trans. Grillmeier, *CCT* 2/2, 405.

⁹⁹ This phrase is probably to be taken as part of a liturgical doxology which was familiar to both Sophronius and Sergius.

2.4.4. Ἡμεῖς δὲ πίστεως ὀρθῆς καὶ ἀμωμήτου καὶ σώφρονος τὸ λογικὸν ποτισθέντες γάλα καὶ ἄδολον καὶ καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα γευσάμενοι ἅπαντα τὰ ἐκείνων σκοτεινὰ διωσάμενοι δόγματα καὶ τούτων ὄντες ἀπάντων τῶν ἀθέσμων αὐτῶν φληνάφων ἐλεύθεροι καὶ τοῖς πατράσι ἡμῶν ἐπιβαίνοντες ἵχνεσι καὶ τοῦ παρόντος κόσμου συντέλειαν λέγομεν καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἐκείνην τὴν μέλλουσαν τὴν μετὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν διαιωνίζειν πιστεύομεν καὶ τὴν κόλασιν ἀτελεύτητον ἔχομεν, τὴν μὲν ἀλήκτως εὐφραίνουσαν τῶν ἀρίστων ἔργων τοὺς πράκτορας, τὴν δὲ ἀπαύστως ἀλγύνουσαν, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ κολάζουσαν τοὺς ἐνθάδε γεγονότας ἑραστὰς τῆς φαυλότητος καὶ μετανοεῖν οὐ θελήσαντας πρὸ τῆς ἐντεῦθεν ἐκδρομῆς καὶ ἐκβάσεως. ὁ γὰρ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτήσει, φησὶν Χριστὸς ὁ κριτής, ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ τὸ πῦρ αὐτῶν οὐ σβεσθήσεται. ταῦτα φρονεῖν καὶ πιστεύειν, σοφώτατοι, ἔκ τε ἀποστολικῆς καὶ εὐαγγελικῆς, ἔκ τε προφητικῆς καὶ νομικῆς, ἔκ τε πατρῴας καὶ διδασκαλικῆς παρεληφότες κηρύξεως καὶ δεδρακότες ὑμῖν τοῖς πανσόφοις κατάδηλα καὶ μηδὲν ὑμᾶς ἀποκρύψαντες.

2.5.1. Ἀκόλουθον λοιπὸν ἐστὶ καὶ ἀρμόδιον καὶ τῇ παλαιᾷ παραδόσει κατάλληλον τὰς ἱεράς συνόδους τῶν πατρικῶν ἡμῶν καὶ πανιέρων ἀθροίσεων δήλας ποιεῖν ἐπὶ γράμματος, ἃς ὡς φωταγωγοὺς ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς περιέπομεν καὶ δι' αἰῶνος ἔχειν εὐχόμεθα, ὅπως αὐταῖς καὶ τῆς μακαρίας ζωῆς κοινωνήσαιμεν ὡς παῖδες αὐτῶν εὐγενεῖς καὶ διάδοχοι. τέτταρας τοίνυν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνθέων τῆς ἐκκλησίας δογμάτων μεγάλας καὶ ἱεράς καὶ οἰκουμενικὰς συνόδους δεχόμεθα εὐαγγελικαῖς φαιδρυνομένας λαμπρότησι καὶ χαρακτήρων εὐαγγελικῶν ἀγλαΐζομένας ποσότητι. τούτων πρωτεύειν φαμέν τὸ ἐν Νικαίᾳ τῶν πριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ θεοφόρων πατέρων συνέδριον, ὅπερ ἐκ θείας ἀθροισθὲν ἐπινεύσεως τῆς Ἀρείου λύττης καθαιρεῖ τὰ μιάσματα. μετ' ἐκείνο δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ, οὐ [468] δόξῃ καὶ χάριτι, συναθροίζεται δεύτερον

4. But we, because we have been given to drink the *rational and guileless milk* (1 Pet. 2: 2) of right and blameless and well-disciplined faith, and have tasted the good word of God, thrust away all their shadowy teachings. Being free of all their lawless babblings and walking in the footsteps of our Fathers, we both speak of the consummation of the present world and believe that that life which is to come after the present life will last forever, and we hold to unending punishment; the former will gladden unceasingly those who have performed excellent deeds, but the latter will bring pain without respite, and also indeed punishment, on those who became lovers of what was vile in this life and refused to repent before the end of their course and departure hence. For '*their worm will not die*', says Christ the judge, who is *the truth* (John 8: 46), '*and their fire will not be extinguished*' (Mark 9: 48). These things are what we think and believe, most wise One, because we have received them from the proclamation which is from apostles and evangelists, from prophets and the Law, from Fathers and teachers, and we have made them manifest to You, all-wise One, and have hidden nothing from You.

2.5 COUNCILS¹⁰⁰

1. Finally, it is consistent and both harmonious with and appropriate to ancient tradition that we make clear in writing the sacred synods of our Fathers and all-sacred assemblies, which we treat as bringing light to our souls and pray that we shall uphold forever, so that with them we may have communion in the blessed life, being their well-born children and successors. Accordingly, in regard to the inspired teachings of the church we accept four great and sacred and ecumenical synods,¹⁰¹ shining with evangelical splendour and radiant with a multitude of distinctive evangelical marks. We maintain as the first of these synods the council in Nicaea, with its 318 God-bearing Fathers, which, assembled by divine inspiration, condemned the pollution of Arius' frenzy.¹⁰² After that one in time, but not in repute and grace,

¹⁰⁰ On synopses of councils in general see Munitiz, 'Synoptic Greek Accounts', 147–86.

¹⁰¹ On the significance of the number 'four' here see the conclusion to the analysis above.

¹⁰² The Council of Nicaea promulgated anathemata on Arian doctrine in 325. See Tanner, i. *5.

ἄθροισμα τὸ ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι συνειλεγμένον τῶν πόλεων· πεντήκοντα δὲ καὶ ἑκατὸν θεόσοφοι πατέρες ἐτύγχανον οἱ καὶ τοῦτο πληροῦν θεόθεν ἡγμένοι τὸ ἄθροισμα, ὃ τὴν τρικέραυνον Μακεδονίῳ, Ἀπολιναρίου τε καὶ Μάγνου σβεννύει δυσσέβειαν καὶ τῆς τοσαύτης χαλεπῆς πυρακτώσεως τῶν εὐσεβούντων τὰ συστήματα ῥύεται. τρίτον μετὰ τοῦτο μόνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ δοξάζω συνέδριον τὸ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸ πρότερον ἐκ θείας συνεδρεῦσαν βουλήσεως· τὸ γὰρ Διοσκόρου λεγόμενον δεύτερον τῆς Εὐτυχούς ἀδοκίμου γνώμης πεφώραται σύστοιχον· ὅπερ πρῶτον συνέδριον διακοσίων μὲν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐγνωρίζετο πλήρωμα, καταβάλλει δὲ τὸν ἀνθρωπολάτρην Νεστόριον καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν χριστομάχον ἀσέβειαν. καὶ τέταρτον μετὰ τὰ τρία τῷ χρόνῳ μόνῳ θεόσοφον ἀθροίζεται σύνταγμα τῶν ἑξακοσίων ὁμοῦ καὶ τριάκοντα παννυμνήτων πατέρων καὶ δαδούχων τῆς πίστεως, ὅπερ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι μὲν τὴν θείαν θεόθεν ποιεῖται συνέλευσιν καὶ συναθλοῦσαν εἶχεν Εὐφημίαν τὴν μάρτυρα τὴν καὶ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον προμαχοῦσαν αὐτῶν τοῦ ὅρου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν περιφήμου καὶ μεγίστης ἀθροίσεως λόγον πολὺν ποιουμένην καὶ ἄπαυστον, κατασφάττει δὲ τὴν ξυνωρίδα τὴν βέβηλον, Εὐτυχῇ φημι καὶ Διόσκορον, καὶ τὴν τούτων ἀποφράττει θεομάχον κακόνοιαν ἐκ τῆς Ἀπολιναριανῆς ὥσπερ πηγῆς καταρρέουσιν καὶ πληροῦσαν πάντας τῆς ἀσεβείας τοὺς ῥύακας, ἐκβάλλει δὲ μετὰ τῆς

assembled the second assembly, convened in the queen of cities.¹⁰³ One hundred and fifty Fathers, full of divine wisdom, were there, who, being led by God, made up the complement of this assembly too, which extinguished the impiety of Macedonius, Apollinaris, and Magnus with a triple thunderbolt¹⁰⁴ and delivered the body of the pious believers from so severe an inflammation.¹⁰⁵ After that I honour the third council, third only in time, the first council which by divine will sat together in Ephesus.¹⁰⁶ (The second one, said to be Dioscorus', was discovered to be congruent with the discredited opinion of Eutyches.¹⁰⁷) This first council was revealed as the complement of 200 holy Fathers, and rejected Nestorius, the worshipper of a human being, and all his impiety that fights against Christ.¹⁰⁸ And the fourth gathering, full of divine wisdom, after the three only in time, was assembled with 630 Fathers, worthy of all praise and torch-bearers of the faith. It held its godly convocation by God in Chalcedon and had the martyr Euphemia sharing its labours (the one who also up to the present fights on behalf of their definition of the faith and speaks unceasingly and mightily about their far-famed and very great assembly).¹⁰⁹ It dispatched that unhallowed pair, I mean Eutyches and Dioscorus, and blocked up their malevolence, hostile to God, which flowed as if from the spring of Apollinaris and filled all the torrents of impiety,¹¹⁰ and through its orthodox addresses it also cast out

¹⁰³ i.e. in Constantinople in 381. See sec. 2.5.4, below, for the same expression.

¹⁰⁴ Greek *τρικέραυνον*. The reading of one family of manuscripts, *τρικέρανον* or 'triple-headed', is perhaps preferable.

¹⁰⁵ These three names are found in Justinian, *On the Right Faith*, 90, 3–6; trans. Wesche, 181. While the followers of Macedonius and Apollinaris were anathematized at the council, there was no mention of Magnus in the conciliar pronouncement. See Tanner, i. *31. Cf. sec. 2.6.1, below.

¹⁰⁶ i.e. Ephesus I in 431, on which see Frend, *Monophysite Movement*, 19–21.

¹⁰⁷ i.e. Ephesus II, the 'Robber Council' of 449, where Dioscorus presided and Eutyches was rehabilitated. See Frend, *Monophysite Movement*, 36–43.

¹⁰⁸ Because of his supposed division of Christ into two separate natures, united in a moral association not in a hypostatic union, Nestorius is said here to worship a human being and to fight against Christ.

¹⁰⁹ The Council of Chalcedon deliberated in 451 in the basilica of the martyr Euphemia (see e.g. Evagrius, *HE* II.3), who thereafter became associated by Chalcedonians with the preservation of the council's doctrine. On the mystique surrounding the martyr in the fifth and sixth centuries see H. Grégoire, 'Sainte Euphémie et l'empereur Maurice', *Le Muséon*, 59 (1946), 295–302; A. M. Schneider, 'Sankt Euphemia und das Konzil von Chalkedon', in Grillmeier and Bacht, i. 291–302.

¹¹⁰ On the juxtaposition of Apollinaris, Eutyches, and Dioscorus see sec. 2.3.5, above.

τούτων ἀσεβεστάτης αἵρέσεως διὰ τῶν αὐτῆς ὀρθοδόξων προσρήσεων καὶ τὴν Νεστορίου τοῦ θεομάχου παμμίαρον αἵρεσιν· καὶ [470] κατὰ ταύτης γὰρ ὡς ἔτι τῇ ἀναιδεΐᾳ σπαιρούσης ἡθροίζετο, ὅθεν καὶ τελείως αὐτὴν ἀπενέκρωσε καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν αὐλῶν ἐξωστράκισεν. ἐπὶ ταύταις δὲ ταῖς μεγάλαις καὶ οὐκουμενικαῖς, πανσέπτοις τε καὶ πανιέροις τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων ὁμοτίμοις ἀθροίσεσι τετράσι καὶ πέμπτῃ ἁγίαν ἄλλην παρὰ ταύτας καὶ μετὰ ταύτας συστάσαν οἰκουμενικὴν δέχομαι σύνοδον τὴν ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι καὶ αὐτὴν γενομένην τῶν πόλεων Ἰουστινιανοῦ τότε τὰ σκῆπτρα τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς βασιλείας διέποντος, καὶ πάντα αὐτῆς τὰ λαμπρὰ διορίσματα, ἧτις κυροῦσα μὲν τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι περιώνυμον ἡθροίσται σύνοδον, ἀναιρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐκρίπτει πρὸς ὄλεθρον πρωτοτύπως μὲν Ὠριγένην τὸν ἄφρονα καὶ πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ ὄνειρώδη κομψεύματα καὶ πολυειδοῦς ἀσεβείας πλήρη συγγράμματα, Εὐαγρίου τε σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ Διδύμου τὰ δόγματα καὶ πάντα αὐτῶν τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ καὶ τερατώδη, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ μυθώδη ληρήματα· μεθ' οὓς τὸν Μομφουεστίας ἐκτίλλει Θεόδωρον, τὸν Νεστορίου τοῦ θεομάχου διδάσκαλον, καὶ ὡς μυσαρὸν σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῦ βλασφήμοις συντάγμασιν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκρίπτει ζιζάνιον, Θεοδωρίτου τε τὰ κακῶς κατὰ τοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας προμάχου Κυρίλλου καὶ δυσσεβῶς γεγονότα συγγράμματα καὶ ὅσα κατὰ τε τῶν δώδεκα τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεσπεσίου Κυρίλλου κεφαλαίων τῆς τε πρώτης ἁγίας ἐν Ἐφέσῳ συνόδου καὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς ἡμῶν κατηγόρησε

with their most impious heresy the wholly abominable heresy of Nestorius, hostile to God. Indeed it assembled for this purpose, to oppose this heresy, which was still gasping in its shamelessness, as it were, which is why the council destroyed it completely and banished it from the halls of the church.¹¹¹ In addition to these four great, ecumenical assemblies of the holy and blessed Fathers, which are all-hallowed and all-sacred and equal in honour, I accept another besides them, a fifth holy ecumenical Synod which came into existence after them and was also held in the queen of cities (Justinian was administering the sovereign¹¹² Roman empire at the time), and all its luminous definitions, whilst the council indeed was assembled to confirm the far-famed Synod of Chalcedon.¹¹³ It condemned and threw out to destruction in the first instance the senseless Origen and all his dreamy pomposities, and his writings full of many kinds of impiety, and together with him the teachings of Evagrius and Didymus and all their pagan and monstrous, not to say fabulous, nonsenses.¹¹⁴ After them the council plucked out Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius' teacher and hostile to God, and threw him, like a loathsome weed,¹¹⁵ with his blasphemous compositions out of the catholic church.¹¹⁶ And it condemned those writings of Theodoret, which in base and impious fashion were composed against Cyril, the champion of pious belief, and all the charges against the Twelve Chapters of the same inspired Cyril and against the first holy synod of Ephesus and our right faith that had been brought by Theodoret,

¹¹¹ Although it was not referred to by name, the supposed teaching of Nestorius was anathematized at Chalcedon, and Theodoret and Ibas were forced to anathematize Nestorius before the council rehabilitated them.

¹¹² Lit. 'administering the sceptre of . . . '.

¹¹³ On the second council of Constantinople (553) and its reception see sec. 1.1, above. As a strict Chalcedonian Sophronius makes explicit the goal of the council: it assembled to confirm the doctrine of Chalcedon.

¹¹⁴ That is, the person and works of Origen were condemned, and the teachings of Evagrius and Didymus. On the 'pagan' and 'fabulous' nature of Origenist doctrine see 2.4.2, above, and cf. Anastasius of Sinai, *Hodegos* V.68–77; ed. Uthemann, 92.

¹¹⁵ Weeds were a common analogy for heretics and heresy, the works of the devil (cf. Matt. 13: 25). See Brox, 'Häresie', 283.

¹¹⁶ As explained in sec. 1.1 above, in an attempt to defend Chalcedon from the charge of Nestorianism, both the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were condemned at the second Council of Constantinople in 553. See Tanner, i. *119–*120. Theodore was perceived by anti-Chalcedonians as being a precursor of Nestorius.

πίστεως Νεστορίῳ τῷ δυσσεβεῖ χαριζόμενος καὶ κεῖνα ταύτης ποιούσα τῆς κατακρίσεως μέτοχα, ἅπερ καὶ ὑπὲρ Διοδώρου καὶ Θεοδώρου ἀπολογούμενος γέγραφε. μεθ' ὧν καὶ τὴν Ἰβα λεγομένην ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς τὸν Πέρσην γεγράφθαι Μάριν ἀπερρίζωσεν, ὥς οὐ μόνον ὀρθῶν δογμάτων ἀντίπαλον, [472] ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ἀσεβείας ἀνάπλεων. ἐκείνας μὲν οὖν τὰς ἱερὰς καὶ μεγάλας καὶ οἰκουμενικὰς ἀγίας τέτταρας συνόδους ἀσπάζομαι καὶ φρονήματι ἐνὶ περιπτύσσομαι· ἐπὶ ταύταις δὲ καὶ ταύτην πέμπτην τιμῶ καὶ γεραίρω καὶ σέβομαι καὶ πάντα αὐτῶν ἀσμένως προσίεμαι, τά τε ἐν δόγμασι καὶ διαφόροις διδάγμασι καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τῶν αἵρετιζόντων ἀναθεματισμοῖς καὶ ὀρίσμασιν. ὅθεν καὶ ἀσμενίζω καὶ δέχομαι οὓς ἐδέξαντο καὶ ἡσμένισαν, καὶ ἀναθεματίζω καὶ ἀποβάλλομαι ὅσους ἀναθέματι καθυπέβαλον καὶ ἀποβλήτους τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀγίας ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας ἡγήσαντο.

2.5.2. Ταύταις ταῖς ἀγίαις καὶ μακαρίαις πέντε συνόδοις ἐπόμενος ἓνα καὶ μόνον ὅρον ἐπίσταμαι πίστεως καὶ μάθημα ἐν οἷδα καὶ σύμβολον, ὅπερ ἡ πάνσοφος καὶ μακαρία τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ θεοφόρων πατέρων θεσπεσία πληθὺς ἐξ ἀγίου προσεφθέγγετο πνεύματος, ὃ καὶ ἡ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα θεοπνεύστων πατέρων ἐπεκύρωσεν ἄθροισις, καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρώτη τῶν διακοσίων ἐνθέων πατέρων ἐβεβαίωσε σύνοδος, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι ἑξακοσίων τριάκοντα πανιέρων πατέρων προσεδέξατο καὶ ἐκράτυνε σύμβασις καὶ ἀπαράτρωτον καὶ ἀρραγὲς καὶ ἀσάλευτον διαπρυσίως ἔφη φυλάττεσθαι.

2.5.3. Δεχόμεθα δὲ καὶ ἀγκάλαις ταῖς αὐταῖς ἀσμενίζομεν καὶ πάντα τοῦ θεσπεσίου Κυρίλλου τὰ θεῖα τε καὶ θεόσοφα συγγράμματα, ὥς πάσης ὀρθότητος γέμοντα καὶ πᾶσαν αἵρετικῶν καθαιρούντα δυσσέβειαν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τὰς πρὸς Νεστόριον τὸν θεοστυγῇ

who supported the impious Nestorius.¹¹⁷ And what Theodoret had written in defence of Diodore and Theodore the council also included in this condemnation.¹¹⁸ With these it pulled out by the roots too the so-called Letter of Ibas written to Mari the Persian, on the grounds that it was not only in opposition to right teachings, but was also full of every impiety.¹¹⁹ So I cleave to these four sacred and great and ecumenical synods and embrace them with a single mind. In addition to these I honour and venerate and revere this fifth one too,¹²⁰ and gladly admit all of their proceedings, both with respect to teachings and different doctrines and with respect to anathemata and definitions against heretics. For this reason I receive gladly and I accept those whom they accepted and received gladly, and I anathematize and I reject whomever they subjected to anathema and considered rejected from our catholic and holy church.

2. In following these five holy and blessed synods I understand one, sole definition of faith and I know one teaching and symbol, about which the all-wise and blessed and inspired throng of the 318 God-bearing Fathers in Nicaea made public utterance through the Holy Spirit, which the assembly of the 150 divinely inspired Fathers in Constantinople also ratified, and the first synod of the 200 godly Fathers in Ephesus confirmed, and the fellowship of the 630 all-sacred Fathers in Chalcedon welcomed and corroborated and asserted clearly that it would preserve unimpaired and unbroken and unshaken.¹²¹

3. We also accept and receive cordially with the same embrace all the godly writings, full of divine wisdom, of the inspired Cyril, in that they are full of all correctness and destroy every impiety of

¹¹⁷ On the anathema on the works of Theodoret see Tanner, i. *121. Since one of the aims of the council of 553 was to emphasize the Cyrillian christological tradition, the works condemned were those which Theodoret had written against Cyril.

¹¹⁸ The works of Theodoret in defence of Theodore were explicitly condemned in 553 (trans. in Tanner, i. *121); but his works in defence of Diodore were not mentioned by name on that occasion.

¹¹⁹ See Tanner, i. *121–*122 on the anathematization of this letter. The so-called Letter of Ibas to Mari was critical of the actions of Cyril throughout the controversy. See Frend, *Monophysite Movement*, 280. English trans. of the Letter to Mari in Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, ii. 295–8.

¹²⁰ On the reception of Constantinople II see sec. 1.3.8, above.

¹²¹ The fact that there is no mention of the doctrinal significance of Constantinople II is to be noted. See above.

καὶ θεήλατον δύο συνοδικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τὴν τε δευτέραν καὶ τὴν τρίτην, ἣ καὶ τὰ δυοκαίδεκα συνήπται κεφάλαια, ἅπερ ἅπασαν τὴν Νεστορίου κακόνοιαν ἀποστόλων ἀγίων ἰσαρίθμοις κατέφλεξεν ἄνθραξι. σὺν ταύταις δὲ δέχομαι καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς τῆς ἐώας ἀγιωτάτους προέδρους συνοδικὴν γραφείσαν ἐπιστολήν, ἐν ἣ καὶ ἱερὰς αὐτῶν τὰς φωνὰς ἀπεκάλεσε [474] καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰρήνην ἐκράτυνεν, αἷς συναρίθμια καὶ ἀ<διάλ>υτα τῶν ἀνατολικῶν προέδρων τὰ γράμματα λέγομεν, ὡς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Κυρίλλου τοῦ θείου δεχθέντα καὶ εἶναι πρὸς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρούμενα φωναῖς ἀναμφιλέκτοις ὀρθόδοξα.

2.5.4. Τούτοις ὁμοίως τοῖς ἱεροῖς Κυρίλλου τοῦ πανσόφου χαράγμασιν ὡς ἱερὰν καὶ ὁμότιμον δέχομαι καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὀρθοδοξίας γεννήτριαν καὶ τὴν θεόσδοτον ἐπιστολήν καὶ θεόπνευστον τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ λαμπροῦ καὶ θεόφρονος Λέοντος τοῦ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς ὑπ' ἡλίῳ πάσης φωστῆρος, ἣν

the heretics, especially the two synodical letters against Nestorius, hateful to God and pursued by God, both the second and third,¹²² to which were also attached the Twelve Chapters,¹²³ which burnt up the entire perversity of Nestorius with the coals of the holy apostles¹²⁴ of equal number. Together with these I accept also the synodical letter written to the most holy leaders of the East, in which he called their utterances sacred and confirmed peace with them.¹²⁵ Counted in with these we assert that the letters of the eastern Fathers¹²⁶ are indissoluble because they were accepted by the godly Cyril himself, and were attested by him in indisputable terms as orthodox.¹²⁷

4. Together¹²⁸ with those sacred writings of the all-wise Cyril, I likewise accept as being sacred and of equal honour, and the mother of the same orthodoxy, also the God-given and divinely inspired letter of the great and illustrious Leo of godly mind,¹²⁹ of the most holy church of the Romans, or rather of the luminary of all under the sun, which he wrote, clearly moved by the divine Spirit, to Flavian, the famous leader of the queen of cities,¹³⁰ against the perverse Eutyches and Nestorius, hateful to God and

¹²² By the 'synodical letters of Cyril' the Chalcedonian definition had meant his Second Letter to Nestorius and his Letter to John of Antioch; it was only under Justinian that Chalcedon's phrase was reinterpreted to refer to the Second *and Third* Letters to Nestorius.

¹²³ i.e. *CPG* 5302, 5303, and 5304. On the significance of these writings in the christological debate around Nestorius see Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. xxi–xxiii and xxxv–xliii.

¹²⁴ In other words, because Cyril's writings were based on apostolic teaching they destroyed Nestorius' doctrine. For other typologies of the apostles see *PGL* s.v. ἀπόστολος E5; J.

¹²⁵ This is (Letter 39) *To John* (*CPG* 5339), which contains the Formula of Reunion. As McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, 114, n. 196, remarks, this letter was 'canonised at Chalcedon as an authoritative expression of orthodox teaching'.

¹²⁶ This refers to the letter to Cyril from John of Antioch containing the Formula of Reunion (*ACO* I, 1, 4, pp. 7–9), accepted by Cyril in his Synodical Letter to John of Antioch. It is the same document as the 'epistle of the eastern leaders' in sec. 2.5, below.

¹²⁷ On the superficial reconciliation of Cyril with the Antiochene party after the council of 431 see McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, 114–16.

¹²⁸ Most of the remainder of this section is discussed by von Schönborn, 'La Primauté romaine', 480–1. See sec. 1.2 above on Sophronius' relationship with Rome.

¹²⁹ This is the contentious *Letter or Tome to Flavian*, regarded by anti-Chalcedonians as Nestorian, or at least as being open to a Nestorianizing interpretation.

¹³⁰ On the use of this expression to designate Constantinople see sec. 2.5.1 (*bis*), above.

θείῳ σαφῶς ἐνεργούμενος πνεύματι κατ' Εὐτυχούς τοῦ κακόφρονος καὶ Νεστορίου τοῦ θεοστυγούς καὶ παράφρονος πρὸς Φλαβιανὸν τὸν αἰοίδιμον τῆς βασιλίδος τῶν πόλεων πρόεδρον γέγραφεν, ἣν καὶ 'στήλην ὀρθοδοξίας' καλῶ καὶ ὀρίζομαι τοῖς οὕτως αὐτὴν καλῶς ὀρισμένοις πατράσιν ἁγίοις ἐπόμενος, ὥς πᾶσαν μὲν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἡμᾶς ἐκδιδάσκουσιν, πᾶσαν δὲ κακοδοξίαν αἵρετικὴν ὀλοθρεύουσιν καὶ τῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἡμῶν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας θεοφρουρήτων αὐλῶν ἀπελαύνουσιν, μεθ' ἧς ἐνθέου συλλαβῆς καὶ χαράγματος καὶ πάσας αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐπιστολάς καὶ τὰ δόγματα ὥς ἐκ στόματος προῖόντα Πέτρου τοῦ κορυφαίου προσίεμαι καὶ καταφιλῶ καὶ ἀσπάζομαι καὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ περιπτύσσομαι.

2.5.5. Ταῦτα, καθὼς προεῖπον, δεχόμενος τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ θεῖα πέντε τῶν μακαρίων πατέρων συνέδρια καὶ τὰ Κυρίλλου πάντα τοῦ πανσόφου συγγράμματα καὶ μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ τῆς Νεστορίου μανίας γενόμενα καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνατολικῶν προέδρων συλλαβὴν τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν γραφεῖσαν τὸν θειότατον Κύριλλον καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ μαρτυρηθεῖσαν ὀρθόδοξον. ὅσα τε Λέων ὁ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας νομεὺς ἀγιώτατος γέγραφε καὶ μάλιστα ᾧ κατὰ τῆς Εὐτυχιανῆς καὶ Νεστοριανῆς βδελυρίας συνέταξε, ταῦτα μὲν ὥς Πέτρου, ἐκεῖνα δὲ ὥς Μάρκου γινώσκω ὀρίσματα, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντα πάντων τῶν τῆς καθολικῆς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐκκρίτων μυσταγωγῶν θεόσοφα [476] διδάγματα, εἴτε ἐν λόγοις τε καὶ συγγράμμασιν εἴτε ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς τισι περιείληπται, καὶ συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν, ᾧπαντα δέχομαι καὶ ἀσπάζομαι, ὅσαπερ ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησία προσίεται καὶ πάντα τοῦμπαλιν ἀποστρέφομαι καὶ ἀναθεματίζω καὶ λογίζομαι βέβηλα, ὅσα καὶ ἡ αὕτῃ πανσόφως βδελύττεται καὶ τῆς οἰκείας εὐσεβείας ἡγείται πολέμια, οὐ μόνον βιβλίδια καὶ λογύδρια καὶ θεομάχα καὶ παρέγγραπτα δόγματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἵρετικὰ καὶ κακόδοξα καὶ κακοδόξων αἵρέσεων ἡγῆσ-

deranged. Indeed I call and define this [letter] as 'the pillar of orthodoxy',¹³¹ following those holy Fathers who well defined it this way, as thoroughly teaching us every right belief, while destroying every heretical wrong belief, and driving it out of the halls of our holy catholic church, guarded by God. With this divinely conceived epistle and writing I also attach myself to all his letters and teachings as if they issued from the mouth of the chief Peter,¹³² and I kiss and cleave to them and embrace them with all my soul.

5. As I have said previously, I accept these five sacred and divine councils of the blessed Fathers and all the writings of the all-wise Cyril, and especially those composed against the madness of Nestorius, and the epistle of the eastern leaders which was written to the most godly Cyril himself and which he attested as orthodox. And [I accept] what Leo, the most holy shepherd of the most holy church of the Romans, wrote, and especially what he composed against the abomination of Eutyches and Nestorius.¹³³ I recognize the latter as the definitions of Peter, the former those of Mark.¹³⁴ Furthermore, [I accept] all the teachings, full of divine wisdom, of all the select spiritual teachers of our catholic church, whether they are contained in discourses and writings or in certain letters, and, to speak in sum, I accept and cleave to everything that our holy catholic church approves. Conversely, I reject and anathematize and account as detestable whatever the church in her consummate wisdom detests and considers at war with her own pious belief, not only booklets and pamphlets and teachings that are hostile to God and interpolated,¹³⁵ but also those heretical and unorthodox persons who are leaders of unorthodox heresies. And for your

¹³¹ The *Tome* of Leo was described as a pillar in the Definition of Chalcedon (Tanner, i. 1, 85, 42). The third Council of Constantinople (680/1) claimed that the Italian synod of 680, held at Rome under Pope Agatho, also used the expression 'pillar of orthodoxy' of the *Tome* (Tanner, i. 1, 127, 10–11). In the extant proceedings of this synod, however (ed. Mansi XI, 185A–186D), this expression does not occur.

¹³² On the reasons behind the importance assigned here to the see of Rome by Sophronius cf. sec. 1.2, above.

¹³³ Namely the *Letter* or *Tome* to *Flavian*.

¹³⁴ For a parallel to Sophronius' juxtaposition here of the see of Alexandria, traditionally associated with Mark the evangelist, and that of Rome with its Petrine associations, see *Homily on the Birth of Christ*, 170, 21–9.

¹³⁵ With these derisory remarks the patriarch probably has in mind anti-Chalcedonian and monoenergist teachings, perhaps especially the Pact of Union of 633.

άμενα πρόσωπα. καὶ πρὸς πληροφορίαν ὑμῶν ἀπαράλειπτον αὐτὰ διαρθροῦμαι τὰ πρόσωπα, ἅπερ ἀναθεματίζω καὶ ποιοῦμαι κατάκριτα οὐ γλώττῃ μόνον καὶ στόματι, ἀλλὰ καὶ καρδίᾳ καὶ πνεύματι, ὡς τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἡμῶν πίστεως ὀφθέντα διὰ πάντων ἐπίβουλα.

2.6.1. Ἀνάθεμα τοίνυν εἰς αἰὲ καὶ κατάθεμα ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου καὶ προσκυνητῆς τριάδος, πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἔστωσαν· πρῶτον μὲν Σίμων ὁ μάγος, ὁ πασῶν πρῶτος κακίστων κακίστως ἄρξας αἱρέσεων, μεθ' ὃν Κλεόβιος, Μένανδρος, Φίλητος, Ἑρμογένης, Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεύς, Δοσίθεος, Γόρθεος, Σατορνῖνος, Μασβόθεος, Ἀδριανός, Βασιλίδης, Ἰσίδωρος ὁ τούτου υἱὸς καὶ τὴν μανίαν ὑπέρτερος, Ἐβίων, Καρποκράτης, Ἐπιφανής, Πρόδικος, Κήρινθος τε καὶ Μήρινθος, Οὐαλεντῖνος, Φλωρίνος, Βλάστος, Ἀρτέμων, Σεκοῦνδος, Κασσιανός, Θεόδοτος, Ἡρακλέων, Πτολεμαῖος, Μάρκος, Κολόρβασος, Ἀδέμις ὁ Καρύστιος, Θεόδοτος ὁ Σκυτεὺς, Θεόδοτος ἕτερος, Εὐφράτης ὁ Περαιτικός, Μονόϊμος

complete satisfaction, I shall make an inventory of the persons whom I anathematize, and make my condemnation not only by tongue and mouth but also in heart and spirit, since these have been seen to be utterly treacherous to our holy and catholic faith.

2.6. HERESIOLOGIES¹³⁶

1. Accordingly, by the holy and consubstantial and worshipful Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, let there be anathema and condemnation forever: first upon Simon Magus, who first made a most evil beginning to all evil heresies,¹³⁷ after him Cleobius, Menander, Philetus, Hermogenes, Alexander the Coppersmith,¹³⁸ Dositheus, Gortheos,¹³⁹ Satorninus, Masbotheus, Hadrian,¹⁴⁰ Basilides, Isidore his son and superior in madness,¹⁴¹ Ebion, Carpocrates, Epiphanes, Prodicus, Cerinthus and Merinthus, Valentinus, Florinus, Blastus,¹⁴² Artemon, Secundus, Cassian,¹⁴³ Theodotus, Heracleon, Ptolemy, Mark, Colorbasus, Ademis the Carystian, Theodotus the Tanner, another Theodotus,¹⁴⁴

¹³⁶ For notes on individual heretics and heretical groups in what follows the reader is referred to *EEC*, to Marjanen and Luomanen (eds.), *Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics'*, or to another appropriate reference work. The focus of the treatment of this section of the *Synodical Letter* will be on Sophronius' sources for his heresiologies and how he used them, rather than on the individual 'heretics' or groups of 'heretics' themselves, except where they are contemporaries or near-contemporaries of Sophronius.

¹³⁷ On Simon Magus as the father or originator of heresies see Brox, 'Häresie', 284; the definitive work on Simon is now A. Ferreira, *Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval and Early Modern Traditions*, Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, 125 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

¹³⁸ The names of Philetus, Hermogenes (or Hymenaeus in some versions of the New Testament), and Alexander the Coppersmith (cf. 2 Tim. 2: 16–18; 1 Tim. 1: 20, and 2 Tim. 3: 14 respectively) are derived from Theodoret, *Compendium of Heretical Fables* (CPG 6223), II, Preface; PG 83, 384C–388A.

¹³⁹ The Gortheans are classed by Epiphanius as Samaritans, but by Theodoret as descendants of Simon Magus, who came from Samaria.

¹⁴⁰ The name Hadrianistai is found in Theodoret I.1; PG 83, 345B, and Hadrian occurs in Theodoret II, Preface; PG 83, 388A, but the bishop of Cyrrhus seems to have misread Eusebius, *HE* IV.22.

¹⁴¹ Isidore is mentioned by Theodoret as the son of Basilides (I.4; PG 83, 348C–349C).

¹⁴² Florinus was a disciple of Valentinus. Blastus is mentioned together with him by Theodoret, I.23; PG 83, 372CD.

¹⁴³ Cassian may also have been influenced by Valentinus: Theodoret in any case includes him with Valentinus' school.

¹⁴⁴ A Theodotus with no further epithet is named by both Theodoret II.5; PG 83, 392C, and Timothy of Constantinople, PG 86, 29D, as a disciple of Theodotus the Tanner.

ὁ Ἀραψ, Ἑρμογένης, Τατιανὸς ὁ Σύρος, [478] Σευήρος, Ἀσκληπιόδοτος, Βαρδησάνης, Ἀρμόνιος ὁ τούτου υἱὸς καὶ τὴν πλάνην ἰσόρροπος, Ἑρμόφιλος, Κέρδων, Σακέρδων, Μαρκίων ὁ Ποντικός, Ἀπελλής, Ἀπολλωνίδης, Πότιτος, Πρέπων, Πίθων, Συνερός, Θεόδοτος ὁ Τραπεζίτης, Μοντανός, Πρισκίλλά τε καὶ Μαξιμίλλα αἱ τούτου μανιώδεις μαθήτραι, Νέπως, Ἐλκεσαῖος, Ὠριγένης, Ὠριγένης ἕτερος ὁ καὶ Ἀδαμάντιος, Σαβέλλιος ὁ Λίβυς, Ναυάτος, Παῦλος ὁ ἐκ Σαμοσάτων, Ἐπίγενος, Κλεομένης, Νόητος ὁ Σμυρναῖος, Μάνης ὁ τῆς ἀθέου μανίας ἐπώνυμος, Σαββάτιος, Ἄρειος, Μελέτιος, Αἰτίος, Εὐνόμιος, Ἀστέριος, Εὐδόξιος, Δονάτος, Μακεδόνιος ὁ τῷ ἁγίῳ μαχησάμενος πνεύματι καὶ πνευματομάχου προσηγορίαν ἀξίαν δεξάμενος, Ἀπολινάριος ὁ Λαοδικεὺς καὶ ὁ τούτου υἱὸς Ἀπολινάριος, Μάγνος, Πολέμων, Πελάγιος, Κελέστιος, Ἰουλιανός, οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς μανίας ὑπέρμαχοι, Θεόδωρος ὁ Μομφουεστίας καὶ Νεστόριος, οἱ τῆς μιαρᾶς ἀνθρωπολατρείας μιαρώτατοι κήρυκες, Κῦρος τε καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ Κίλικες, οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀθεΐας ἀθεώτατοι πρόβολοι, Εὐτυχής, Διόσκορος ὁ Εὐτυχοῦς ὑπερασπιστὴς καὶ συνήγορος, Βαρσουμᾶς, Ζωορᾶς, Τιμόθεος

Euphrates the Peratic, Monoimus the Arab, Hermogenes, Tatian the Syrian, Severus, Asclepiodotus,¹⁴⁵ Bardesanes, Harmonius his son and well-matched in error,¹⁴⁶ Hermophilus, Cerdo, Sacerdo,¹⁴⁷ Marcion of Pontus, Apelles, Apollonides,¹⁴⁸ Potitus, Prepon, Pithon, Synerus,¹⁴⁹ Theodotus the Money-changer; Montanus, and Priscilla and Maximilla, his mad pupils; Nepos, Elkesai, Origen, another Origen also [called] Adamantius,¹⁵⁰ Sabellius the Libyan,¹⁵¹ Navatus, Paul of Samosata, Epigonus,¹⁵² Cleomenes, Noetus of Smyrna, Manes who gave his name to the godless madness,¹⁵³ Sabbatius, Arius, Meletius, Aetius, Eunomius, Asterius, Eudoxius, Donatus, Macedonius who fought against the Holy Spirit and received the just epithet 'Spirit-fighter'; Apollinaris of Laodicea and his son Apollinaris,¹⁵⁴ Magnus,¹⁵⁵ Polemo, Pelagius, Celestius, Julian, the defenders of the same madness; Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, the most polluted heralds of the polluted worship of a human being, both Cyrus¹⁵⁶ and John the Cilicians, the most godless guardians of the

¹⁴⁵ In Timothy of Constantinople, *PG* 86, 29D, he is also called Asclepiodotus.

¹⁴⁶ In the Greek there is a pun between 'Harmonius' and 'well-matched in error'.

¹⁴⁷ The name of Sacerdo is unknown to us from elsewhere, and is probably the result of textual corruption. See sec. 1.5.4, above, on the heresiologies.

¹⁴⁸ Apollonides is mentioned by Theodoret II.5; *PG* 83, 392C, as a disciple of Theodotus the Tanner, on whom see above.

¹⁴⁹ Potitus, Prepon, Pithon, and Synerus are mentioned simply by Theodoret I.25; *PG* 83, 376D–377A, as Marcionists, whose doctrines were refuted by Justin Martyr and other apologists.

¹⁵⁰ The main character in a fourth-century anti-Gnostic writing, Adamantius took issue with heretics, and is named in the compendium to Theodoret as one of his sources (*PG* 83, 340A). Adamantius came to be erroneously identified with Origen, whose surname was Adamantius.

¹⁵¹ On Sabellius see n. 16, above.

¹⁵² Called by Sophronius 'Epigenos'.

¹⁵³ In the Greek there is a pun on the words Manes and madness (Greek *mania*).

¹⁵⁴ It was, in fact, Apollinaris the younger (c.315–90) who by his writings propounded a christology in which there was no human spirit or mind in Christ, but the divine Logos instead.

¹⁵⁵ On Magnus see sec. 2.5.1, above.

¹⁵⁶ Cyrus, bishop of Tyre, an influential member of the group around John of Antioch, was deposed, like John, by Cyril of Alexandria at Ephesus in 431. In Article VIII of the *Announcement* of Cyrus of Alexandria (document 3 in the monoenergist dossier, Part 3 below), Cyrus of Tyre and John of Aigiai are anathematized, as well as 'anyone else who in some way or other contradicted the twelve chapters of the most holy Cyril'. Murphy and Sherwood, *Konstantinopel II und III*, 184, mistakenly identify these two men with those who appear in Sophronius' work *In Praise of Saints Cyrus and John* (*CPG* 7645). Both Cyrus and John of Antioch are said to be godless in that they are portrayed as followers of Nestorius, and therefore deny godliness in Christ.

ὁ λεγόμενος Αἴλουρος, Πέτρος ὁ Μογγὸς καὶ Ἀκάκιος οἱ τὸ Κεν-
 ωτικὸν [480] τεκτηνόμενοι Ζήνωνος, Λαμπέτιος ὁ τῆς δυσωνύμου
 τῶν Μαρκανιστῶν αἵρέσεως ἑξαρχος, Δίδυμος καὶ Εὐάγριος οἱ τῆς
 Ὠριγενιανῆς τερθρείας μυστηριάρχαι παμμίαροι, Πέτρος ὁ
 κναφεύς, ὁ τῷ τρισαγίῳ ὕμνῳ προσαρμόσαι σταυρὸν θρασυνόμενος,
 Πέτρος ἕτερος τὸ Ἰβηρικὸν καὶ φρενοβάρβαρον μίasma, Ἡσαίας ὁ
 τοῦ παρόντος Πέτρου συνόμιλος, οἱ ἄλλην ἀκέφαλον ἐν Ἀκεφάλοις
 καταδείξαντες αἵρεσιν· μεθ' ὧν ἀπάντων καὶ πρὸ πάντων καὶ μετὰ
 πάντας καὶ κατὰ πάντας καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας ἔστω καὶ Σευήρος
 ἀνάθεμα, ὁ τούτων μαθητῆς ἐκμανέστατος καὶ πάντων χρηματίσας
 Ἀκεφάλων τῶν νέων καὶ παλαιῶν ὠμότατος τύραννος καὶ τῆς
 ἀγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐχθρὸς δυσμενέστατος καὶ τῆς Ἀντι-
 οχείων ἀγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας μοιχὸς ἀνομώτατος καὶ φθορεὺς
 βδελυρώτατος, Θεοδόσιός τε ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, ὁ Τραπεζούντιος
 Ἀνθιμος, Ἰάκωβος ὁ Σύρος, Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ Ἀλικαρνασεύς, Φιλικήσι-
 μος, Γαϊανὸς ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, ἀφ' ὧν ἡ τῶν Γαϊανιτῶν ἡγουν
 Ἰουλιανιστῶν ἐπιγέγονεν αἵρεσις, Δωρόθεος ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀθέως
 ὑπερμαχήσας αἵρέσεως, Παῦλος ὁ μελανός, οὐ μόνον δὲ λεγόμενος

same godlessness; Eutyches, Dioscorus, the protector and advocate of Eutyches; Barsumas, Zooras, Timothy called the Cat, Peter the Stammerer, and Acacius who crafted the *Kenoticon* of Zeno;¹⁵⁷ Lampetius, the chief of the hateful heresy of the Marcianists;¹⁵⁸ Didymus and Evagrius, the all-polluted chief initiates of Origen's sophistry; Peter the Fuller, who dared to attach the cross to the Trisagion hymn; another Peter, the defilement from Iberia of barbarian mind,¹⁵⁹ who introduced another headless heresy among the Headless Ones, and Isaiah the associate of this Peter.¹⁶⁰ With all these, and before all and after all and according to all and on behalf of all, let Severus be anathema, their thoroughly mad disciple, who of all the Headless Ones, new and old, is called a most cruel tyrant and a most hostile enemy of the holy catholic church, and a most lawless adulterer of the most holy church of Antioch, and a most disgusting seducer;¹⁶¹ and Theodosius of Alexandria, Anthimus of Trebizond,¹⁶² Jacob the Syrian; Julian of Halicarnassus, Felicissimus and Gaianas of Alexandria, from whom the heresy of the Gaianites or Julianists was bred;¹⁶³ Dorotheus, who in godless fashion championed the same heresy; Paul the Black, who was not only called black but in

¹⁵⁷ Sophronius puns on the title *Henoticon*, Zeno's document of unity, by calling it *Kenoticon*, an empty document or a purgative.

¹⁵⁸ Lampetius was in fact one of the principal representatives of the sect of the Euchites or Messalians (on whom see below). His mistaken inclusion here in a list of anti-Chalcedonians may have been caused by the fact that he is mentioned in a letter of Severus, patriarch of Antioch from 512 to 518. The notice concerning Lampetius here is confused and anachronistic, since the Marcianists here were a group of Messalians named after the sixth-century leader Marcian.

¹⁵⁹ A first-generation anti-Chalcedonian (d. 491), Peter was for a short time bishop of Gaza. On account of his Georgian ancestry he is called a barbarian.

¹⁶⁰ Isaiah of Scete was the teacher of the first-generation anti-Chalcedonian, Peter the Iberian, and a writer of ascetic works. His followers are included in Sophronius' second heresiology, but scarcely merit the opprobrium which they receive here.

¹⁶¹ The significance of Severus of Antioch for Chalcedonians like Sophronius can be seen from the fact that he is considered the leader of the anti-Chalcedonians (the Headless Ones), as well as from the invective heaped on him here.

¹⁶² Originally bishop of Trebizond, Anthimus became patriarch of Constantinople in the 520s, but was deposed because he communicated with Severus of Antioch.

¹⁶³ An apthartodocetist, Gaianas was elected by his party to be patriarch of Alexandria in opposition to Theodosius. The Gaianites continued to exist in Alexandria, and their seventh-century leader Menas is condemned by Sophronius in the *Synodical Letter* at the end of the heresiology.

ἀλλὰ καὶ γεγονὼς κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, Ἰωάννης ὁ γραμματικός, ὁ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν Φιλόπονος, μᾶλλον δὲ ματαιόπονος, Κόνων τε καὶ Εὐγένιος, οἱ τρεῖς τῆς τριθεΐας τρισκατάρατοι πρόμαχοι, Θεμίστιος ὁ τῆς ἀγνοίας πατὴρ καὶ γεννήτωρ καὶ σπορεὺς ἀθεσμότατος, ὃς ἀγνοεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐφληνάφει τῆς κρίσεως, ἀγνοῶν ἅπερ αὐτὸς ὁ θεήλατος ἔφασκε καὶ μὴ εἰδὼς ἅπερ ἀμφιγνοῶν ἀνεφθέγγετο. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἡγνόει τῶν οἰκείων λόγων τὴν δύναμιν, οὐκ ἂν τὴν ὀλέθριον ἀγνοίαν [482] τέτοκε καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἄγους θερμῶς ὑπερήσπιζεν, ἀγνοεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, οὐ καθὸ θεὸς ὑπῆρχεν αἰῶδιος, ἀλλὰ καθὸ γέγονε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος, τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς συντελείας καὶ κρίσεως ἐξ ἀφρόνων φρενῶν ἐρευγόμενος καὶ ψιλὸν αὐτὸν ἐργαζόμενος ἄνθρωπον καὶ ταῦτα τερατεῖαν ἐπιφημίζων ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἀκέφαλον, καὶ φύσιν μίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ φανταζόμενος σύνθετον, ἔστω δὲ σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ Πέτρος ὁ Σύρος ἀνάθεμα καὶ Σέργιος ὁ Ἀρμένιος, οἱ τῆς μικρᾶς τριθεΐας ἡγούμενοι, καὶ μηδὲ οὕτω πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συμφωνήσαντες μηδὲ τὰ αὐτὰ παραπλησίως ἀλλήλοις δοξάσαντες, Δαμιανὸς ὁ τούτων μὲν ὑπερβαλλόντως ἀντίπαλος, νέος δὲ φανεὶς ἐν

truth became so;¹⁶¹ John the Grammarian, whose epithet is Philoponus, or rather Mataioponus,¹⁶⁵ and Conon and Eugenius, the three thrice-accursed defenders of tritheism;¹⁶⁶ Themistius, the father and the begetter and most lawless sower of ignorance, who babbled that Christ, our true God, did not know the day of judgement, statements which he himself, driven mad by God, made in ignorance, not knowing what he uttered in his mistaken thinking. For if he did not know the force of his own words, he would not have given birth to the destructive ignorance and hotly defended the pollution of ignorance, belching forth from his senseless brain the statement that, not in so far as he was God eternal but in so far as he had in truth become a human being, was Christ ignorant of the day of consummation and judgement, and making him a mere human being. And he called this headless monster after himself, and conjured up one composite nature of the same Christ our Saviour.¹⁶⁷ Let there be anathema with him both Peter the Syrian¹⁶⁸ and Sergius the Armenian,¹⁶⁹ the leaders of minor tritheism, although they neither agreed so much with each other nor had the same ideas equally as each other (Damian opposed them exceedingly, but in our times was shown to be a

¹⁶¹ A controversial anti-Chalcedonian, as we have seen in sec. 1.1 above, Paul the Black spent more time out of his patriarchate of Antioch than in it, being anathematized by others in his party for communicating with Chalcedonians, among other things. This may explain Sophronius' accusatory pun on Paul's blackness.

¹⁶⁵ That is, a worker in vain rather than a lover of work.

¹⁶⁶ Conon, bishop of Tarsus, and Eugenius, bishop of Seleucia, were tritheists, and followers of John Philoponus. Conon subsequently rejected Philoponus' teaching on the resurrection of the body. Again to be noted is Sophronius' pun on the names of those he anathematizes, this time on 'thrice-accursed' and 'tritheism'.

¹⁶⁷ For the Agnoetai, the sixth-century anti-Chalcedonians who argued for ignorance in Christ, and their condemnation, see Van Roey and Allen, *Monophysite Texts*, 5–15.

¹⁶⁸ For the doctrinal disagreement between Peter of Callinicum and Damian of Alexandria on the subject of how to deal with tritheism see sec. 1.1, above. Peter in fact wrote *against* tritheism, but was accused by Damian of being a tritheist. The fact that Sophronius disparagingly calls Peter a minor tritheist indicates how well acquainted he is with developments among anti-Chalcedonians.

¹⁶⁹ Around 591 Sergius became anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Edessa. With his brother John he opposed the writings of Peter of Callinicum, according to Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* II, 372–3, and said that they should not be accepted. From this a schism resulted (sec. 1.1 above). Sophronius' remarks show once again his familiarity with anti-Chalcedonian politics: Sergius and Peter must originally have been of like mind, but then had a falling out.

ἡμετέροις χρόνοις Σαβέλλιος, μεθ' ὧν καὶ οἱ αὐτῶν τῆς ἀσεβείας διάδοχοι ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν καὶ κατάθεμα Ἀθανάσιός τε ὁ Σύρος καὶ ὁ ἀποζυγάριος Ἀναστάσιος καὶ οἱ τὴν τούτων ἀσύμβατον σύμβασιν ἀσυμβάτως τε καὶ ἀμαθῶς προσιέμενοι καὶ ἀλογίστων δίκην κτηνῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν βουκολούμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλοις μὲν [φησι] <ώσεϊ> φιλικῶς συμφυρόμενοι, ὑπ' ἀλλήλων δὲ τοῖς ἀναθεματισμοῖς ἐχθρωδῶς τιτρωσκόμενοι.

2.6.2. Ἐνδυσέσθωσαν δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς καὶ περιβαλλέσθωσαν τὸ ἀνάθεμα καὶ κατάθεμα καὶ Βενιαμὴν ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Σέργιος καὶ Θωμᾶς καὶ Σεβήρος οἱ Σύροι, οἱ ἔτι ζῶντες ζωὴν τὴν ἐπάρατον καὶ πολεμοῦντες ἐκμανῶς τὴν εὐσέβειαν· κοινωνεῖτω δὲ αὐτοῖς τῆς τῶν παρόντων ἀναθεματισμῶν κατακρίσεως καὶ Μηνᾶς ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, ὁ τῆς τῶν Γαϊανιτῶν προμαχῶν καὶ προασπίζων αἵρέσεως καὶ πολεμῶν ἐμφανῶς τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ

new Sabellius¹⁷⁰); with them let their successors in impiety also be anathema and condemned: Athanasius the Syrian¹⁷¹ and Anastasius the unyoker, and those who stupidly attached themselves to their unagreed agreement bringing no agreement, and were cheated by them like irrational cattle.¹⁷² They mingled as if in a friendly way with each other, but were wounded in enemy fashion by the anathemata from each other.

2. With these let there be invested and covered with anathema and condemnation Benjamin of Alexandria and the Syrians John¹⁷³ and Sergius¹⁷⁴ and Thomas¹⁷⁵ and Severus,¹⁷⁶ who are still living their accursed life and warring madly against pious belief. Let there share with them the condemnation of the present anathemata Menas of Alexandria too, who championed and defended the heresy of the Gaianites and fought openly against the proclamation of the truth,¹⁷⁷ and all those who are in

¹⁷⁰ On Damian see sec. 1.1, above; for his Sabellianism see sec. 1.5.4, above.

¹⁷¹ On the incomplete outcome of the union between Athanasius the Camel-driver and Anastasius of Alexandria in 616 see sec. 1.3.1, above.

¹⁷² The primary meaning of *βουκολεῖν*, which I have rendered here in its secondary meaning as 'cheat', is in fact to tend or graze cattle, a fact on which Sophronius puns.

¹⁷³ The Syrian John seems to be John II, anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Cyrrhus, who is mentioned by Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* II. 412, as accompanying the patriarch Athanasius of Antioch to Mabbog for discussions with the emperor Heraclius. See sec. 1.3.1, above.

¹⁷⁴ A bishop Sergius was signatory to the *synodicon* of union in 616, according to Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* II.393. Michael also writes of Sergius, a bishop of Syria, who also accompanied Athanasius of Mabbog (II.412). These two Sergii are in all probability identical. See sec. 1.3.1, above.

¹⁷⁵ Thomas of Heraclea, bishop of Mabbog, fled to Egypt during the anti-Chalcedonian persecutions conducted by Domitian of Melitene under the reign of the emperor Maurice (560–602): see Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* II.381. Not only was he a signatory to the *synodicon* of union in 616 (II.393), but in addition he played an important part in the entire proceedings. Furthermore, he was in the entourage of Athanasius of Antioch when the patriarch of Antioch met Heraclius in Mabbog: Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* II.412. See sec. 1.3.1, above.

¹⁷⁶ Anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Samosata, Severus went to Egypt with his brother Athanasius of Antioch in 616. His name does not appear among the signatories of the *synodikon* of union. Severus also accompanied his brother to Mabbog for the talks with Heraclius. In Michael the Syrian he is portrayed in hagiographic terms. He died around 641: Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* II.427–9. See 1. 2, above.

¹⁷⁷ Unless the Gaianite Menas is to be identified as the brother of the anti-Chalcedonian Benjamin, this is the only testimony to him. Cosma, *De 'oconomia' incarnationis*, 35, makes the identification. Menas, the brother of Benjamin, was tortured by Chalcedonians for his beliefs.

κήρυγμα καὶ πάντες σὺν αὐτοῖς οἱ τούτων κοινωνοὶ καὶ ὁμόφυλοι καὶ τὴν ἀσέβειαν σύστοιχοι.

2.6.3. [484] Βαλλέσθωσαν δὲ τοῖς ἴσοις αὐτοῖς ἀναθέμασι καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ αἱρέσεις αἱ μετὰ τὴν Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν ἀκμάσασαι καὶ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν πολεμεῖν θρασυνόμεναι, τουτέστιν ἡ Νικολαϊτῶν, ἡ Εὐτυχιτῶν, ἡ Καϊνῶν, ἡ Ἀδαμیانων, ἡ Βαρβηλιωτῶν, ἡ Βορβοριανῶν, ἡ Ναασσηνῶν, ἡ Στρατιωτικῶν, ἡ <Ὁ>φιονιτῶν, ἡ Σιθιανῶν, ἡ Σοφιανῶν, ἡ Ὀφιτῶν, ἡ Καϊνῶν, ἡ Ἀντιτακτικῶν, ἡ Περαιτικῶν, ἡ Ὑδροπαραστατῶν, ἡ Ἐγκρατητῶν, ἡ Μαρκιανιστῶν, ἡ Φρυγῶν, ἡ Πεπουζιανῶν, ἡ Ἀρτοτυριτῶν, ἡ Τασκοδρούγων, ἡ Τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατητῶν, ἡ Ναζωραίων, ἡ Μελχισεδεκιτῶν, ἡ Ἀντιδικομαριανιτῶν, ἡ Ψαθυριανῶν, ἡ Κυρτιανῶν, ἡ Δουλιανῶν, ἡ Ἀνθρωπομορφιτῶν,

communion with them and are of the same stock and correspond to their impiety.

3. Let there be struck by the same anathemata also all the heresies which blossomed after the coming of Christ and dared to fight the church of Christ: that is, the heresy of the Nicolaites,¹⁷⁸ Eutychites,¹⁷⁹ Cainists,¹⁸⁰ Adamites, Barbeliotes, Borborians, Naassines, Stratiotici,¹⁸¹ Ophionites,¹⁸² Sethians, Sophians,¹⁸³ Ophites, Cainites, Antitactites, Peratics, Hydroparastates, Encratites,¹⁸⁴ Marcianists, Phrygians,¹⁸⁵ Pepouzians,¹⁸⁶ Artotyrites,¹⁸⁷ Tasco-drougites,¹⁸⁸ Quartodecimans,¹⁸⁹ Nazarites,¹⁹⁰ Melchisedecites, Antidicomarianites,¹⁹¹ Psathryians,¹⁹² Curtians,¹⁹³ Doulians,¹⁹⁴

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Rev. 2: 6, 14, 16, 20.

¹⁷⁹ According to Theodoret I.1; *PG* 83, 345B, the Eutychites were followers of Simon Magus.

¹⁸⁰ Cainists and Cainites are recorded by Theodoret I.1; *PG* 83, 345B and 368BC.

¹⁸¹ According to Epiphanius, *Panarion* 26. 3; ed. Holl, I.279, 24–6, this was an Egyptian Gnostic sect.

¹⁸² Theodoret I.14; *PG* 83, 364C–368A, equates Ophionites with Ophites and Sethians.

¹⁸³ This is the only attestation of a sect with this name, and it very likely arose from a textual corruption between Ophianites and Ophites, unless there was in fact a group which took its name from the Greek *sophia* (wisdom).

¹⁸⁴ Since encratism is a global term used to designate adherence to extreme asceticism, it is not tied specifically to a religion or a period. However, here may be meant the followers of Tatian.

¹⁸⁵ By Phrygians are meant the adherents of Montanus.

¹⁸⁶ Pepouzians is another name for Montanists. See Theodoret III.2; *PG* 83, 401D–404A.

¹⁸⁷ A name composed of the Greek words for bread and cheese, this refers to a group who used those commodities in their sacrament.

¹⁸⁸ Also known as Ascodrougites, this is an obscure group which may have been associated with Montanism.

¹⁸⁹ This group of Christians claimed to be following the Johannine account of Christ's passion and celebrated Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover or the fourteenth (*quartodecimanus*) day of the month Nisan. They were not christologically aberrant.

¹⁹⁰ This was an Aramaic-speaking Jewish-Christian sect, about which we know otherwise very little.

¹⁹¹ This group was held to deny Mary's perpetual virginity, claiming she had other children by Joseph.

¹⁹² The Psathryians were a short-lived Arian sect in the fourth century. See Socrates, *HE* V.23, and Sozomen, *HE* VII.17.

¹⁹³ According to Theodoret IV.4; *PG* 83, 421C, this was the name of a group which separated from the Psathryians.

¹⁹⁴ Another Arian sect, the Doulians reputedly received their name from calling the Son the servant (*doulos* in Greek) of the Father. See Theodoret IV.4; *PG* 83, 421CD.

ἡ Τερακιτῶν, ἡ Μεσαλιανῶν, ἡ Εὐτυχιτῶν, ἡ Ἀκεφάλων, ἡ Οὐερσουνοφитῶν, ἡ Ἑσαιοανῶν, ἡ Ἀγνοητῶν, ἡ Ἰακωβιτῶν, ἡ Τριθεϊτῶν καὶ ἥτις ἑτέρα παρὰ ταύτας καθέστηκε δυσσεβῆς καὶ θεήλατος αἵρεσις.

2.6.4. Ἀπαντας τοίνυν τοὺς προαναφερομένους αἵρεσιάρχας καὶ τὰς μετὰ τούτους ὀνομασθείσας δυσσεβεστάτας αἵρέσεις καὶ σχίσματα ἀναθεματίζω καὶ καταθεματίζω ψυχῇ καὶ [486] καρδίᾳ καὶ στόματι, ἐννοίᾳ τε καὶ λόγοις καὶ ῥήμασι, καὶ πάντα ἕτερον αἵρεσιάρχην ὀλέθριον καὶ πᾶσαν ἑτέραν παμβέβηλον αἵρεσιν καὶ πᾶν ἕτερον σχίσμα θεήλατον, ὅσουςπερ ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησία ἀναθεματίζει. ἀναθεματίζω δὲ καὶ καταθεματίζω καὶ πάντας αὐτῶν τοὺς ὁμόφρονas τοὺς τὰς αὐτὰς αὐτοῖς ἀσεβείας ζηλώσαντας καὶ ἀμετανοήτους ἐν αὐταῖς τελευτήσαντας καὶ τοὺς ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν αὐταῖς διαμένοντας καὶ πολεμοῦντας τῆς καθολικῆς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας τὸ κήρυγμα, καὶ πίστιν ἡμῶν τὴν ὀρθὴν καὶ ἀμώμητον βάλλοντας. καὶ ἀναθεματίζω πάλιν παραπλησίως καὶ πάντα αὐτῶν τὰ θεομάχα συγγράμματα, ἃ κατὰ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἡμῶν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας συνέταξαν καὶ κατὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς ἡμῶν καὶ ἀμωμήτου συνεγράψαντο πίστεως. ἀναθεματίζω τε σὺν αὐταῖς ταῖς βεβήλοις αἵρέσεσι καὶ πᾶσαν ἑτέραν θεοστυγὴ καὶ κακόδοξον αἵρεσιν, ἣν ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησία ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ κατακρίνειν συνήθισται καὶ τοὺς ἐξάρχους αὐτῶν καὶ γεννήτορας καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν μυσαρὰ καὶ παμμίαρα λογύδριά τε καὶ βιβλίδια, μόνα τιμῶν καὶ

Anthropomorphites,¹⁹⁵ Hieracites,¹⁹⁶ Messalians,¹⁹⁷ Eutycheans, Headless Ones, Bersounouphites,¹⁹⁸ Isaians,¹⁹⁹ Agnoetai,²⁰⁰ Jacobites, tritheists, and besides those whatever other heresy, impious and pursued by God, has existed.

4. All the heresiarchs cited above, therefore, and the most impious heresies and schisms named after them; I anathematize and condemn with soul and heart and mouth, and in mind and speech and words, and every other destructive heresiarch and every other wholly profane heresy, and every other schism pursued by God, as many as our holy catholic church anathematizes. I also anathematize and condemn also all who think like them, those who vie with them in the same impiety and have died unrepentant in them, and those who even at the present time still persist in them and fight the preaching of our catholic church and strike our right and blameless faith.²⁰¹ And again I anathematize likewise also all their writings, hostile to God, which they composed against our most holy catholic church and wrote against our right and blameless faith. With the same profane heresies I anathematize also every other heresy hateful to God and unorthodox, which our holy catholic church has been accustomed to anathematize and condemn, and their leaders and begetters, and their loathsome and utterly abominable pamphlets and booklets,²⁰²

¹⁹⁵ Being against the conception of a transcendent God, adherents of anthropomorphism imagined God in human form. As such they were not confined to a particular group or period in the Patristic era.

¹⁹⁶ The Hieracites were the followers of the Egyptian ascetic Hieracas (end of third–beginning of fourth century), who was accused during his lifetime of holding Origenist views.

¹⁹⁷ Messalians or Euchites (“those who pray”) were ascetic groups, especially of the fourth and fifth centuries, who were devoted to prayer and poverty to the extent that they rejected work and the necessity of providing for their daily needs.

¹⁹⁸ The Bersounouphites, or more commonly Barsanuphians, were an Egyptian anti-Chalcedonian group, named after the monk Barsanuphius, which separated from the anti-Chalcedonians at the end of the fifth century and remained in schism until the beginning of the ninth century.

¹⁹⁹ The Isaians were followers of Isaiah of Scete (d. 491), who was a teacher of the famous first-generation anti-Chalcedonian Peter the Iberian. Whether these formed a special group of devotees of Isaiah’s influential spiritual work, the *Ascelicon*, is uncertain.

²⁰⁰ The followers of Themistius, on whom see sec. 1.1 above.

²⁰¹ This is probably to be taken as referring in the first instance to the anti-Chalcedonians.

²⁰² On the same expression and its interpretation see sec. 2.5.5, above.

κρατῶν καὶ φρονῶν καὶ σεβόμενος τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας τὰ δόγματα, ἅπερ μερικῶς ὑμῖν καὶ διὰ βραχέων ἐκτέθειμαι διὰ τὸ τῶν συνοδικῶν γραμμάτων, ὡς εἶπον, ἐπίτομον, μεθ' ὧν καὶ ἀπαίρειν τῶν ἐντεῦθεν προσεύχομαι, ὅτε θεὸς τοῦτο γενέσθαι προστάξειεν.

2.7.1. Ὅθεν καὶ τὴν ὑμῶν ἀξιῶ πατρικὴν ἀγιότητα ταῦτα πρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ταπεινότητος θεσμῷ συνοδικῷ δεχομένην τὰ γράμματα πατρώοις θεωρῆσαι τοῖς ὅμμασι καὶ ἀδελφικοῖς κατανοῆσαι τοῖς βλέμμασι, καὶ εἴ τι δι' ἄγνοιαν ἔπαισται ἢ διὰ λήθην ἐλλέλειπται ἢ διὰ σπουδὴν παρεώραται ἢ διὰ συντομίαν κεκώφωται καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐμνημόνεται ἢ διὰ [488] γλώττης ἀκινήσιαν σεσίγηται ἢ διὰ βραδυγλωττίαν καὶ φωνῆς μεγίστην ἰσχνότητα ἢ διὰ λόγων ἀγροικोटέρων ἀσθένειαν καὶ μὴ βουλομένων ἡμῶν σεσιώπηται, προσθήκαις ἀναπληρῶσαι καὶ φθέγμασιν ἐκ πατρικῆς προερχομένοις πληρώσεως καὶ διορθώσεσιν ἰθύναι καὶ ῥώσιν προσφιλεστάτην χαρίσασθαι ἀδελφικοῖς ἐνεργουμένην σπουδάσμασι καὶ πατρικαῖς ἐνομβρουμένην προθέσεσιν, ἵνα μήτε τὸ ἐλλειπὲς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀτελὲς εἰς αἰὲ διαφαίνοιτο, μήτε τὸ ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀγνοία πολλάκις σφαλλόμενον ἀρρωστοῦν εἰς αἰὲ διαμένοι καὶ δι' ὅλου τοῦ βίου νοσηλευόμενον· ὅπερ φιλικῶς ὑφ' ὑμῶν καὶ γνησίως γινόμενον πλουτίσοι μὲν ἐμέ καὶ ἰάσεται, μαρτυρήσοι δὲ τοῖς μακαρίοις ὑμῖν τὸ συμπαθὲς καὶ φιλόστοργον, ταυτὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν τὸ φιλότεκνόν τε καὶ φιλάδελφον. οὕτω δὲ πρὸς ὑμῶν ἐγὼ πλουτιζόμενος καὶ τὸ ἐλλειπὲς προσαναπληρούμενος καὶ τὸ ἀσθενὲς ἰατρευόμενος καὶ τὸ χωλὸν ἀνορθούμενος καὶ ῥώσει καὶ πλούτῳ πατρικῷ καὶ ἀδελφικῷ στεφανούμενος, πηλίκην ἔχειν χάριν ὑμῖν καὶ χαρὰν σὺν αὐτῇ νομισθήσομαι ἢ εὐφροσύνην τρυγᾶν καὶ ἡδονὴν τὴν ἀνωτάτῳ γνωσθήσομαι. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν εἰδεῖν μόνος θεός, εἰδεῖν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγώ, θεοτίμητοι, ὁ τὴν τοιαύτην κερδαίνων εὐπάθειαν καὶ τὴν λαμπρὰν εὐεργεσίαν δρεπόμενος, εἰδοίητε δὲ τάχα καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ

honouring and holding fast to and bearing in mind and revering only the teachings of our holy catholic and apostolic church, which I have expounded to you partially and in brief because, as I have said, of the summary form of the synodical letter.²⁰³ With these sentiments I pray that I shall depart hence when God ordains that this shall happen.

2.7 CONCLUSION

1. Accordingly, I request Your Paternal Holiness that, when by synodical ordinance You have received this letter from my lowliness, You scrutinize it with the eyes of a father and assess it with the gaze of a brother. If there has been any blunder through ignorance, or if anything has been omitted through forgetfulness, or overlooked through haste, or muted through brevity and has not been mentioned anywhere, or has been left unsaid because I could not express it, or through slowness of tongue and exceeding thinness of voice (cf. Exod. 4: 10) or through the weakness of rather boorish words has been passed over in silence, even if unintentionally, I request You to supplement it with additions and with expressions proceeding from [Your] fatherly plenitude, and straighten it with amendments and bestow encouragement with much affection, activated by brotherly zeal and showered by fatherly counsels. [I request this] so that neither what is deficient in it appear forever imperfect, nor what is weak and often mistaken through ignorance remain forever feeble and chronically ailing. When this is accomplished by You in a friendly and genuine manner, may it enrich and heal me, and testify to Your Blessedness my affinity with You and my affection, which is the same as saying the love of a child and of a brother. Thus when I am enriched by You, and when what I lacked is supplemented, and my weakness is healed and my limp corrected, and I am crowned by encouragement and by paternal and fraternal riches, I shall be considered as having such great favour with You and joy to accompany it, and be known as harvesting happiness and the highest pleasure. But may God alone know this, and may I myself know this too, O one honoured by God—when I have gained the advantage of so great a spiritual well-being and have harvested so bright a benefaction. May You too perhaps know this and learn it for Yourself, if You

²⁰³ Yet another reference by Sophronius to the supposed brevity of synodical letters.

μαθήσοισθε, εἰ καρδίας τῆς ἐμῆς τὸ θερμὸν εἰς εὐσέβειαν ἴδοιτε καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ πολὺ πρὸς ἀγάπησιν ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοῖς θεωρήσοιτε. περὶ τούτων οὖν ἐπὶ πλεον ὑμᾶς αἰτεῖν τοῖς λόγοις ἀφόμενος, οἶδα γάρ, ὡς ταῦτα πάντως πληρώσοιτε καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐλαχίστων αἰτήσεων ἀδελφικῆς ἀγάπης πυρσῶ πυρακτούμενοι καὶ πόθῳ πατρικῶ φλογιζόμενοι· ἐκείνο δυσωπῶ καὶ δυσωπῶν οὐδέποτε παύσομαι, ὥστε καὶ εὐχαῖς πρὸς θεὸν καὶ δεήσεσιν ἐμὲ περιέπειν θερμότατα τὸν [490] δεδιότα καὶ τρέμοντα καὶ τὸ βάρος βαστάζειν τοῦ προσεπιτεθέντος μοι ζυγοῦ μὴ δυνάμενον.

2.7.2. Καὶ οὐ τοῦτο γε μόνον, ἀλλ' ὅπως καὶ τὸ Χριστοῦ μοι τοῦτο συμβόσκειτε ποίμνιον, ὅπερ ποιμαίνειν μὲν αὐτὸς ἐγκεχείρισται· ἀδυνατῶ δὲ μὴ ἐπικουρούντων ὑμῶν ἀντιλήψει ποιμαίνειν τοῦτο καὶ τρέφειν ἐνθέοις τισὶ καὶ ὠφελίμοις βλαστήμασι καὶ φυλάττειν ἀβλαβὲς καὶ ἀπήμαντον. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρεσβεύω καὶ δέομαι, ἵνα μὴ ταῦτα βλάβην τὴν οἴανου ὑπομείναντα παρὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀπειρίαν καὶ ἀτεχνίαν καὶ οὐκ ἄρκουσαν πρὸς τὸ δεόντως νέμειν ἀδράνειαν, ὡς αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς λυμηνάμενος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως κρίνωμαι καὶ τῶν κλεπτόντων καὶ σφαττόντων καὶ ἀπολλύντων ληστῶν Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ πολύτιμα πρόβατα οὐ τελευτῶσαν ὑποσχῶ τὴν κόλασιν· τὴν γὰρ τούτων σωτηρίαν τε καὶ ἐπαύξησιν καὶ τὴν πόαις ταῖς ἀρίσταις κορυφουμένην πιότητα οἶδα σαφῶς καὶ ἐπίσταμαι πρὸς τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος Χριστοῦ εὐθυνθησόμενος, ἀλλ' εἴ τι, θεοτίμητοι, δύνασθε θεοῦ χαριζομένου τὸ δύνασθαι βοηθεῖν ἡμῖν ἀγωνίσασθε, ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ Χριστοῦ ταῦτα τιμιώτατα πρόβατα θηριάλωτοι παρὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀδυναμίαν γενοίμεθα.

2.7.3. Τὴν ἴσιν δὲ ὑμῖν πλουσίαν προσάγω παράκλησιν, ἵνα ἐκτενῇ ποιῆσθε καὶ ἄπαυστον τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ἱκετείαν καὶ δέησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν φιλοχρίστων καὶ γαληνοτάτων ἡμῶν βασιλέων τῶν θεόθεν τῆς βασιλείας λαχόντων τοὺς οἶακας, ὅπως αὐτὸς ὁ φιλοικτίρμων θεὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ δύναμιν ἔχων ἰσοσθενῇ τῷ βουλήματι, ὑμετέραις θεοδέκτοις εὐχαῖς μειλιπτόμενος ἐτῶν μὲν πληθὺν αὐτοῖς πολλὴν προσχαρίσεται, νίκας τε μεγίστας κατὰ

know the fervour of my heart towards pious belief, and observe with the eyes of the soul how much my soul is disposed towards love. Leaving aside, then, any further verbal pleas to You on these matters (for I know that You will fulfil these requests completely, since before our most lowly requests You are inflamed with the fire of fraternal love and burn with fatherly longing), I importune You and shall never cease to importune You on this point, that *with prayers to God and supplications* (Eph. 6: 18) You treat me most warmly, since I am in fear and trembling and unable to bear the weight of the yoke placed on me.

2. And [I importune You] not only on this account, but so that You may join me in feeding this flock of Christ, which I have been entrusted to shepherd. But if You do not succour me with Your support, I am incapable of shepherding it and nurturing it with some godly and beneficial blooms and safeguarding it unharmed and unhurt. And because of this I plead with You and beg You, lest, if the flock be subject to harm in this through my inexperience and lack of skill, and a weakness which is insufficient to pasture them as needed, I be judged on the day of judgement for having inflicted outrages on them myself, and suffer the eternal punishment of robbers who steal and slaughter and destroy the most precious flock of Christ God. I know clearly that they are both safe and growing and are well fed because of their excellent pastures, and I understand that I shall be called to account by Christ, the chief shepherd; but, O one honoured by God, if you are able to do something, God granting the possibility, exert Yourself to help us, lest both I myself and these most precious sheep of Christ be caught by wild beasts through my impotence.

3. I offer an equally profuse appeal to You, that You will make intense and unceasing plea and petition (cf. Eph. 6: 18) to God on behalf of our Christ-loving and most serene sovereigns,²⁰⁴ who received from God the rudders of the empire. My intention is that God himself, lover of mercy and lover of human beings, who has power equal in force to intention, when he has been appeased by Your prayers which are acceptable to God, will bestow on them a large number of years, and grant them both the greatest victories

²⁰⁴ i.e. the emperor Heraclius and empress Martina.

[492] βαρβάρων δοίη καὶ τρόπαια, καὶ παίδων παισὶν αὐτοὺς στεφανώσῃ καὶ εἰρήνῃ θεϊκῇ χαρακώσῃ, καὶ σκήπτρα παράσχοι κραταιὰ καὶ ἐνδύναμα βαρβάρων μὲν ἀπάντων, μάλιστα δὲ Σαρακηνῶν, ὁφρὺν καταθράπτοντα, τῶν δι' ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀδοκῆτως νῦν ἡμῖν ἐπαναστάντων καὶ πάντα ληϊζομένων ὡμῶ καὶ θηριώδει φρονήματι καὶ δυσσεβεῖ καὶ ἀθέῳ τολμήματι. διὸ περισῶς καὶ τοὺς μακαρίους ὑμᾶς ἱκετεύομεν ἐκτενεστάτας πρὸς Χριστὸν τὰς δεήσεις ποιήσασθαι, ὅπως ταύτας εὐμενῶς πρὸς ὑμῶν προσηκόμενος καταβάλῃ θάπτον αὐτῶν τὰ μανίας πλήρη φρυάγματα καὶ εὐτελεῖς αὐτοὺς ὑποπόδιον καθὰ καὶ τὸ πρότερον τοῖς θεοσδότοις ἡμῶν βασιλεῦσι δωρήσοιτο, ἵν' εὐημεροῖεν μὲν αὐτοὶ οἱ τὸ ἐπὶ γῆς ἡμῶν βασίλειον ἔχοντες, πολεμικῶν θορύβων παυσάμενοι, εὐημεροίῃ δὲ καὶ ἅπαν αὐτῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς τὸ πολίτευμα σκήπτροις τοῖς αὐτῶν καρτεροῖς χαρακούμενον καὶ εἰρηνικῆς δι' αὐτῶν καταστάσεως τοὺς εὐφροσύνης τοκέας δρεπόμενον βότρυας.

2.7.4. Ἀντιβολῶ δὲ δικαίως ὑμῶν τὸ φιλάδελφον Λεόντιον τὸν θεοσεβέστατον διάκονον τῆς ἁγίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τοῦ εὐαγοῦς ἡμῶν σεκρέτου καγγελλάριόν τε καὶ πρωτονοτάριον, καὶ τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸν Πολύευκτον, τοὺς τοῖσδε ἡμῶν τοῖς συνοδικοῖς διακονουμένους χαράγμασιν, εὐμενέσι προσώποις θεάσασθαι καὶ συγκαταβάσει πρεπώδει προσδέξασθαι· τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῶν καὶ τὸ ἰδιώτατον πέφυκε γνῶρισμα, ὧς τοὺς θεατὰς ὑμῶν αἰεὶ καταπλήττετε ἐν ὕψει μεγίστῳ τυγχάνοντες

over the barbarians, and trophies, and crown them with children of their children and fortify them with divine peace, and provide them with strong and mighty authority over all barbarians but especially the Saracens, destroying their pride. Through our sins²⁰⁵ they [sc. the Saracens] have now unexpectedly risen up against us, and are carrying everything off as booty with cruel and savage intent and impious and godless daring.²⁰⁶ This is why we especially beg also Your blessed Self to make the most intense supplications to Christ, so that when he has graciously approved these from You he may immediately cast down their insolent acts, full of madness, and present them, paltry as they are, as a footstool to our God-given rulers, just as before, so that those who have the empire on our earth may themselves enjoy good days once they have ceased from the clamours of war, and with them their whole state, fortified by their puissant authority, when through their peaceful direction it has harvested the grapes that generate good cheer.

4. I rightly entreat You in fraternal love to look upon with kindly countenance and welcome with fitting condescension Leontius, the most reverent deacon of the [Church of the] Holy Resurrection of Christ our God, and steward (*kankellarios*) and first secretary (*protonotarios*) of our undefiled bureau,²⁰⁷ and our most devout brother Polyeuktos,²⁰⁸ the ministers of this, our *Synodical Letter*. (For this is Your most distinctive mark by which You always astonish our observers—that though You are in the loftiest position You are clad with the greatest humility.) So indeed, with

²⁰⁵ That the sins of Christians caused the Arab invasions is a recurring theme in Sophronius' work. See e.g. *Homily on the Birth of Christ*, 169, 12–170, 20 and 175, 25–176, 7; *Homily on Holy Baptism*, 166, 13–167, 30.

²⁰⁶ On the basis of these remarks we may conclude that the *Synodical Letter* was composed at the beginning of 634, before the Arabs had consolidated their hold on the eastern empire. See von Schönborn, *Sophrone*, 89–91.

²⁰⁷ i.e. the patriarchal office or council: see *ODB* 3, 1866, s.v. *Sekretion*. In particular the patriarchal chancellery was concerned with calligraphy, and the signing and sealing of patriarchal documents. See J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l'église byzantine*, Archives de l'Orient Chrétien, 11 (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1970), 340–3. Since as *protonotarios* Leontius would have stood close to the patriarch and, among other duties, vetted letters before their dispatch (cf. *ODB* 3, 1746, s.v. *Protonotarios*), it is possible that he had a hand in the composition of the *Synodical Letter*. The copy of Sophronius' letter which went to Honorius in Rome was entrusted to Stephen of Dor and others. See Conte, *Chiesa e primato*, 416.

²⁰⁸ Evidently a member of the Chalcedonian clergy of Jerusalem, Polyeuktos is not known to us from elsewhere.

καὶ μεγίστην ἐνδεδυμένοι ταπείνωσιν· ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσιν ὑμῶν τοῖς λαμπροῖς ἰδιώμασι πνευματικῶς καὶ ἱλαρῶς δεξιώσασθε καὶ ἐφόδια ψυχῆς πνευματικὰ καὶ λαμπρὰ προσχαρίσασθε [494] καὶ θάπτον ὡς ἡμᾶς ἀντιπέμψατε γαννυμένους καὶ χαίροντας, ὅτι τοιοῦτον ἱστορεῖν Βυζαντίων ἡξίωται πρόεδρον, χαροποιούντας τε καὶ ἡμῶν τὴν εὐτέλειαν ἐν τῷ διηγείσθαι κομφῶς ἡμῖν τὰ ὑμέτερα – ῥῶσιν ψυχῆς θεοδώρητον καὶ ὑγείαν τοῦ σώματος θεόσδοτον – καὶ νέμειν ποθούμενα γράμματα τὰ πίστιν ἡμῖν τὴν ὀρθὴν ἐκφαιδρύνοντα καὶ τὸ ἦθος τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκλευκαίνοντα καὶ τὴν ποιμαντικὴν ἡμᾶς ἐπιστήμην παιδεύοντα καὶ θαρραλέους πρὸς τὸ ποιμαίνειν τὰ ἐνθάδε Χριστοῦ ποιούμενα ποίμνια.

2.7.5. Πᾶσαν τὴν σὺν τοῖς πανιέροις ὑμῖν θεοφιλῇ καὶ φαιδρὰν ἀδελφότητα πλείστα ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἐγὼ τε ὁ ταπεινὸς καὶ ἐλάχιστος καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ προσαγορεύομεν.

2.7.6. Ἐρρωμένος ἐν κυρίῳ ὑπερέυχου μου, ἀγιώτατε ἀδελφέ.

all Your luminous personal qualities greet them spiritually and cheerfully, and gratify them with spiritual and luminous provisions for the soul, and speedily send them back to us glad and joyful, because they have been judged worthy of observing such a patriarch of the Byzantines. They will both delight our meanness in elegantly telling me news of You, Your God-given strength of soul and God-gifted health of body, and will bestow the longed-for letter,²⁰⁹ which will illumine the right faith for us, and make shining white the habit of the soul, and teach us pastoral understanding, and make us confident in grazing the flocks of Christ here.

5. Both I, humble and least, and all the brothers with me, greet in Christ God all the brotherhood, dear to God and cheerful, who are with Your all-sacred Self.

6. Do You, strengthened in the Lord, pray for me, most holy brother.²¹⁰

²⁰⁹ i.e. Sergius' written acceptance of Sophronius' *Synodical Letter*.

²¹⁰ This formula is standard in correspondence between patriarchs.