THE IMMUTABILITY OF CHRIST AND JUSTINIAN'S CONDEMNATION OF THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA

MILTON V. ANASTOS

JUSTINIAN condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia because he was convinced that Theodore had divided the Logos-Christ into two persons, one human and one divine, and that Theodore's Christ was no more than a mere man. Opinions of the orthodoxy of Theodore's Christology have differed widely in medieval and modern times, but a thorough appraisal of Justinian's theological writings and his judgment of Theodore has yet to be made. The present article,[1] which will deal with only one phase of this question, is devoted to an examination of the meaning of the terms τρεπτός (mutable), ἀλλοιωτός (subject to change, changeable), τρεπτότης (mutability), ἄτρεπτος (immutable), ἀτρεπτότης or ἀτρεψία (immutability), ἀναλλοίωτος (unchangeable), and the like in the Christological controversies of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries.

The signification of these epithets will be made clear by the texts cited in the course of this paper, but a few preliminary definitions may be of service. They refer in the first instance to the eternity and unchangeableness of the divine essence of the Logos, which is to be regarded as having united itself with human nature at the incarnation without change. The Logos became flesh by union with human nature in the womb of the Virgin, not by transformation into flesh. These words are used frequently in this sense; and a whole treatise of Theodoretus, entitled Ἄτρεπτος, expounds this conception in great detail.[2] The reverse is also possible, and we often find denials that the human nature was changed into the divine after the incarnation.[3] The Chalcedonian Symbol of 451 in its formula, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, υἱόν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον, expressly rejected the view of Eutyches and the Monophysites that after the incarnation the human nature was absorbed by the divine.[4]

[1] This is a preliminary draft of a part of my book on the theology of the Emperor Justinian I.

[2] MPG, 83, 31–106.

[3] E.g., Justinian, *Confessio rectae fidei*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians* (*Abhandlungen d. Bayerischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Abt., N. F., Heft 18 [1939]), 74.21–24; MPG, 86.1, 997A, quoted in n. 16 below.

[4] Ed. Eduard Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (abbreviated below as ACO), 2.1.2, [325], 129.30 f.; J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 7 (Paris-Leipzig, 1901), 116B. On the reading ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, which Schwartz adopts on the authority of the best manuscripts instead of ἐκ δύο φύσεων, see J. Hefele–H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, 2.2 (Paris, 1908), 723 ff.; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (26th ed., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1947), no. 148, pp. 70 f.; Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 2 (New York, 1877), 62 ff. Justinian in his *Contra Monophysitas* reads ἐν δυσὶ φύσεσιν: ed. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians* (abbreviated below as Ed. Schwartz), 31.23;

This is the doctrine denounced in the so-called Athanasianum (*Quicunque vult*), attributed to Athanasius but probably a work of the end of the fifth century, in the clauses:

> Qui licet deus sit et homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus. Unus autem, non conversione divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione humanitatis in deum. Unus omnino, non confusione substantiae sed unitate personae.[5]

These connotations will be fully illustrated below.

A somewhat different interpretation is put upon these terms in the works of Arius [6] and Theodore of Mopsuestia, as also in some of the writings of Justinian that discuss Theodore's conception of the ἀτρεπτότης of Christ, and in the twelfth anathema of the Fifth Oecumenical Council.[7] Here τρεπτός refers to mutability of soul, which is glorified and divinized after the resurrection to immutability (ἀτρεπτότης). Arius and Theodore apparently sought in this way to preserve Christ's human freedom of will. In combating the Apollinarians with their doctrine of a Jesus Christ who had perfect humanity except for the νοῦς or reasonable soul (ψυχὴ λογική), which was supplied by the divine Logos, Theodore wished to emphasize the perfect humanity of Christ. He was careful to insist that Christ was without blemish, but he deemed it essential for the salvation of mankind that Christ should have been free to choose evil and to sin had he wished to do so. Arius taught that Christ was a perfect created being of God, immutable and unchangeable by the exercise of his will, and that, by exerting his will, Christ remained good as long as he wished, since he was of a mutable nature.[8]

Actually, however, as Athanasius had the acumen to realize, all these conceptions merge into one. There is no question of the freedom of the will here, but the more basic one of the essence of the Logos. Dealing in this way

---

MPG, 86.1, 1133D. Severus of Antioch, the Monophysite, believed that the Creed had ἐκ δύο φύσεων: ed. A. Sanda, *Severi Philalethes* (Beirut, 1928), c. 62, p. 116. On the pre-Chalcedonian form of this phrase, see Andreas Schmid, *Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium* (n. 104 below), 52 ff.

[5] Mansi, 2, 1355B; Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, no. 39 f., pp. 17 f.; Schaff, *Creeds*, 2, 66 ff. On the various authors proposed, see Berthold Altaner, *Patrologie* (2d ed., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1950), 235 f. G. D. W. Ommanney, *A Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed* (Oxford, 1897), ascribes it to Vincent of Lerins at the first half of the fifth century.

[6] See Henry M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (2d ed., Cambridge, England, 1900), 22, 24 f., 44, 120–122; G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche* (Paris, 1936), 235 ff.; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London, 1950), 231 ff., 242. It is curious that, despite their insistence on freedom of the will in Christ, the Arians believed, as did Apollinarius later on, that the place of the rational soul in Christ was taken by the divine Logos.

[7] See n. 10 below.

[8] Quoted by Athanasius in *De synodis*, 16, MPG, 26, 709A: ἰδίῳ θελήματι ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον κτίσμα τοῦ θεοῦ τέλειον. See Gwatkin, 25, n. 3. See texts cited in nn. 70 f. below.

with the problem raised by the Arian view of the τρεπτότης of Christ, Athanasius made a brilliant and highly original contribution to Christian thought. His solution was accepted by the church and lies behind much of the Christology, not only of Cyril, Justinian, and the Council of 553, but also of the Sixth Oecumenical Council (680–681), which definitely settled the question of the relation in Christ between the human and divine wills. Although the formula of 681 [9] advances beyond that of Athanasius, it reaches fundamentally the same conclusion and is based upon the same premises. In what follows we shall see that Justinian was completely justified in anathematizing Theodore's doctrine of Christ as τρεπτός until after the resurrection, and that in so doing he was merely following the sacrosanct tradition of Nicaea and applying a necessary corrective to a Christology which violated the fundamental tenets of Christian doctrine.

The best brief summary of Justinian's criticism of Theodore is to be found in the twelfth anathema of the Fifth Oecumenical Council (held in Constantinople in 553).[10]

[9] Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, nos. 289–293, pp. 135 ff.; Schaff, *Creeds*, 2, 72 f.

By the ninth century the phrase ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος had become so much a part of the language of scholars that Photius could use it of literary style in a discussion of the authenticity of certain orations of Demosthenes: *Bibliotheca*, cod. 265, MPG, 104, 176C.

[10] Printed in Charles Joseph Hefele–H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, 3.1 (Paris, 1909), 123 ff., which is taken from Mansi, 9 (Paris–Leipzig, 1902), 384 f.: Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται Θεοδώρου τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς, τοῦ Μοψουεστίας, τοῦ εἰπόντος ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄλλον τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὸ παθῶν ψυχῆς καὶ τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐνοχλούμενον, καὶ τῶν χειρόνων κατὰ μικρὸν χωριζόμενον, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ προκοπῆς ἔργων βελτιωθέντα, καὶ ἐκ πολιτείας ἄμωμον καταστάντα, ὡς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον βαπτισθῆναι εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαβεῖν, καὶ υἱοθεσίας ἀξιωθῆναι· καὶ κατ' ἰσότητα βασιλικῆς εἰκόνος εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου προσκυνεῖσθαι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἄτρεπτον ταῖς ἐννοίαις, καὶ ἀναμάρτητον παντελῶς γενέσθαι. καὶ πάλιν εἰρηκότος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβοῦς Θεοδώρου τὴν ἕνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν τοιαύτην γεγενῆσθαι οἵαν ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπὶ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός· ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· καὶ πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀναριθμήτοις αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαις τολμήσαντος εἰπεῖν ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐμφυσήσας ὁ κύριος τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ εἰπών· λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, οὐ δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἀλλὰ σχήματι μόνον ἐνεφύσησεν. οὗτος δὲ καὶ τὴν ὁμολογίαν Θωμᾶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ψηλαφήσει τῶν χειρῶν καὶ τῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ κυρίου μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, τό· ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου, εἶπε, μὴ εἰρῆσθαι περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θωμᾶ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐκπλαγέντα τὸν Θωμᾶν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν θεόν, τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν Χριστόν. τὸ δὲ χεῖρον, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γενομένῃ παρ' αὐτοῦ δῆθεν ἑρμηνείᾳ συγκρίνων ὁ αὐτὸς Θεόδωρος τὸν Χριστὸν Πλάτωνι καὶ Μανιχαίῳ καὶ Ἐπικούρῳ καὶ Μαρκίωνι λέγει ὅτι, ὥσπερ ἐκείνων ἕκαστος εὑράμενος οἰκεῖον δόγμα τοὺς αὐτῷ μαθητεύσαντας πεποίηκε καλεῖσθαι Πλατωνικοὺς καὶ Μανιχαίους καὶ Ἐπικουρείους καὶ Μαρκιωνιστάς, τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εὑραμένου δόγμα ἐξ αὐτοῦ Χριστιανοὺς καλεῖσθαι. εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀντιποιεῖται τοῦ εἰρημένου ἀσεβεστάτου Θεοδώρου καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, ἐν οἷς τάς τε εἰρημένας καὶ ἄλλας ἀναριθμήτους βλασφημίας ἐξέχεε κατὰ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀναθεματίζει αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ ἀσεβῆ αὐτοῦ συγγράμματα καὶ πάντας τοὺς δεχομένους ἢ καὶ ἐκδικοῦντας αὐτὸν ἢ λέγοντας ὀρθοδόξως αὐτὸν ἐκθέσθαι, καὶ τοὺς γράψαντας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια φρονοῦντας ἢ φρονήσαντας πώποτε καὶ μέχρι τέλους ἐμμείναντας τῇ τοιαύτῃ αἱρέσει, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

If anyone defends the impious Theodore of Mopsuestia, who said that one is the God Logos and another is the Christ, who was harassed by anxieties of the soul and the desires of the flesh, and was gradually liberated from the baser passions, and in this way was elevated because of progress in his deeds and became blameless in his life; that he was baptized as a mere man in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that by reason of the baptism he received the grace of the Holy Spirit and was considered worthy of adoption; and that in the manner of a royal image he was worshipped in the person of the God Logos, and after the resurrection became immutable in his thoughts and completely sinless. And [if anyone defends] the same impious Theodore, who taught also that the union between the God Logos and Christ was the same as that which the apostle describes between a man and a woman: "The two shall be one flesh," and who, in addition to his other innumerable blasphemies, dared to assert that when the Lord blew upon the disciples after the resurrection and said, "Receive ye the holy spirit" (John 20.22), he did not give them the Holy Spirit but only blew upon them symbolically. And this fellow declared that the confession of Thomas, "My Lord and my God," when he touched the hands and the side of the Lord after the resurrection (John 20.28), was not uttered by Thomas with regard to Christ but that Thomas, overwhelmed by the miracle of the resurrection, was with these words paying homage to God, who had raised Christ. And, still worse, in his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles the same Theodore compares Christ to Plato, Manichaeus, Epicurus, and Marcion, and maintains that, as each of these discovered his own system and was thereby responsible for his followers' being called Platonists, Manichaeans, Epicureans, and Marcionites, so also Christ discovered a system, and the Christians are named after him. If anyone, therefore, defends the said most impious Theodore and his impious writings in which he poured forth against the great God and our savior Jesus Christ the blasphemies described and innumerable others, and does not anathematize him, his sacrilegious works, and all who accept or justify him or hold that his views are orthodox, together with those who have written to defend him or his books, and those whose views resemble, or have ever resembled, his, and who have persevered until death in this heresy, let him be anathema.

Leclercq [11] has documented these charges in some detail from the writings of Theodore, but he quotes no text to support Justinian's reference to Theodore's view of Christ as τρεπτός before the resurrection; and no modern scholar has ever before discussed the significance of this aspect of Justinian's theology. Accordingly, in the analysis which follows we shall for the most part ignore the other objections of Justinian and concentrate upon his interpretation of Christ's τρεπτότης. Actually, as we shall see, many of the major errors of Theodore's Christology arise from the doctrine of the Person of Christ presupposed by the theory that Christ did not attain ἀτρεπτότητα until after the resurrection.

The twelfth anathema of the Fifth Oecumenical Council translated above reproduces with minor alterations the eleventh anathema, published

[11] Hefele–Leclercq, *loc. cit.*

by the Emperor at the end of his *Confessio rectae fidei.*[12] He repeats the same charge also in a memorandum he sent to the Council of 553 to inform them of the importance he attached to the condemnation of the Three Chapters.[13] In this brief document of a little more than three columns of Migne, called the Τύπος τοῦ Βασιλέως Ἰουστινιανοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον περὶ Θεοδώρου τοῦ Μοψουεστίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, the Emperor states the defects of Theodore's system in very much the same language that is to be found in his other two pronouncements on this subject. The chief difference in the portion of the text that has to do with ἄτρεπτος is the addition of πρὸς τὰ κρείττονα to balance τῶν χειρόνων (thus strengthening the idea of a change in Christ from a state that was worse or lower to one that was better or higher), and of the adjective ἀρίστῃ to modify πολιτείᾳ (which adds the connotation that Christ became blameless by the perfection of his way of life).[14] These variations do not of course affect Justinian's judgment of Theodore in any way. In the same work Justinian expounds the relation of the two natures in Christ, by saying that

> According to the flesh . . . he was born of the holy Virgin; but since God the Logos descended from heaven and emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, he was called son of man although he remained what he was, that is God. For he is immutable and unchangeable by nature.[15]

[12] Ed. Schwartz, 92.26–94.13; MPG, 86.1, 1017 ABC.

[13] By the "Three Chapters" (τρία κεφάλαια) are meant (a) the person and works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, (b) the letter of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa (d. 457), to Maris, Bishop of Hardaschir (in Persia), and (c) the polemic of Theodoretus against the twelve anti-Nestorian anathemas of Cyril and the Council of Ephesus, and in defence of Theodore and Nestorius. See É. Amann, *s.v.* Trois-chapitres (affaire des), *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 15 (1947), 1868–1924.

[14] MPG, 86.1, 1039D–1041A: πρὸς γὰρ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀναριθμήτοις αὐτοῦ δυσφημίαις εἰς Χριστὸν τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν γενομέναις, ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν λόγον καὶ ἄλλον τὸν Χριστὸν ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς παθῶν, καὶ τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐνοχλούμενον, καὶ τῶν χειρόνων κατὰ μικρὸν ἀφιστάμενον πρὸς τὰ κρείττονα τῇ προκοπῇ τῶν ἔργων ἐληλυθέναι, καὶ τῇ ἀρίστῃ πολιτείᾳ γενόμενον ἄμωμον. καὶ ὡς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ὀνόματι πατρός, καὶ υἱοῦ, καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰληφέναι καὶ υἱοθεσίας ἠξιῶσθαι, καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν βασιλικῆς εἰκόνος εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὸν Χριστὸν προσκυνεῖσθαι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἄτρεπτον ταῖς ἐννοίαις καὶ ἀναμάρτητον γεγενῆσθαι. καὶ πρὸς τούτοις εἶπε τοιαύτην γεγενῆσθαι τὴν ἕνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν ὁποίαν ὁ ἀπόστολος ἔφη περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῆς γυναικός· ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

[15] *Ibid.*, 1037C–1039A: καίτοι γεγέννηται κατὰ σάρκα, ὡς εἴρηται, ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου, ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταφοιτήσας θεὸς λόγος κεκένωκεν ἑαυτόν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, καὶ κεχρημάτικεν ἀνθρώπου υἱὸς μετὰ τοῦ μεῖναι ὃ ἦν, τουτέστι θεός· ἄτρεπτος γὰρ καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος κατὰ φύσιν ἐστίν· ὡς εἷς ἤδη νοούμενος μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ λέγεται κατελθεῖν, ὠνόμασται δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, τέλειος ὢν ἐν θεότητι, καὶ τέλειος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, καὶ ὡς ἐν ἑνὶ προσώπῳ νοούμενος. εἷς γὰρ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, κἂν ἡ τῶν φύσεων διαφορὰ μὴ ἀγνοῆται, ἐξ ὧν τὴν ἀπόῤῥητον ἕνωσίν φαμεν πεπρᾶχθαι. τοιγαροῦν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν μονογενῆ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, θεὸν τέλειον, καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον, ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς

The God Logos, Justinian says, became flesh and became man without change and without being transformed into flesh,[16] remaining always the only begotten Logos of God the Father, the Son begotten before the ages. On this point he cites pseudo-Augustine to prove that the child of Mary was not just a man but God, who chose to be born a humble man in order to show by this humility his own greatness.[17]

But we must not infer from Christ's suffering and humiliation, the Emperor warns, that the divine essence underwent change, for the ancient fathers teach that the glorification and the abasement are both to be ascribed to the one only begotten God Logos, who took flesh and became man.[18] Christ, Justinian remarks on the authority of a sermon on the Virgin Mary delivered by Proclus of Constantinople (d. *ca.* 446), was not a man who had been deified, or one who had become God by reason of the progress he had made, but God who took flesh, who was impassible by nature and became passible out of pity for mankind.[19] Those, however, like Nestorius

---

γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

[16] Ed. Schwartz, 74.21 f., 76.2 ff., 88.12 f.; MPG, 86.1, 997A: οὔτε γὰρ ἡ θεία φύσις εἰς τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην μετεβλήθη, οὔτε δὲ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις εἰς τὴν θείαν ἐτράπη. 997C–999A: ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου γέγονεν καὶ μείνας ὅπερ ἦν, οὐ μετέβαλεν ὅπερ γέγονεν. ὅθεν καὶ δύο γεννήσεις τοῦ αὐτοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ λόγου ὁμολογοῦμεν, τὴν μὲν πρὸ αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀσωμάτως, τὴν δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας σαρκωθέντος, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος. ὁ γὰρ ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκλάμψας ὑπὲρ ἔννοιαν ἐκ μητρὸς ἀνέτειλεν ὑπὲρ λόγον, καὶ ὢν θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἀληθῶς. διὰ τοῦτο κυρίως καὶ κατ' ἀλήθειαν θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν, ἔνδοξον, καὶ ἀειπάρθενον Μαρίαν ὁμολογοῦμεν, οὐχ ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς λαβόντος, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ὁ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων μονογενὴς θεὸς λόγος σαρκωθεὶς ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀτρέπτως ἐνηνθρώπησεν. καὶ ἀόρατος ὢν ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὁρατὸς γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀπαθὴς ὢν θεὸς οὐκ ἀπηξίωσε παθητὸς εἶναι ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ ἀθάνατος νόμοις ὑποκεῖσθαι θανάτου. 1011B: ὅθεν αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἀτρέπτως ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἄνθρωπόν τινα αὐτὸν ἐληλυθέναι . . . So also ed. Schwartz, 63.26–9 = 1079D. Opposite the Greek text Schwartz prints the text of a contemporary Latin translation, which bears the title (ed. Schwartz, p. 73): *Edictum piissimi imperatoris Ivstiniani rectae fidei confessionem continens et refvtationem heresium qvae adversantvr Catholicae Dei Ecclesiae.* A marginal note in one Greek manuscript labels it πρόγραμμα ἤτοι διδασκαλία καὶ ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς περὶ τῆς ἀμωμήτου καὶ ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως ἡμῶν τῶν χριστιανῶν. Other authorities call it ἴδικτον τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου βασιλέως ἰουστινιανοῦ τὴν τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως περιέχον ὁμολογίαν καὶ ἀνασκευὴν τῶν μαχομένων αἱρέσεων τῇ καθολικῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησία.

[17] Ed. Schwartz, 54.37 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 1059D: ἐκεῖνο θαύμασον μᾶλλον ὅτι ὁ λόγος ἔλαβεν σάρκα καὶ οὐκ ἐτράπη εἰς σάρκα, ὅτι μένων θεὸς γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος . . . οὕτως ἠβουλήθη ὁ ὕψιστος γεννηθῆναι ταπεινός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ταπεινώσει ἐπιδείξηται τὴν μεγαλειότητα.

[18] Ed. Schwartz, 59.20–23; MPG, 86.1, 1071A: οὐδὲ γὰρ διὰ τὰ ταπεινὰ τροπὴν λέγουσιν τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ θεάτητος, οὐδὲ διὰ τὰ ὑψηλὰ διαιροῦσι τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τῆς θεότητος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος καὶ τὰ ὑψηλὰ καὶ τὰ ταπεινὰ εἶναι παραδιδόασιν.

[19] Ed. Schwartz, 54.26–28; MPG, 86.1, 1059C: ὁ ὢν κατὰ φύσιν ἀπαθὴς γέγονε δι' οἶκτον πολυπαθής· οὐκ ἐκ προκοπῆς γέγονε θεὸς ὁ Χριστός, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ δι' οἶκτον γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς ᾧ πιστεύομεν· οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀποθεωθέντα κηρύττομεν, ἀλλὰ θεὸν σαρκωθέντα ὁμολογοῦμεν. On

and his teacher Theodore, who do not confess that the God Logos became man, clearly make Christ a mere man, who was called Son of God by grace. In point of fact, Justinian says, the Logos is by nature the true Son of God, and men are sons of God only by grace.[20] Biblical texts like Psalms 8.5 ("For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor"), 2 Corinthians 8.9 ("For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich"), Hebrews 2.9 ("But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor"), and John 14.28 ("My father is greater than I") have reference only to the incarnation of the Logos. They show that it was the divine Logos who humbled himself and became man for the sake of mankind, and not a man who was later elevated to glory and honor. To assume that Christ was promoted in this way, as Theodore does in his exegesis of the eighth Psalm, Justinian says, is to divide Christ in two, to introduce the false doctrine of the glorification of Christ for merit, and to assume that he who was thus glorified was previously alien to the sphere to which he had been raised.[21]

Although Justinian appeals often to individual authorities like Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Cyril, he seems in condemning Theodore and the Three Chapters as a whole to have put his chief reliance on the four oecumenical councils preceding that of 553, which he himself had convoked. In the Τύπος (see n. 14 above) to the Fifth Council he devotes most of his space to an enumeration of the first four universal councils and to a summary of their dogmatic decisions. He makes much, too, of the imperial precedents, and notes with obvious relish the role of his predecessors, Constantine, Theodosius I, Theodosius II, and Marcian, in formulating the orthodox faith and securing the condemnation of the heretics.[22] In introducing his

---

the doctrine of Proclus in the controversy over the Three Chapters, see Franz Xaver Bauer, *Proklos von Konstantinopel, ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- u. Dogmengeschichte des 5. Jahrhunderts* (*Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München*, IV, 8 [Munich, 1919]), 64–95.

[20] Ed. Schwartz, 49.7–9; MPG, 86.1, 1047C: οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἐνανθρωπῆσαι μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες φανεροί εἰσι τὸν Χριστὸν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι καὶ κατὰ χάριν υἱὸν θεοῦ ὀνομάζεσθαι λέγοντες, ὡς ἡ κακοδοξία Νεστορίου καὶ Θεοδώρου τοῦ διδασκάλου αὐτοῦ λέγει. Cf. ed. Schwartz, 76.16 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 999AB.

[21] Ed. Schwartz, 74.24–76.12 (Philippians 2.6 f.), 55.21–59.13; MPG, 86.1, 997B–999A, 1061C–1069D.

Biblical references, unless otherwise indicated, are to the King James version (occasionally with minor changes).

For the history of the exegesis of Philippians 2.5 ff., see P. Henry, *s. v.* kénose, *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément*, 5 (1950), 7–161.

[22] MPG, 86.1, 1035B–1039D.

denunciation of Theodore, which follows immediately after his summary of the great conciliar decisions, he notes that the Nestorians had taken advantage of the opportunity offered by Theodore of Mopsuestia, "whose blasphemies are much grosser than those of his disciple Nestorius," to circumvent "these four councils." [23] He reinforces his argument in the Τύπος by a long extract from the letter written by Cyril after the Council of Ephesus to Theodosius II in which Cyril had declared Christ to be immutable and unchangeable by nature.[24]

In all such matters, Justinian says, the chief authority is the Nicene Creed drafted by the 318 fathers in 325, which he received at baptism and faithfully observes, and which was accepted as the touchstone of the faith by the "150 fathers" (i.e., the Second Oecumenical Council at Constantinople in 381), the Third Council (Ephesus, 431), and the Fourth (Chalcedon, 451). He asserts vigorously and lays great emphasis upon the fact that the fathers of each of the three oecumenical councils that were subsequent to Nicaea remained faithful to the Symbol of 325 in all respects, and that the councils of 431 and 451 expressly rejected all creeds except that of 325. It is not surprising, therefore, that he places his own anathemas, which he subjoins immediately after this discussion, within the same Nicene tradition,[25] and that he censures Theodore for misinterpreting the Creed of the 318 fathers.[26]

In keeping with this principle also is the prominence that he gives in his system to Nicene terms like ὁμοούσιος, and his insistence that Christ was the eternal Logos of God the Father, of the same essence as the Father, and in no wise a created being.[27]

THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA

Modern opinions on the Christology of Theodore differ widely. The older critics acquiesced easily in his condemnation by Justinian and the Council of 553; and Mai, in rejecting Theodore, repudiated those who attempted to force an orthodox interpretation upon his works.[28] Neander and

[23] *Ibid.*, 1039D–1041D.

[24] *Ibid.*, 1037D.

[25] Ed. Schwartz, 88.34–90.15; MPG, 86.1, 1013ABC.

[26] Ed. Schwartz, 100.30 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 1025AB. The creed mentioned here by Justinian as condemned at Ephesus and Chalcedon was first associated directly with Theodore's name by Marius Mercator; see n. 59 below.

[27] Ed. Schwartz, 72.29–74.16, 76.21 ff., 59.16 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 995C–997A, 999B, 1035C, 1071A. For other passages in Justinian on Christ's immutability, see 27.3 ff., 31.15, 36.21 ff., 53.32 ff.

[28] Le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, 8 (2d ed., Paris, 1713), 565–568; Leo Allatius, *Diatriba de Theodoris*, reprinted in

Dorner,[29] on the other hand, in their attempt to give an objective account, make no clear pronouncement on the question of his orthodoxy. The older view is repeated also in the preface to the edition of Theodore's *Commentary on the Minor Epistles of St. Paul* by H. B. Swete, who, however, remarks that Theodore was "far from being a wilful heretic" and erred largely because of his zeal in combating Apollinarianism.[30]

This judgment prevailed [31] until the recent publication of a considerable body of new texts of Theodore's works, both in the original Greek and in Syriac translation, necessitated a reëxamination and reappraisal of Theodore's theological position. The chief of these is Theodore's renowned commentary on the Psalms, mostly in Greek but partly in Latin, edited with great skill and learning by Monsignor Robert Devreesse,[32] who had published previously a valuable critical edition of the work of the Roman deacon Pelagius, *In defensione Trium Capitulorum.*[33] Devreesse has now terminated some twenty years of fruitful research on Theodore with an important book of over four hundred pages, modestly entitled *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste,*[34] which contains the results of his studies and one hundred pages of the Greek remains of Theodore's Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, patiently extricated from the *catenae* and a host of manuscripts that often conceal the words now identified as Theodore's under the name of other authors. Significant contributions have been made also by A. Mingana, the modern initiator of the new interest in this subject, who produced the Syriac

---

MPG, 66, 80C *et passim*; Angelo Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 6 (Rome, 1832), v f.; Otto Fridolin Fritzsche in his *De Theodori Mopsuesteni vita et scriptis commentatio historica theologica* (Halle, 1836, as reprinted in MPG, 66, 24B, 59–60).

[29] Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, transl. by Joseph Torrey, 4 (London, 1851), 108 ff., 409 ff., 430 ff.; J. A. Dorner, *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. II, vol. I (transl. by D. W. Simon, Edinburgh, 1869), 25 ff., 380 ff.

[30] *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii*, ed. H. B. Swete, 1 (Cambridge, England, 1880), lxxix–lxxxvii.

[31] So Bardenhewer, Harnack, Schwane, Seeberg, and Tixeront. The question is still discussed on the old premises, without use of the newly published material, in the fifth edition of Friedrich Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium d. Dogmengeschichte*, ed. Kurt Aland (Halle-Saale, 1950), 217–227.

[32] *Studi e Testi*, 93 (Vatican City, 1939). Other important new texts have been published by Karl Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus d. Griechischen Kirche* (*Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, 15 [Münster, i. W., 1933]), 113–212. In the same series appeared J. Reuss, *Matthäus-, Markus-, u. Johannes-Katenen* (1941), but this I have not yet been able to obtain. See also Johannes Quasten, "Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium," *Harvard Theological Review*, 35 (1942), 209–219; *idem*, ed., Francis J. Reine, *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (*Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity*, 2 [Washington, D. C., 1942]).

[33] *Studi e Testi*, 57 (Vatican City, 1932).

[34] *Ibid.*, 141 (*ibid.*, 1948).

of Theodore's catechetical homilies together with an English rendering (On the Nicene Creed, On the Lord's Prayer, On Baptism, On the Eucharist and Liturgy, and a brief Catechism, that purports to give a synopsis of Christian doctrine); [35] by J. M. Vosté, who edited and translated into Latin (from the Syriac) Theodore's *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, and has written a number of notable articles on Theodore; [36] and by Raymond Tonneau, who, working in collaboration with Devreesse, has put out a photographic reproduction of *Ms. Mingana Syr. 561* with a French version of the same catechetical orations that Mingana had rendered into English in *Woodbrooke Studies*.[37] In bringing out this corpus, though not unmindful of the great services of Mingana and the accuracy of his scholarship, Tonneau sought to reproduce Theodore's ideas with even greater fidelity, in order to do Theodore full justice and spare him criticism arising from infelicities of style or misinterpretation of key doctrinal passages.

Devreesse summarizes all that is known of Theodore and gives a well-documented exposition of Theodore's theological system. As a result of his textual researches he concludes that, when it is possible to control them by the genuine body of Theodore's writings, the fragments represented by the Council of 553 as excerpts from his works "se présentent tronqués, falsifiés, dénaturés de toute manière"; and that, wherever passages exist only in the conciliar acts and cannot be found in context in the indubitable works of the author himself, they should be regarded as in conflict with Theodore's position ("là où la pierre de touche fait défaut nécessité est de reconnaître qu'ils contredisent l'enseignement de Théodore").[38] Believing that no one today would condemn Origen as Justinian did, he requests the same indulgence for Theodore. One can detect omissions and exaggerations in Theodore's treatises, Devreesse says, but we should not on this account impute to him errors of which he was not guilty or reproach him for the date of his birth.[39]

[35] *Woodbrooke Studies*, 5–6 (Cambridge, England, 1932–33); *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 5 (Manchester, 1919), 296–316.

[36] *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in Evangelium Iohannis Apostoli* (*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri*, Series Quarta, Tomus III, Textus, No. 115 [Paris, 1940], Versio, No. 116 [Louvain, 1940]); "Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes," *Angelicum*, 19 (1942), 179–198; "L'oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste au ii^e^ concile de Constantinople," *Revue Biblique*, 38 (1929), 382–395, 542–554; *idem*, "Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur St. Jean, d'après la version Syriaque," *ibid.*, 32 (1923), 522–551. See also Berthold Altaner, *Patrologie* (2d ed., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1950), 277 f.; L. Patterson, *Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought* (London, 1926).

[37] *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste, reproduction phototypique du Ms. Mingana Syr. 561* (*Selly Oak Colleges' Library, Birmingham*), *traduction, introduction, index* (*Studi e Testi*, 145, Vatican City, 1949).

[38] *Essai*, 283.

[39] *Ibid.*, 285.

Actually, Devreesse finds little to reprehend in Theodore and, in his final summary, presents Theodore's Christology in eminently orthodox terms: At the appointed time, he says, the Son of God condescended to dwell among men; and the Logos took flesh, being God, like his Father, from whom he is inseparable, and also perfect man, like us mortal men, assuming and assumed, two natures, one person.[40]

In this exposition Devreesse makes no attempt to collate Theodore's theories with orthodox dogma. He does not point to their Nestorian character or attempt to justify or explain them on dogmatic grounds. Thus, he presents without historical comment or exegesis Theodore's notion, which surely smacks of Nestorianism, that the man assumed by the Logos was brought back to life by Him and by Him made immortal, impassible, incorruptible, and absolutely immutable, and placed at the right hand of the Father as judge of the universe.[41] Apparently, in the numerous other passages in which Theodore seems to have divided Christ sharply into two persons (one human and one divine), Devreesse feels that these views are tolerable dogmatically because the subjects they treat had not yet been formulated in precise terms by an oecumenical council. Moreover, he would probably argue, Theodore constantly appeals to the traditional language and insists that the two natures, the human and the divine, are united in the one Jesus Christ. Amann gave a very similar interpretation in the critique he wrote to salute the appearance of Mingana's *Woodbrooke Studies*, as also in a more recent article.[42]

Both Amann and Devreesse seem to have been so impressed by the originality and sound instincts of Theodore in Biblical exegesis,[43] and by the vigor with which he attacked Docetism and Apollinarianism, that they criticize him only with the greatest reluctance and many qualifications. Neither Martin Jugie nor Wilhelm de Vries felt any such qualms, and repudiate Theodore unequivocally as a heretic. Jugie calls him "le vrai père de la doctrine condamnée par l'Église sous le nom de nestorianisme," and finds his sacramental doctrine also defective for teaching that the consecrated

[40] *Ibid.*, 279: "Au temps marqué dans le plan divin, le Fils de Dieu condescend à habiter parmi les hommes. C'est le Verbe qui prend chair: Dieu, comme son Père, dont il est inséparable; homme parfait, comme un mortel d'entre nous. Assumant et assumé, deux natures, une personne – le Christ historique, d'un mot. L'Esprit – Saint forme son temple, le conduit au désert, le ressuscite. C'est lui, cet Homme-Dieu, qui est glorifié; c'est lui qui viendra juger le monde."

[41] *Ibid.*, 117 f.

[42] "La doctrine christologique de Théodore de Mopsueste (à propos d'une publication récente)," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 14 (1934), 161–190; *s.v.* Théodore de Mopsueste, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 15 (1943), 235–279.

[43] Devreesse, *Essai*, 5–42, 53–93, gives the necessary bibliography.

elements in the Eucharist are only figuratively the real body and blood of Christ.[44]

In the same vein, but more thorough and more detailed is the judgment of Wilhelm de Vries, who finds Theodore's dogmatic position unsatisfactory on several counts.[45] He is of the opinion that the chief error of Theodore is his denial of the true incarnation of the Son of God, his refusal to recognize that God truly became man in Christ and that God and man in Christ are one. In distinguishing between him who assumes and him who is assumed, and in stating categorically that these two are not the same, Theodore, according to de Vries, imperils the whole doctrine of salvation and of the sacraments.[46] Moreover, he says, Theodore in the *περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως*,[47] asserts that since no *φύσις* (nature) can exist without an hypostasis and no hypostasis, without a *πρόσωπον*, and since the two natures of the person are both complete, there must be in Jesus Christ two *πρόσωπα*, one of the Logos and another of the humanity.[48] Thus, Theodore lacked a true conception of the *communicatio idiomatum*, actually taught that there were two persons in Christ, denied original sin and its consequences, and, by refusing to recognize that Christ is truly God (since God only dwells in him), made a mere man, and not God, the cause of our salvation. This means, he believes, that the participation of mankind in the humanity of Jesus Christ, who, according to Theodore, is only the adoptive Son of God, gives us no *consortium divinae naturae*. Theodore's ideas on the sacraments follow the same pattern and in effect contravene the teaching of the Church that we become united with Christ in this world through baptism, or that there is a Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, or that the sacraments in general have more than symbolic value. De Vries admits that Theodore constantly made use of acceptable language

[44] "Le 'Liber ad baptizandos' de Théodore de Mopsueste," *Échos d'Orient*, 34 (1935), 257–271 (by "Liber ad baptizandos" Jugie means the various catechetical orations published by Mingana and Tonneau); *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium*, 5 (Paris, 1935), 90–91, 296–299, 308–311, 318 f.

[45] "Der 'Nestorianismus' Theodors von Mopsuestia in seiner Sakramentenlehre," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* (abbreviated below as OCP), 7 (1941), 91–148; *Sakramententheologie bei den Nestorianern* (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 133 [Rome, 1947]), index, *s.v.*

[46] OCP, *loc. cit.*, 92 f.; Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies*, 5, 198, 82; cf. 142, 38; 208, 91; 206, 90.

[47] Many of the criticisms made against Theodore stand the test of modern critical methods. But the passage on which de Vries relies here, taken from Leontius of Byzantium, does Theodore a great injustice, as is brilliantly demonstrated by Marcel Richard, "La tradition des fragments du traité *περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως* de Théodore de Mopsueste," *Le Muséon*, 56 (1943), 64 f.; *idem*, "L'introduction du mot 'hypostase' dans la théologie de l'incarnation," *Mélanges de Science Religieuse*, 2 (1945), 21–29.

[48] OCP, 93 f.

in expounding Christology and the sacraments, but claims that, despite this fact, he always abandons the teaching of the Church for the rationalistic and heretical exegesis of the Antiochene School, of which he was the foremost spokesman.[49]

From the strictly theological standpoint de Vries's strictures have great merit. The flaw in his argument, however, is that he oversimplifies the historical situation here and fails to demonstrate at any given point that the theories of Theodore which he reprehends as heretical could have been recognized as such by Theodore or his contemporaries. He offers no proof that during Theodore's lifetime the doctrine of the Person of Christ, of the relation between φύσις, ὑπόστασις, and πρόσωπον, had been formulated in any juridical or oecumenical way. Theodore died in 428, and therefore can hardly be criticized for not following the mandate of the Third Oecumenical Council of Ephesus (431), even if it were possible to determine what, if any, truly oecumenical decisions were reached at that time, in view of the bifurcation of the Council into two sections, one consisting of the partisans of Cyril of Alexandria and the other of the Antiochene group led by John of Antioch and Nestorius.[50] Likewise, it would be improper to condemn Theodore for failure to adhere to the Compromise Formula of 433, to which both John of Antioch and Cyril found it possible to subscribe, or to the Christological Symbol of the Fourth Oecumenical Council of 451.

Thus, we are faced with the problem as to whether Justinian and the Fifth Council of 553 were guilty of the same kind of anachronistic mistake. Unlike the Council of Chalcedon, which gave its oecumenical sanction to only two of Cyril's writings (the *Epistula dogmatica ad Nestorium* and the *Epistula ad orientales*),[51] Justinian's theologians in 553 endorsed also Cyril's *Twelve Anathemas* against Nestorius (the so-called *Epistula Synodica*), which clearly and unambiguously rejected the doctrine of the *assumptus homo*[52] and the premises underlying the Antiochene Christology. It is

[49] OCP, 94, 96, 99 f., 102–106, 108, 111, 123 f., 127, 132, 136–138.

De Vries occasionally refers (OCP, 97 f., 100, 104 f., 106–108) to Theodore's statements on the immortality, incorruptibility, and immutability of Christ, but without analysis, historical interpretation, or discussion of their true significance.

[50] Adhémar d'Alès, *Le dogme d'Éphèse* (Paris, 1931), 155 ff.; Friedrich Loofs, *Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge, England, 1914), 53 f., 94 f.

[51] The two documents of Cyril approved at Chalcedon (*Epistolae* 4 and 39) are to be found in MPG, 77, 44–49, 173–81; Eduard Schwartz, ACO, 1.1.1, 25–28; 1.1.4, 15–20; 1.2, 37–39, 104–107; 1.5, 49–51, 334–340. Cf. Mansi, 6, 960AB, 973C; 7, 113BC; 8, 821E–822E. See Hubert du Manoir de Juaye, *Dogme et spiritualité chez Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1944), 515 f.; Loofs, *op. cit.*, 97 f.

[52] Justinian and the Fifth Oecumenical Council expressly rejected the view set forth repeatedly by Theodore that the Logos joined himself to, or assumed, a man: Ed. Schwartz,

often said that Justinian's condemnation of the *Three Chapters* was intended to mollify the Monophysites and to win their loyalty to the Empire. This is a large question and will be treated *in extenso* in the book of which the present paper is an excerpt. As far as the anathematization of the works of Theodore is concerned, however, there can be no doubt that Justinian was addressing himself to a purely theological matter that had no specifically political implications.

Theodore's soteriology was closely bound up with his view of Christ as achieving immortality at the resurrection. God, he says, pronounced judgment against Satan, while

> He raised Christ our Lord from the dead, and made Him immortal and immutable, and took Him up to heaven. And He vouchsafed to all the (human) race, while still on the earth, the joy of (His) gifts so that no room might be left to Satan from which to inflict injuries on us.[53]

This is a commonplace in Theodore and occurs countless times.

> He [Jesus Christ] was also baptised so that He might perform the Economy of the Gospel according to order, and in this (Economy) He died and abolished death. It was easy and not difficult for God to have made Him at once immortal, incorruptible and immutable as He became after His resurrection, but because it was not He alone whom He wished to make immortal and immutable, but us also who are partakers of His nature, He rightly, and on account of this association, did not so make the firstfruits of us all in order that, as the blessed Paul said, "He might have the pre-eminence in all things" [Col. 1.18]. In this way, because of the communion that we have with Him in this world, we will, with justice, be partakers with Him of the future good things. . .

74.32–35, 88.3–7; MPG, 86.1, 997C, 1011B; n.b. anathemas 2, 3, 14: Mansi, 9, 377AB, 385D–388B; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, 3.1, 107 ff., 128 ff.

The attempts of modern theologians like F. Déodat de Basly (*La Christiade Française* [2 vols., Paris, 1927], supported by a series of learned and ingenious but unconvincing articles in *La France Franciscaine*, 11 [1928], 265–313; 12 [1929], 125–160; 17 [1934], 418–473, etc., which were analyzed at length by Auguste Gaudel, *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 17 [1937], 64–90, 214–234; 18 [1938], 45–71, 201–217) and Léon Seiller (*La psychologie humaine du Christ et l'unicité de personne* [Paris, 1949], published also in *Franziskanische Studien*, 1949, and reviewed adversely by P. Galtier, *Gregorianum*, 31 [1950], 457 f.) to prove that the Orthodox Church, East and West, has always endorsed the patently Nestorian doctrine of the *assumptus homo* are quite unsuccessful, as I hope to show on another occasion. H. Diepen, "De Assumptus-Homo-theologie. Een onderzoek naar de Christologie van R. P. Déodat de Basly, O.F.M.," 1948, I know only from the note in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 25 (1949), 481.

[53] Translated from the Syriac by Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies*, 6, 29; Tonneau, *Homélies*, 355: "et (Dieu) . . . condamna l'usurpateur (τύραννος) en raison de la volonté perverse qu'il avait montré contre lui (le Christ) et contre toute notre race, et il émit contre lui une sentence. Il ressuscita alors d'entre les morts Notre-Seigneur le Christ, le fit immortel et immuable et le fit monter au ciel. Dès lors il proposa pour tout le genre (humain, γένος) la jouissance des dons, en sorte qu'il ne restât plus au démon même la moindre occasion de nous nuire."

We also when we are baptised show (in ourselves) the symbol of the world to come; we die with Him in baptism, and we rise symbolically with Him, and we endeavour to live according to His law in the hope of the future good things which we expect to share with Him at the resurrection from the dead. If Christ our Lord had immediately after his rising from the dead, raised also all men who had previously died, and had bestowed upon them new life fully and immediately, we should have been in no need of doing anything; as, however, He actually performed only on Himself the renewal which is to come and through which He rose from the dead and His body became immortal and His soul immutable, it became necessary that this decrepit and mortal world should last further in order that mankind might believe in Him and receive the hope of communion (with Him) and future life.[54]

In these words the importance for human salvation of the immortality, incorruptibility, and immutability conferred upon Christ by the resurrection is strongly emphasized. A few more texts are of interest, both to confirm those already cited and to illustrate Theodore's sharp division between the Logos and the human Jesus Christ, which, it must be said, gives the impression of a Jesus Christ consisting of two persons. In his treatment of the sacrament of baptism, Theodore says:

The things that the ancients held as figures and shadows came now into reality when our Lord Jesus Christ, who was assumed from us and for us, died according to the human law, and through His resurrection became immortal, incorruptible and for ever immutable, and as such ascended into heaven, as by His union with our nature He became to us an earnest of our own participation in the event. In saying: "If Christ rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead [1 Cor. 15, 12]," (the Apostle) clearly showed that it was necessary for all to believe that there is a resurrection, and in believing in it we had also to believe that we will equally clearly participate in it. As we have a firm belief that things that have already happened will happen to us, so [the things that happened at the resurrection of our Lord] we believe that they will happen to us.[55]

Theodore seems completely to have lost sight here of the presence of the Logos in the person of Christ. His Jesus Christ seems hardly more than a man, ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος. Similarly, further along, Theodore adds:

And He [the man assumed from us] became for ever immune from death, and immortal and incorruptible by nature. And as such He ascended into heaven and became for ever beyond the reach of the harm and injury of Satan, who was thus unable to do any harm to a man who was immortal, incorruptible and immutable, and who dwelt in heaven and possessed a close union with the Divine nature.[56]

[54] *Woodbrooke Studies*, 5, 69 f.; Tonneau, *Homélies*, 151–153.
[55] *Woodbrooke Studies*, 6, 19 f.; Tonneau, *Homélies*, 331.
[56] *Woodbrooke Studies*, 6, 22; Tonneau, *Homélies*, 337.

At one point, in comparing the sacrament of baptism to the death (during the baptism itself and immersion into the water) and resurrection (in rising out of the water) of the Lord, he goes so far as to say that

> you have been born and have become a new man; you are no more part of Adam who was mutable and burdened and made wretched by sin, but of Christ who was completely freed from sin through resurrection, while even before it He never drew nigh unto it. It was congruous that (this sinless state) should have had its beginning in Him before (His resurrection), and that at His resurrection He should fully receive an immutable nature. In this way He confirmed to us the resurrection from the dead and our participation in incorruptibility.[57]

Otherwise, he no doubt felt, Christ could not have been a complete and perfect man, and could not have held out to all men the hope of eternal life.

Several attempts have been made to reconstruct from the extant Syriac the original text of the Nicene Creed[58] that Theodore expounded in his catechetical orations. All of these differ slightly from each other but all agree that Theodore's Creed, not to be confused with the *Symbolum fidei* ascribed to him by the Fifth Council,[59] bore closer resemblance to the so-called Symbol of 381 than to that of 325, and lacked the anathemas in which the fathers of 325 denounced the Arian doctrine that Christ was τρεπτός. The Creed of 325 is so frequently cited in the early centuries of the church together with

[57] *Woodbrooke Studies*, 6, 67; Tonneau, *Homélies*, 455: "Tu es né et devenu complètement autre; tu n'es plus dès lors partie de (cet) Adam, qui est changeant, – parce que accablé de péchés et malheureux, – mais (tu es partie) du Christ, qui fut absolument exempt (de l'atteinte) du péché par la résurrection, n'en ayant même fait aucun depuis le commencement, parce qu'il convenait que cela aussi fût aussi en lui à titre primordial; mais, par la résurrection, c'est complètement qu'il reçoit la nature immuable. Par conséquent, pour nous aussi, il confirme la résurrection d'entre les morts et la participation à l'incorruptibilité."

[58] Devreesse, *Essai*, 103, n. 3; *idem*, "Les instructions catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 13 (1933), 425–427; J. Lebon, "Les anciens symboles dans la définition de Chalcédoine," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 32 (1936), 835–840. A. Rücker, *Ritus Baptismi et Missae, quem descripsit Theodorus Ep. Mopsuestenus in sermonibus catecheticis* (*Opuscula et Textus historiam ecclesiae eiusque vitam atque doctrinam illustrantia, Series liturgica*, edd. R. Stapper et A. Rücker, [Münster, 1933]), 43 f. See also J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 187 f.

[59] *Essai*, 256 f.; see index, *s.v. symbole*. Devreesse accepts as Theodore's no *symbolum fidei* except that included in the commentary on the Nicene Creed. He denies the authenticity of the creed attributed to Theodore by Marius Mercator and condemned as Theodore's by Justinian, the Fifth Council, and Leontius, and believes that it is improper to associate this latter document with Theodore in any way whatsoever. W. de Vries, *loc. cit.*, on the other hand, while uncertain whether it was actually penned by Theodore himself, is of the opinion that the theological notions it contains may properly be traced back to him. Kelly, *loc. cit.* (in previous note), rightly draws attention to the striking resemblance between the creed rejected by Devreesse and the Nestorian symbol reconstructed by C. P. Caspari, *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete u. wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols u. d. Glaubensregeln*, 1 (Christiania, 1866), 116 ff.; G. Ludwig Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole u. Glaubensregeln d. alten kirche*, (3rd ed., Breslau, 1897), no. 132 (pp. 144–146).

its anathemas that it is difficult to understand why Theodore was unaware of the unacceptability of his doctrine of ἄτρεπτος, although the Creed does occur occasionally without the anathemas. It is of some interest that Nestorius apparently meant by the "Nicene Creed" a formula like the so-called Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which, with the exception of the hybrid symbol given by Epiphanius in his *Panarion*, regularly omits the anathemas.[60] None of Theodore's modern critics has noted the relevance of the Nicene anathemas to a true appraisal of Theodore's Christology. But Justinian, whose talents in this field have often been misunderstood, depreciated, and scorned, was too acute a theologian to miss so obvious a point. What he was doing was to judge Theodore by the criterion of the *Symbolum fidei* to which all churchmen professed allegiance, and which was by universal assent the infallible criterion of orthodoxy, always cited by all sides.

The Council of 325 intended by its anathema of those who regarded Christ as τρεπτός to condemn the view that Jesus Christ like a man made a choice between good and evil by virtue of his freedom of the will, and could even have chosen sin and error had he willed to do so. This can be proved by the pronouncement made earlier in 325 when the Council of fifty-six bishops from Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine that met at Antioch to appoint a successor to Philogonius took it upon itself to formulate an anti-Arian creed rejecting such a conception.[61] Since this material was first published

[60] Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 318 f.; Francis J. Badcock, *History of the Creeds* (2d ed., London, 1938), 195 f., 209; cf. P. T. Camelot, "'Symbole de Nicée,'" OCP, 13 (1947), 425 ff.

Eduard Schwartz, "Das Nicaenum u. das Constantinopolitanum auf der Synode von Chalkedon," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 25 (1926), 38–88; J. Lebon, "Les anciens symboles dans la définition de Chalcédoine," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 32 (1936), 809–876; *idem*, "Nicée-Constantinople, les premiers symboles de foi," *ibid.*, 537–547; A. d'Alès, "Nicée. Constantinople, les premiers symboles de foi," *Recherches de science religieuse*, 26 (1936), 85–92. Cf. Ignacio Ortiz de Urbina, *El Símbolo Niceno* (Madrid, 1947); *idem*, "Textus Symboli Nicaeni," OCP, 2 (1936), 330–350.

For rare instances of the omission of the anathemas from the Nicene Creed, see the Latin version quoted by Pope Leo I in his letter to the Emperor Leo I (*Ep.* 165), ed. Schwartz, ACO, 2.4, 114.18 ff.; MPL, 54, 1159B (Latin), 1160B (Greek); Cuthbert H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima, canonum et conciliorum Graecorum interpretationes Latinae*, 1.2.1 (Oxford, 1913), 306. But cf. (with anathemas) *ibid.*, 298 f., 304–305, 307, 309–320. Note also *ibid.*, 300, where one manuscript omits the *et mutabilem uel conuertibilem esse Filium Dei*, and 308, a copy of the Creed taken from Cyril, *Epistola* 1, in which Cyril fails to give the anathemas: MPG, 77, 16C; Mansi, 5, 479 f.; Schwartz, ACO, 1.1.1, 12.32–13.5; 1.3, 6.4–11. Cyril gives the anathemas in *Epp.* 4 and 55, for which see nn. 51 and 106. Other quotations of the Creed with anathemas can be found in Schwartz, ACO, 1.1.4, 51.19–29; 1.3, 28.12–22, 60.31–61.5, 120.38–121.10.

[61] Erich Seeberg, *Die Synode von Antiochien im Jahre 324/25. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Konzils von Nicäa* (*Neue Studien zur Geschichte d. Theologie u. d. Kirche*, 16 [Berlin, 1913]), gives a review of the evidence and of the controversy. H. G. Opitz has now fixed the date definitely as 325: "Die Zeitfolge des Arianischen Streites von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 328," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 33 (1934), 151.

by Schwartz in 1905 its authenticity has been doubted, principally by Harnack and Nau, but authorities now agree that the Syriac texts which are our sole extant authorities for this pre-Nicene Synod, are genuine and reliable.[62] In any case, the text itself is clearly anterior to the Nicene Creed (which is a much crisper and more formal document) and undoubtedly represents the theological ideas of early opponents of Arius. The anathemas of this Antiochene formulary do not deviate substantially from those of Nicaea but they are slightly fuller in form and, hence, give added precision to the condemnation of the use of τρεπτός for Christ. At Nicaea the fathers wrote:

those who say, there was when when he was not, and, he did not exist before he was made, and that he was created out of nothing, or who assert that the Son of God is of a different substance or essence, or is created or mutable or changeable – these the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.[63]

But the Antiochene anathema of the use of τρεπτός as a description of Christ is much more explicit:

In addition [we anathematize] those who hold that he is immutable by reason of his free will, and likewise those who derive his birth from nothing and claim that He is not immutable by nature like the Father. For our Savior has been taught to be the image of the Father in all respects, but especially in this.[64]

The bishops at Antioch indubitably meant to repudiate the Arian contention that Christ could conceivably have chosen the wrong path if he had wished to do so.

Obviously the same interpretation is valid in the exegesis of τρεπτός in the Nicene Symbol. Schwartz maintains that Constantine I, knowing of the work of the Council of Antioch of 325, purposely forced a verdict at Nicaea that

[62] Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 208 f.; Monald Goemans, *Het algemeen concilie in de vierde eeuw* (Nijmegen-Utrecht, 1945), 26 f.

[63] See n. 68; cf. C. H. Turner, *History and Use of Creeds and Anathemas* (London, 1906).

[64] The Greek version was prepared by E. Schwartz on the basis of the Syriac, "Zur Geschichte des Athanasius VI," *Nachrichten von d. königl. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologisch-historische Kl. (1905), 277.8 ff.; reprinted by Hans Georg Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, 3.1.1 (Berlin–Leipzig, 1934), 39.16–40.2: . . . ἀναθεματίζοντες ἐκείνους, οἳ λέγουσιν ἢ νομίζουσιν ἢ κηρύττουσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ κτίσμα ἢ γενητὸν ἢ ποιητὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῶς γέννημα εἶναι ἢ ὅτι ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν · ἡμεῖς γὰρ, ὅτι ἦν καὶ ἔστιν καὶ ὅτι φῶς ἐστιν, πιστεύομεν · προσέτι δὲ κἀκείνους οἳ τῇ αὐτεξουσίῳ θελήσει αὐτοῦ ἄτρεπτον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἡγοῦνται, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος παράγοντες τὴν γέννησιν, καὶ μὴ φύσει ἄτρεπτον κατὰ τὸν πατέρα. εἰκὼν γὰρ ὡς ἐν πᾶσιν, οὕτως καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τῷδε τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκηρύχθη ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν. Cf. also *ibid.*, 3 ff.: ἀλλὰ κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς υἱὸν λέγουσιν αὐτὸν αἱ γραφαὶ γεννηθέντα, ὥστε καὶ πιστεύομεν ἄτρεπτον εἶναι καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον αὐτὸν οὐδὲ θελήσει ἢ θέσει γεννηθῆναι ἢ γενέσθαι, ὥστε ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος αὐτὸν εἶναι φαίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καθὸ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰκός, οὐδ' ὅπερ οὐ θέμις ἐννοεῖν καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἢ φύσιν ἢ μῖξιν οὐδενὸς τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ γενομένων . . .

would be independent of the episcopal decision made at Antioch, and show the superiority of the imperial to the episcopal or even conciliar authority.[65] Actually, apart from the lack of the Nicene ὁμοούσιος in the Antiochene decree and a few other minor variations, the two creeds do not differ radically. In any case, the anathemas of both are very similar, and in the condemnation of τρεπτός the Nicene version departs from its predecessor only by being more terse.

That τρεπτός is to be understood in the same sense in both formulae is demonstrated by incontestable contemporary evidence. Earliest in point of time is the Ἐπιστολὴ τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου κατὰ Ἀρείου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ, copies of which are preserved by Athanasius in his *De decretis Nicaenae synodi*,[66] as well as by the ecclesiastical historians, Gelasius, Socrates, and Theodoretus.[67] According to Athanasius the Council of Nicaea anathematized the view that the Son of God was free by exercise of his will to choose either evil or virtue.[68] Neither τρεπτός nor ἄτρεπτος is mentioned at this

[65] Eduard Schwartz, "Zur Geschichte des Athanasius VII," *Nachrichten von d. königl. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologisch-historische Kl. (1908), 370 ff.

[66] Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, 2.1.3 (Berlin–Leipzig, 1935), 35.8–37.2.

[67] Socrates, *H.E.*, 1.9.1, MPG, 67, 77C; Gelasius, *H.E.*, 2, 34, 4, edd. Gerhard Loeschke et Margret Heinemann (Leipzig, 1918), 121.5–11; cf. Theodoretus, *H.E.*, 1, 9, 4, ed. Léon Parmentier (Leipzig, 1911), 39.2–7; MPG, 82, 928C.

[68] *De decretis Nicaenae synodi*, 36, 3, ed. Opitz, *op. cit.*, 2.1.3, 35.18 ff.: καὶ παμψηφὶ ἔδοξεν ἀναθεματισθῆναι τὴν ἀσεβῆ αὐτοῦ [*sc.* Ἀρείου] δόξαν καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ βλάσφημα, οἷς ἐκέχρητο βλασφημῶν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, λέγων 'ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἶναι' καὶ 'πρὶν γεννηθῆναι μὴ εἶναι' καὶ 'εἶναί ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν,' καὶ αὐτεξουσιότητι κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος καὶ κτίσμα ὀνομάζοντος καὶ ποίημα. Comparison with the actual anathemas in the Nicene Creed itself, as quoted by Athanasius a few lines farther on (*op. cit.*, 36.40 ff.), show that the intention in the last clause here is to anathematize the Arian use of τρεπτός. τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας 'ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν' ἢ 'οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῇ' ἢ 'ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο' ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι ἢ κτιστὸν ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τοὺς τοιούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

This version of the anathemas differs only very slightly from the usually accepted oecumenical version. The Creed itself with anathemas runs as follows (ed. Schwartz, ACO, 1.1.7, 65.15–26; Schwartz gives the Latin form of the same in ACO, 1.3, 120.38–121.10): πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς οὐρανούς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας· ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἀποστολικὴ καὶ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

See also the expanded version of the Creed prepared by Athanasius to solemnize his conviction that the Holy Spirit is of the same essence as the Father and the Son: ACO, 1.1.7, 66. 10–34; MPG, 26, 1232 ABC.

juncture, but the context makes it perfectly clear that it is the τρεπτός of the Nicene anathema to which these authors have reference.

ATHANASIUS

For Athanasius, as for the Nicene party in general, this was a vital question. They did not of course deny that Jesus Christ as τέλειος ἄνθρωπος was endowed with a free will, nor had they the slightest intention of imposing any limitations upon the Godhead. What they would not tolerate was the hypothesis that Christ might conceivably have failed in any way to be what he was, or might possibly have made any choice at variance with those recorded in the Gospels. Hence, they fought strenuously against the Arian notion that Christ's sinlessness was the result of the exercise of his will. This, Athanasius said, would be to make Christ's divinity and resurrection a reward for proper discipline and would in effect do away with his eternal divinity, his Sonship, and his unity with God:

> It is obvious that all men [have become sons of God] through him and he before all, or rather, that he is the sole true Son, who alone is true God of true God, having this rank, not as a reward of virtue, nor as one who is alien to it, but being divine by nature, by essence. For he is the Son begotten of the essence of the Father, so that none may doubt that, like the immutable Father, the Logos also is immutable. . . . For he was not advanced from a lower state to a higher one, but rather, being God, took the form of a Servant (cf. Isaiah 53, Philippians 2.5 ff.), and in taking it was not elevated but humbled himself. Where then in all this is there a reward for virtue, or what progress or improvement is there in humiliation? [69]

[69] *Oratio I contra Arianos*, 39 f., MPG, 26, 93ABC: δῆλον ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ μὲν οἱ πάντες, αὐτὸς δὲ πρὸ πάντων, μᾶλλον δὲ μόνον αὐτὸς ἀληθινὸς υἱός, καὶ μόνος ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ θεὸς ἀληθινός ἐστιν, οὐ μισθὸν ἀρετῆς ταῦτα λαβών, οὐδὲ ἄλλος ὢν παρὰ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ φύσει, κατ' οὐσίαν ὢν ταῦτα. γέννημα γὰρ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας ὑπάρχει, ὥστε μηδένα ἀμφιβάλλειν, ὅτι καθ' ὁμοιότητα τοῦ ἀτρέπτου πατρὸς ἄτρεπτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ λόγος . . . οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἐλαττόνων βελτίων γέγονεν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον θεὸς ὑπάρχων τὴν δούλου μορφὴν ἔλαβε, καὶ ἐν τῷ λαβεῖν οὐκ ἐβελτιώθη, ἀλλ' ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν. ποῦ τοίνυν ἐν τούτοις μισθὸς τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἢ ποία προκοπὴ καὶ βελτίωσις ἐν ταπεινώσει;

In the references that follow, the *Oratio I contra Arianos* will be abbreviated by the letters C.A. The first number thereafter indicates the section, the succeeding ones, the columns in MPG, 26.

Most instructive as sources of Athanasian theology are the letters of Bishop Alexander of Alexandria (313–328), approximately seventy of which were known to Epiphanius (*Panarion*, 69, 4, 3 [ed. Karl Holl, 3, 155.25 ff.]). Of the few that have been preserved in the works of other writers, perhaps the most notable is the one addressed to Bishop Alexander of Thessalonike [so designated by Opitz; otherwise spoken of as Alexander of Constantinople], which contains in brief outline most of what Athanasius has to say about the immutability of Christ: Theodoretus, *H.E.*, 1, 4, 1–61, ed. Parmentier, 8 ff.; MPG, 82, 888B–909B; ed. Opitz, *op. cit.*, 3.1.1, Urk. 14, 19–29; n.b., for the immutability of Christ and Athanasius's treatment of this subject in the *Oratio I contra Arianos* and the *De decretis Nicaenae synodi*: 21.11–22, 24.11–24, 25.1–5, 27.1 f., 13 f. Cf. Alexander's letter to all the bishops of the church, *ibid.*, Urk. 4b, 8.2 f., 7–10; 9.7 ff.; Socrates, *H.E.*, 1, 6, MPG, 67, 44A–52A; Gelasius, *H.E.*, 2, 3, 1–21, edd. Loeschke and Heinemann, 34.22–40.18.

This passage epitomizes Athanasius's argument against the Arian doctrine of the mutability of Christ. But in view of the high importance he himself attached to this polemic, which occupies the greater part of his first *Oratio contra Arianos*, and in view of the fact that his theory of the ἀτρεπτότης of Christ became normative for the Byzantine Church, it will be instructive to analyze his treatment of this subject with some care.

Unless Christ is to be likened to wood or a stone, the Arians contended, he must be mutable and have freedom to choose either good or evil, as he wishes. This proposition Athanasius attacked in the first instance because it rested on the Arian thesis, abominated by him and the Orthodox Church, that Christ was a created being (κτιστόν). If, he asks, the Logos were mutable and changeable, when would he come to rest, and when would he cease to progress? And how could the mutable be like the immutable? Were the Logos mutable, and his will undependable, he would be constantly changing, and could not be the image of the Father. Nor would Christ ever have said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14.9), unless he were, like the Father, immutable and changeless. Moreover, if he were mutable and if he made progress daily, he would not be perfect.

But, how could he not be perfect [exclaims Athanasius], who is equal to God? Or how could he not be immutable who is one with God and the true Son of his essence? Since the essence of the Father is immutable, immutable also would he be who is the truly begotten of his Father's essence,[70] . . . even as the entire Trinity is perfect, immutable, and unchangeable.[71]

For a harsh judgment on the theology of Athanasius, see Marcel Richard, "Saint Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens," *Mélanges de science religieuse*, 4 (1947), 5–54, who argues that Athanasius made no provision for the human soul in Christ, and never realized the inadequacies of a Christology that did not so provide. Louis Bouyer, *L'Incarnation et l'église – corps du Christ dans la théologie de Saint Athanase* (Paris, 1943), 102 ff., tries to show that Athanasius does not deny Christ a human soul.

[70] C.A., 35, 84A–85B: *'αὐτεξούσιός ἐστιν ἢ οὐκ ἔστι; προαιρέσει κατὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον καλός ἐστι, καὶ δύναται, ἐὰν θελήσῃ, τραπῆναι, τρεπτῆς ὢν φύσεως· ἢ ὡς λίθος καὶ ξύλον οὐκ ἔχει τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐλευθέραν εἰς τὸ κινεῖσθαι καὶ ῥέπειν εἰς ἑκάτερα;' . . . εἰ γὰρ τρεπτὸς καὶ ἀλλοιούμενός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος, ποῖ ἄρα στήσεται, καὶ ποῖον αὐτοῦ τὸ τέλος ἔσται τῆς ἐπιδόσεως; ἢ πῶς ὅμοιος τῷ ἀτρέπτῳ ὁ τρεπτὸς εἶναι δυνήσεται; πῶς δὲ ὁ τὸν τρεπτὸν ἑωρακὼς ἑωρακέναι τὸν ἄτρεπτον νομίσειεν; ἐν ποίᾳ δὲ ἄρα ἐὰν γένηται καταστάσει, δυνήσεταί τις τὸν πατέρα ἐν αὐτῷ βλέπειν; δῆλον γὰρ ὡς οὐκ ἀεί τις ὄψεται ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν πατέρα, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ τρέπεσθαι τὸν υἱόν, καὶ ἀλλοιουμένης αὐτὸν εἶναι φύσεως. ὁ μὲν γὰρ πατὴρ ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος, καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχει, καὶ ὁ αὐτός ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς εἰ κατ' ἐκείνους τρεπτός, καὶ οὐκ ἀεὶ ὁ αὐτός, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ ἀλλοιουμένης φύσεώς εστι, πῶς ὁ τοιοῦτος εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι δύναται, οὐκ ἔχων τὸ ὅμοιον τῆς ἀτρεψίας; πῶς δὲ καὶ ὅλως ἐν τῷ πατρί ἐστιν, ἀμφίβολον ἔχων τὴν προαίρεσιν; τάχα δὲ καὶ τρεπτὸς ὤν, καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν προκόπτων, οὔπω τέλειός ἐστιν. ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν τοιαύτη τῶν 'Αρειανῶν οἰχέσθω μανία, ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια λαμπέτω, καὶ δεικνύτω τούτους παραφρονοῦντας. πῶς γὰρ οὐ τέλειος, ὁ ἴσος θεῷ; ἢ πῶς οὐκ ἄτρεπτος, ὁ μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἓν ὤν, καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἴδιος ὢν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ; τῆς δὲ οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς οὔσης ἀτρέπτου, ἄτρεπτον ἂν εἴη καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἴδιον γέννημα. εἰ δὲ τούτου οὕτως ὄντος, τοῦ λόγου τροπὴν καταψεύδονται, μανθανέτωσαν ποῦ τούτων ὁ λόγος κινδυνεύει· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ καὶ τὸ δένδρον ἐπιγινώσκεται· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς*

The Son is unvarying like the Father, Athanasius argues,[72] even after his incarnation, and discloses his changelessness and immutability to those who might think that he was altered by his union with flesh and had become something different from what he had always been. Created beings arise out of nothing, have no existence before creation, and are unstable by nature. But the Son is the eternal Wisdom; the cause of change in creation, he himself remains immutable.[73]

He then goes on to grapple with the Arian exegesis of Biblical texts that deal with the exaltation of Christ. The Arians took Philippians 2.9 ("Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name") and Psalm 45.7 ("Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows") to mean that Christ received grace, was exalted and anointed as a reward for the wise use he had made of his freedom, and was thus proved to have been of a mutable nature.[74] But, it is objected, this would mean that Christ, having won his Sonship by virtue and progress, could not have been the true God or genuine Son of God, since those who are called sons by reason of virtue and grace are not really sons by nature or being and can forfeit their sonship by misbehavior.[75] Christ then could not have been the Son of God according to the essence, but only by the grace imparted to him, whereby the Father is his creator, as he is of all the rest of the universe.[76] He could not, therefore, have been Son of God from the beginning, but only from the time of his incarnation, when he showed obedience even unto death. According to this interpretation, it would not be the Son who glorified human flesh but the flesh which glorified him. This reasoning, however, contradicts the Scriptures

---

τὸν υἱὸν ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ γνῶσις γνῶσίς ἐστι τοῦ πατρός. Cf. C.A., 40 and 35, 93B, 85A; MPG, 26, 292B (*Or. c. A.*, 2, 68), 709A (*De synodis*, 16); MPG, 25, 205A, 449C, 456CD.

[71] C.A., 18, 49B, 1097A (*Contra Apollinarium*, 1, 3). Cf. *Epistola ad Episcopos Aegypti et Libyae*, 12, MPG, 25, 564BC: 'καὶ ὅτι τῇ μὲν φύσει τρεπτός ἐστι, τῷ δὲ ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ὡς βούλεται, μένει καλός· ὅτε μέντοι θέλει, δύναται τρέπεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ πάντα. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ θεός, προγινώσκων ἔσεσθαι καλὸν αὐτόν, προλαβὼν ταύτην αὐτῷ τὴν δόξαν δέδωκεν, ἣν ἂν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔσχε μετὰ ταῦτα. ὥστε ἐξ ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὧν προέγνω ὁ θεός, τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν νῦν γεγονέναι.' 565 B: οὐ γάρ ἐστι τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδιον καὶ φύσει γέννημα ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς χάριτι γέγονεν. Cf. *ibid.*, 13, *ibid.*, 568BC.

[72] On the basis of Hebrews 13.8, Malachi 3.6, Deuteronomy 32.39, Psalm 102.26–28.

[73] C.A., 36, 85BC–88A: [ὁ υἱὸς] γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος δείκνυσι τὴν ταὐτότητα καὶ τὸ ἄτρεπτον ἑαυτοῦ τοῖς νομίζουσι διὰ τὴν σάρκα ἠλλοιῶσθαι αὐτόν, καὶ ἕτερόν τι γεγενῆσθαι . . . ὁ δὲ υἱός, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὤν, καὶ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ ἴδιος, ἀναλλοίωτος καὶ ἄτρεπτός ἐστιν, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ πατήρ. οὐ γὰρ θέμις εἰπεῖν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς ἀτρέπτου τρεπτὸν γεννᾶσθαι λόγον καὶ ἀλλοιουμένην σοφίαν.

[74] C.A., 37, 88BC: εἰ διὰ τοῦτο ὑψώθη, καὶ χάριν ἔλαβε, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κέχρισται, μισθὸν τῆς προαιρέσεως ἔλαβε. προαιρέσει δὲ πράξας, τρεπτῆς ἐστι πάντως φύσεως.

[75] C.A., 37, 89A.

[76] C.A., 38, 89B.

and would make of Christ either something distinct from the Son, God, and Logos, or else a mere man.[77]

For, [says Athanasius], if Christ did not exist [before the incarnation], or if he did exist but afterwards improved, how were all things created through him, or how did the Father delight in him if he were not perfect? . . . Or if he first received adoration after his death, how is it that Abraham worshipped him in his tent (Gen. 18) and Moses in the bush (Exod. 3)? And how did Daniel see ten thousand myriads and thousands upon thousands ministering unto him (Dan. 7.10)? And if, according to them, he gained dignity recently, how is it that the Son referred to the heavenly glory he had before the foundation of the universe when he said, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17.5)? And if he were now exalted for the first time, as they say, how can it be that before this he "Bowed the heavens also, and came down" (Psalm 18.9) . . . If, therefore, the Son had his glory before the creation of the universe and was Lord of glory and the Most High, and descended from heaven, and is ever to be worshipped, then he was not glorified after his descent, but rather himself glorified what stood in need of glorification. And if he descended to improve our lot, he did not receive the titles of Son and God as a reward, but rather himself made us the sons of his Father and by becoming a man himself made men gods.[78]

Next, Christ is shown by further citation of the Scriptures[79] to have been God first and then man.[80] Moreover, we are told, St. Paul in Philippians 2.5–11 teaches that Christ in the incarnation did not advance from an inferior position to a higher one, but rather, as God, took the form of a servant, through which he was not exalted but humbled. This precludes the possibility of Christ's having received any kind of promotion thereby; being from eternity in the Father, he was plainly incapable of further advancement or exaltation.[81] The texts, contrariwise, like Philippians 2.9 (quoted above) according to which "God hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name," refer not to Christ's divinity, but to his humanity, which he glorified and made immortal, and in so doing destroyed the power of death over mankind.[82]

For, just as Christ died and was exalted as a man, so also as a man he is said to receive what he always had as God, in order that the grace thus given might be vouchsafed also to us. For the Logos was not impaired when he took a body, so as to seek to

[77] C.A., 38, 89CD: *φαίνεται γὰρ μηδὲν βελτιώσας αὐτὸς τὴν σάρκα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς δι' αὐτῆς βελτιωθείς, εἴ γε κατὰ τὴν κακόνοιαν αὐτῶν τότε ὑψώθη καὶ υἱὸς ἐλέχθη, ὅτε γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος.*

[78] *Ibid.*, 92AB.

[79] John 1.3, Colossians 1.15–17.

[80] C.A., 39, 92C.

[81] C.A., 40, 93B–96B.

[82] C.A., 41–43, 96B–101B. Similar exegesis is to be found for Proverbs 8.22, Acts 2.36, and Hebrews 3.1–4 in sections 53–64.

obtain grace, but instead even deified what he had put on and conferred this great benefit upon the human race. Being Logos and existing in the form of God, he has always received adoration. Likewise, remaining unchanged, even after becoming man and being called Jesus, he none the less has dominion over all creation, which bends the knee to him in this name, and confesses that the incarnation of the Logos and his submission to death in the flesh in no way discredit his divinity but increase the glory of God the Father.[83]

Athanasius applies the same method of interpretation to the unction mentioned in Psalm 45.7 ("Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Therefore, God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness") and to the benefits of Christ's baptism, both of which he ascribes, not to him who was already God and Son and King and Logos, but to the humanity that was joined to him in the incarnation and was thus ennobled, freed from sin, and made immortal by the Logos without a transformation of his nature.[84]

Jesus Christ, [he says, citing Hebrews 13.8], is the same yesterday, today, and forever, and remains immutable. It is the same who gives and who receives, giving as the Logos of God, and receiving as man. For it is not the Logos, as Logos, who is the beneficiary of improvement, since he has had everything from all eternity, but mankind, who in him and through him have the source of all gifts.[85]

The first half of the above-cited seventh verse of Psalm 45 ("Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity") was taken by the Arians as proof of Christ's mutability. But, replies Athanasius, this passage really proves the contrary and demonstrates that Christ was not subject to change. It is true of men, he says, that some have transgressed and some have disobeyed. They are so inconstant that often a man who had been good or just at one time might at another be bad or unjust. Accordingly, there was need for one who was invariable, so that men might then have before them the unvarying exemplar of the justice of the Logos as a spur to virtue. Since the first Adam erred and with his sin brought death into the world, it was needful that the second Adam be immutable and thus empower mankind to gain the same victory over sin that he had won by reason of his immutability and invariability.

Very properly, therefore, the Lord, who is from eternity immutable by nature and a lover of justice and a hater of evil, was anointed and himself sent so that, being unchangeable and remaining so, he might take mutable flesh, condemn the sin in it, make

[83] C.A., 42, 97C–100A.

[84] C.A., 46–49, 105B–116A: *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ αὐτός ἐστι· καὶ οὐκ ἐπειδὴ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐτράπη* (112B).

[85] C.A., 48, 112C.

it free, and enable men in the future to fulfil the justice of the law in it, and thus be able to say, "We are no longer in the flesh but in the spirit, if the spirit of God dwelleth within us" (Romans 8.9).[86]

Athanasius repudiates the Arian Biblical exegesis in general because it fails to recognize that the Logos has all that the Father has, including the Father's immutability and unchangeableness.

It is not as subject to the laws and to inclination in either direction that he [*sc.* Christ] loves one thing and hates another, as if in fear of falling from grace, should he choose what he ought not and in other ways be shown to be mutable. But since he is God and the Logos of the Father, he is a just judge, who loves virtue, or rather, is the bestower of virtue. Being just and holy by nature, he is therefore said to love justice and hate injustice; or, in other words, he loves and embraces the virtuous and rejects and hates the unrighteous.[87]

Furthermore, Athanasius adds, there are similar texts (Psalm 10.7; 5.6; 86.2; Malachi 1.2 f.; Isaiah 61.8) that describe God the Father as loving justice and hating iniquity, not because God would just as easily choose either alternative, for that is the characteristic of created beings, but because as judge he favors the just over the wicked. So, in this also, the Son is the image of the Father.[88]

This is the way Athanasius presents his argument in the *Oratio I contra Arianos*. In the *De decretis Nicaenae synodi*, he is more concerned to prove that Christ is of the same essence as the Father, (*ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί*) and is begotten of the essence of the Father (*τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός*), as the Nicene Creed plainly declares.[89] He is therefore unlike all *κτίσματα* (creatures) and by nature *ἄτρεπτος*.[90] He had no need to win or achieve by good works what he already was. He was righteous, virtuous, and blameless, not by effort but by nature. The fathers at Nicaea, Athanasius wrote, in refuting Arianism, declared

[86] C.A., 51, 117B–120A.

[87] C.A., 52, 120AB: *ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄτρεπτός ἐστι, καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχει, οὐχ ἁπλῶς, ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ πατήρ . . . ἢ πῶς πάντα τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὸ ἄτρεπτον καὶ τὸ ἀναλλοίωτον τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχει; οὐχ ὡς ὑποκείμενος δὲ νόμοις, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ θάτερα ῥοπὴν ἔχων, τὸ μὲν ἀγαπᾷ, τὸ δὲ μισεῖ, ἵνα μή, φόβῳ τοῦ ἐκπεσεῖν, τὸ ἕτερον προσλαμβάνῃ, καὶ ἄλλως πάλιν τρεπτὸς εἰσάγηται· ἀλλ' ὡς θεὸς ὢν καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρός, κριτής ἐστι δίκαιος καὶ φιλάρετος, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ χορηγὸς ἀρετῆς· δίκαιος οὖν φύσει καὶ ὅσιος ὤν, διὰ τοῦτο ἀγαπᾶν λέγεται δικαιοσύνην καὶ μισεῖν ἀδικίαν . . .*

[88] *Ibid.*, 120B–121A. The references are to the Septuagint.

[89] See the Creed as published by Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, and n. 68 above. The recent and most learned work of Ignacio Ortiz de Urbina, *El Símbolo Niceno* (Madrid, 1947), does not deal with the problem of Christ's mutability.

[90] *De decretis Nicaenae synodi*, 19, 2–20, 2, ed. Opitz, *op. cit.*, 2.1.3, 16.4–37; cf. *ibid.*, 5.23–30 (6, 1); 33.12–17 (35, 14); 30.3 f., 28–36 (33, 8, 12 f.).

the Son to be of the same essence as the Father, so that they might indicate that the Son is of the Father, not only like him but the same in likeness, and so that they might show that the immutability of the Son and his resemblance [to his Father] differ from what we call imitation [of the divine], which we attain by virtue and by keeping the commandments. The bodies of men that are similar to each other can differ in certain respects and be far from each other, as in the relation between the sons of men and their fathers, as it is written of Adam and Seth, the son he begot, who was like his father "after his image" (Genesis 5.3). But the begetting of the Son by the Father is far above human nature, and the Son is not only like, but indivisible from, the Father's essence, and the Son and the Father are one (John 10.30), as he himself said; and the Logos is always in the Father and the Father in the Logos (John 14.10), as the reflection is in the light, for that is what the word means. Accordingly, with this in mind, the Council rightly wrote "of the same essence," in order to overturn the malevolence of the heretics and show that the Logos differs from creatures. Moreover, after writing "of the essence," they at once added, "the holy catholic church anathematizes those who say that the Son of God was *ex nihilo* or created or mutable or a creature or of a different essence." In this way they showed clearly that the words, "of the essence" and "of the same essence," do away with the foolish expressions of impiety, like "created being" and "creature" and "made" and "mutable" and "he did not exist before he was begotten." [91]

The Nicene fathers, Athanasius argues a few pages farther along in the *De decretis*, thought it amounted to the same thing whether they said the Logos "was from God" or from "the essence of God," since they took the word God to mean the essence of his being (cf. Exodus 3.14, where God says of himself Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν). But, they believed, if the Logos were not from God, as a true son would be by nature from his father, but is only said to be of God like created beings in general because of having been created by God, then he would not be of the essence of God, nor would he be Son by essence but by reason of his virtue, just as men are called the children of God by grace. Hence, they concluded that, being the true and sole Son of God, he is of the essence of God, the effulgence of God, inseparable from his essence, and thus immutable and invariable.[92] This being so, he suffers no change at any time, either in his sojourn on earth in the body, or in his experience of hunger, thirst, and fatigue, or in the crucifixion and passion.[93]

This is not the place for a history of the enormous influence that Athana-

[91] *De decretis Nicaenae synodi*, 20, 3–6, ed. Opitz, *op. cit.*, 2.1.3, 17.5–25; MPG, 25, 452BCD: ἀλλ' οἱ ἐπίσκοποι. . . ἠναγκάσθησαν. . . εἰπεῖν καὶ γράψαι, ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱόν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ὅμοιον τὸν υἱόν, ἀλλὰ ταὐτὸν τῇ ὁμοιώσει ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι σημαίνωσι καὶ ἄλλην οὖσαν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁμοίωσιν καὶ ἀτρεψίαν δείξωσι παρὰ τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν λεγομένην μίμησιν, ἣν ἐξ ἀρετῆς διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐντολῶν τήρησιν ἡμεῖς προσλαμβάνομεν.

[92] *De decretis Nicaenae synodi*, 22, 4–23, 2, ed. Opitz, *op. cit.*, 2.1.3, 19.2–17; MPG, 25, 456BCD. Cf. Opitz, 21.1–32, 26.29 ff., 30.32–35.

[93] *Epistola ad Epictetum*, 5, MPG, 26, 1060A. So also pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Apollinarium*, *ibid.*, 1096A, 1112C, 1136A, 1161AB.

sius exerted upon patristic literature. But a few texts will be cited to illustrate the continuity of the tradition between the Creed of Nicaea, as expounded and championed by Athanasius, and the dogmatic decrees of the Emperor Justinian. The immutability of Christ and the unchangeability of his divine essence were axiomatic.

Basil the Great (d. 379) twice quotes the Nicene Creed with its anathemas,[94] frequently expresses great respect for the Council of 325, and says that not a word should be set aside in its Creed, which he esteemed more highly than any of its successors.[95] Christ was, according to him, of the same nature and essence as the Father,[96] and the true Son of the Father by nature (*φύσει*), not by adoption.[97] With obvious reference to the Arian arguments rebutted by Athanasius in the *Oratio I contra Arianos* he interprets John 5.19 ("The Son can do nothing of himself") to mean that, unlike creatures, the Son, who was very justice itself, always did what he wished, and was not the pawn of haphazard decisions made by creatures of unstable and varying constitution.[98] In all this, however, his principal concern is to rebut the Macedonians, who maintained that the Holy Spirit was a creature of a different essence from that of the Father. In dealing with this contention, Basil assumes the results of Nicaea and goes on to prove that the Holy Spirit was of the same essence as the Father and the Son. Thus, in *Epistola* 8, he denies that the Holy Spirit had a mutable nature (*τρεπτὴν οὐσίαν*), and insists that it was consubstantial with the Father and the Son (*ὁμοούσιον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ . . . τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως τῷ πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ*).[99] A few years later, and with the same objective, Epiphanius, in his *Panarion*, likewise taught that all three members of the Trinity were immutable.[100]

Gregory of Nazianzus declares that the Son has all that the Father has

[94] *Epistola* 125, 2; 140, 2: MPG, 32, 548CD, 588CD–589A.

[95] *Ep.* 114, MPG, 32, 529A (*μηδεμίαν τῶν ἐκεῖ λέξεων ἀθετεῖν*); *Ep.* 81, *ibid.*, 457A; *Ep.* 125, 1, *ibid.*, 545BC–548B; *Ep.* 159, 1, *ibid.*, 620B.

[96] *Ep.* 52, 1 ff., *ibid.*, 391C–396A; *Ep.* 159, 1, *ibid.*, 620BC.

[97] *Adversus Eunomium*, 4, MPG, 29, 672A, 689B–692B.

[98] *Ep.* 8, 9, MPG, 32, 261B: *ἀλλὰ καὶ τό, οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν, λαμβάνουσιν οἱ θεομάχοι ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων. ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ῥητὸν μάλιστα καταγγέλλει τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρί. εἰ γὰρ ἕκαστον τῶν λογικῶν κτισμάτων δύναταί τι ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, αὐτεξούσιον ἔχον τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρόν τε καὶ κρεῖττον ῥοπήν, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς οὐ δύναταί τι ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ· οὐ κτίσμα ὁ υἱός. εἰ δὲ μὴ κτίσμα, ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί. καὶ πάλιν, οὐδὲν τῶν κτισμάτων τὰ ὅσα βούλεται δύναται. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πάντα ὅσα ἠθέλησεν ἐποίησεν· οὐκ ἄρα κτίσμα ὁ υἱός. καὶ πάλιν, πάντα τὰ κτίσματα ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων συνέστηκεν, ἢ τῶν ἐναντίων ἐστὶ δεκτικά. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, καὶ ἄϋλός ἐστιν· οὐκ ἄρα κτίσμα ὁ υἱός. εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο, ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί.*

[99] *Ep.* 8, 10 f., MPG, 32, 262C–265B.

[100] *Panarion Haer.*, 69, 26, 4, ed. Karl Holl, 3 (Leipzig, 1933), 176.19 f.; cf. *ibid.*, 157.13, 158.5–10, 159.8 (statements of the Arian view).

(John 16.15), that he is of the Father, consubstantial with him, and immutable. Amphilochius of Iconium, the follower and friend of the Cappadocians, writes in the same vein,[101] while, according to an anonymous homily on the *Hypapante*, once attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, Christ had his Father's essence, and was not subject to change (ἀναλλοίωτος).[102] Didymus the Blind, the famous scholar of Alexandria, who died at the end of the fourth century, describes the ἐνανθρώπησις as ἀτρεπτοτάτη, and says that the Logos became man without change (ἀτρέπτως).[103] Isidore, an ascetic priest from Pelusium, the provincial capital of Augustamnica Prima, also maintains that the Logos remained immutable despite the incarnation. Similarly, Theodotus, Bishop of Ancyra, a contemporary and ally of Cyril in the struggle against Nestorius, in his Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὸ Σύμβολον, repeats the Nicene anathemas, and denies that the Logos suffered change at the incarnation.[104]

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

Of greater interest and importance are the works of Isidore's great fellow African, Cyril of Alexandria. Like his predecessors, Cyril stands firmly on the Creed of Nicaea, not one word or letter of which, he says, could be altered, and makes it the basis of the two works from his hand that were endorsed officially by the Council of Chalcedon in 451. He would not tolerate any additions to this Creed, and declares that his own doctrines are in complete harmony with it.[105] He even wrote out a copy of the Creed, with its anathemas, including the one that condemns the Arian use of τρεπτός or ἀλλοιωτός for Christ, and sent it, together with a detailed commentary, to a group of monks, whom he warned that Christ himself had sat with the fathers of Nicaea and had presided over their deliberations.[106] In all three of these documents he maintains that Christ was immutable, that he was not changed into flesh or a man at the incarnation, and that he never ceased to

[101] *Oratio* 30, 11, 20; 39, 13: MPG, 36, 116C, 128D, 349A. Karl Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern* (Tübingen-Leipzig, 1904), 192, 232, 240, 248, 250.

[102] MPG, 33, 1196AB, 1197B.

[103] *De Trinitate*, 1, 26; 3, 1, 3, 4, 10, 18, 21: MPG, 39, 389A, 780B, 821BC, 829D, 857C, 884D, 900A; *In Psalmos*, 15, 8; *ibid.*, 1232B–D. Cf. Eduard Weigl, *Christologie vom Tode des Athanasius bis zum Ausbruch des Nestorianischen Streites*, 373–429 (*Münchener Studien zur historischen Theologie*, 4 [Munich, 1925]), 104 f.

[104] For Isidore see Andreas Schmid, *Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium* (*Paradosis: Beiträge zur Geschichte d. altchristlichen Literatur u. Theologie*, 2 [Freiburg in d. Schweiz, 1948]), 42, 48, 78, 88. For Theodotus see MPG, 77, 1316C, 1317AD, 1325B, 1336C, 1341A.

[105] See n. 51 above; *Ep.* 39, MPG, 77 180D–181A, 176C–177B; *Ep.* 4, *ibid.*, 45B, 48D.

[106] *Ep.* 55, MPG, 77, 289D–320A, n.b. 293A; Schwartz, ACO, 1.1.4, 49–61; 1.5, 343–53; cf. Mansi, 9, 246C–247B.

be God.[107] Near the beginning of his *Apologeticus contra Theodoretum pro xii capitibus* (his defence of his twelve anathemas against Nestorius), in which he says the God Logos was superior to change (τροπῆς ἀμείνων), he expressly mentions and approves the relevant Nicene anathema.[108]

In his commentary on the Creed, Cyril adds that Christ is of the same essence as the Father (ὁμοούσιος), God begotten of God, and that the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son.[109] He was God first and man afterwards, not a man who was elevated to be God. Nor did he join a man to himself, share glory and honor with him, and prepare him thus for the cross, resurrection, ascent into heaven, and *sessio* at the right hand of God. In humbling himself and taking the form of a servant, as Philippians 2.5 ff. shows, though remaining God, he became man and submitted to humiliation.[110]

In his annotations on the Gospel of John, Cyril carries the argument a step further and advances beyond Athanasius. From the negative point of view, Athanasius denies that Christ was mutable or led a life of rectitude and nobility by exercise of his freedom of the will. Positively, he insists on Christ's being of the same essence as the Father. But he never follows his reasoning to its logical conclusion, and never states in so many words that Christ did what he did because he was what he was, although the implication is obvious. Cyril states explicitly what Athanasius left unsaid. His point of departure is John 8.28: "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Basil had dealt with a similar text, which was popular among those who wished to deny the full divinity of Christ, but his exegesis is far from brilliant.[111] Cyril is more successful. Christ spoke these words, he says, because he often pretended as a man not to know what he actually knew as God, as for example in the incident of the raising of Lazarus, when he asked, "Where have you laid him?" (John 11.34), although as God he had even foretold Lazarus's death.[112] What he knew as God he says he learned from the Father.

Christ never acted separately or apart from the Father; but, being identical with the Father in essence, his thoughts, wishes, and acts were always

[107] MPG, 77, 45B, 180A, 304ABC. For other passages in Cyril on this subject, see MPG, 76, 16CD, 44A, 49A, 52AD, 53D–56A, 179A, 320AB, 321B, 328B, 397AB, 413B, 420CD, 421B, 424B, 440D.

[108] MPG, 76, 396BC.

[109] MPG, 77, 297CD, 305B, 300AB.

[110] *Ep.* 55, MPG, 77, 304BC, 301BC, 312BC.

[111] N. 98 above.

[112] *In S. Joannem*, 5.5, *Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium*, ed. Philip E. Pusey, 2 (Oxford, 1872), 50.13–51.14; MPG, 73, 845C–848B.

the same as the Father's in all respects.[113] It is absurd, therefore, says Cyril, to claim, as did the Arians, that Christ was inferior to the Father and had to receive aid from him. For that would be the same as saying that God the Father provided his own power with power or made his own wisdom wiser, since Christ is the strength and wisdom of the Father. Similarly, it is ridiculous to think of progress and improvement on the part of Christ, who is God by nature, and has all the attributes of divinity.[114]

That the Son does everything according to the will of the Father does not make him the servant or disciple of the Father but demonstrates the identity of their essence.[115] The good always adheres to the divine nature.[116]

Created beings, it is argued, can choose evil and often fall from better to worse. So far as they are concerned, therefore, the good is the result of piety and virtue. But this is not true of the divine essence. In the absence of change and mutation, the good can be explained from the nature of the essence itself, like heat in fire or cold in snow. Fire, for example, exerts the force peculiar to it, not by will but by reason of its nature and substance, and can be nothing but what it is. Jesus Christ, likewise, is not subject to change and fluctuation. He does not, in the manner of men, choose a certain course of action because of a desire to please God, but because, by the laws of his nature, he neither thinks or does anything that is out of harmony with the wishes of the Father. The consubstantial Godhead is never at variance with itself.[117]

[113] Pusey, *loc. cit.*, 38.21 ff.; MPG, 73, 833B: *μαθήσεσθε γὰρ ὅταν ἴδητε κατὰ φύσιν ὄντα θεὸν καὶ υἱόν, ὡς εἰμὶ μὲν ἰδιογνώμων οὐδαμῶς, συνεθελητὴς δὲ ἀεὶ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, καὶ ὅσαπερ ἂν ἐργάζοιτο ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ποιεῖν οὐκ ὀκνῶν, λαλῶν δὲ πάλιν ὅσα καὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα λέγοντα. τῆς γὰρ αὐτῆς οὐσίας εἰμὶ τῷ γεννήσαντι. ἐθεράπευον μὲν γὰρ τῷ σαββάτῳ τὸν πάρετον . . . ἀλλ' ἐνεργὸν ὑμῖν ὑπέδειξα τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ.* (Christ is represented speaking here in the first person.)

N.b.: Pusey, *loc. cit.*, 51.29–52.4; MPG, 73, 848C: *οὐκ ἄρα διὰ τὸ ἡττῆσθαι τῆς πατρῴας ἀρετῆς, οὐδὲ διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαί τι κατορθοῦν ἐξ ἰδίας ἰσχύος, οὐδὲν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖν ἐν τούτοις δυσχυρίσατο, ἀλλ' ἐπείπερ ἰσογνώμων ἐστὶ καὶ συνεθελητὴς ἀεὶ τῷ γεννήσαντι πρὸς πᾶν ὁτιοῦν, καὶ οὐδὲν μελετήσας κατὰ μόνας ὥσπερ καὶ διῃρημένως ἐπιτελεῖν.*

[114] Pusey, *loc. cit.*, 40.5–41.4; MPG, 73, 836 ABC: *. . . κατὰ τίνα τρόπον, λέγε μοι, πάλιν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῇ ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει χορηγήσει τὸ δύνασθαι, ἢ πῶς ἂν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σοφίαν σοφωτέραν ἐργάσαιτο; ἢ γὰρ ἀνάγκη λέγειν ὡς ἐπί τι μεῖζον ἄνεισιν ἀεί, καὶ προκόπτει κατὰ βραχὺ πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαί τι καὶ πλέον τῆς ἐνούσης ἰσχύος αὐτῷ· ὅπερ ἐστὶν εὔηθές τε καὶ ἀδύνατον παντελῶς . . . πῶς ἂν ἔτι καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων ὀνομάζοιτο κύριος ὁ υἱός, ἢ πῶς ἂν ἔτι νοοῖτο σοφία καὶ δύναμις, δυναμούμενος καθ' ὑμᾶς καὶ σοφούμενος παρ' ἑτέρου; . . . ἤγουν εἰ πιστεύετε κατὰ φύσιν εἶναι θεόν, δότε δὴ δότε τελείως ἔχειν αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς θεότητος ἴδια. ἴδιον δὲ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἰδιότητος τὸ μήτε περὶ μηδὲν ἀσθενεῖν, μήτε μὴν τῆς ἀνωτάτω σοφίας ἀπολιμπάνεσθαι, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ φύσιν εἶναι σοφίαν καὶ δύναμιν.*

[115] Pusey, *loc. cit.*, 44.18–45.7; 46.10–47.13; MPG, 73, 840BC, 841B–844A.

[116] Pusey, *loc. cit.*, 39.27 f.: MPG, 73, 833D: *δεῖν γε οἶμαι τῷ γε ὄντι κατὰ φύσιν θεῷ πάντα τελείως προσεῖναι τὰ ἀγαθά.*

[117] Pusey, *loc. cit.*, 52.3–26, 53.21–54.9; Liber vi, *ibid.*, 102.16–23, MPG, 73, 848C–849A, 849CD, 901D–904A.

SOUNDNESS OF JUSTINIAN'S VIEWS

For a just evaluation of Justinian's attitude towards Theodore, it will be necessary to survey briefly the dogmatic situation at the middle of the sixth century.[118] Zeno's *Henoticon* (482), having served only to exacerbate tempers and multiply the grounds for dissent on all sides, had proved a complete failure. The Chalcedonian symbol still preserved its official position, but the Monophysites attacked it openly, and it left many problems unsolved. Perhaps the most serious of these, so far as the present paper is concerned, is that of the *communicatio idiomatum* (κοινωνία ἰδιωμάτων).[119] The question is whether it was possible after the Chalcedonian definition of 451 to describe Jesus Christ, *qua* man, as mutable in his soul like mankind in general. This would seem to have been ruled out by both the symbol and the two letters of Cyril endorsed by the Council in 451.[120] Yet the Tome of Leo, which the Council of Chalcedon had pronounced valid,[121] despite the distinction it made between the human and the divine in Christ, decreed that the union between the two in Christ was so close as to permit one to say of the Logos that he had suffered or of Jesus that he had performed the miracles, although in a strict sense the human nature of Christ was the subject of the passion and the glorification, while the Logos was responsible for the miracles.[122] If the venerable Tome could sanction such language, and could even go so far as to endorse the doctrine of the *assumptus homo*, would it not, in like manner, authorize followers of Theodore to say of Christ that he was mutable and did not obtain his immortality, incorruptibility, and immutability until after the resurrection? Juridically, perhaps, these alternatives were possible, but they opened the way for a

[118] The latest book on this period, Ernest Stein, *Histoire du Bas Empire*, II, 476–565 (Brussels, 1949), is not very satisfactory for ecclesiastical or intellectual history in general, but has good bibliographies. See above all Marcel Richard, "Le Néo-chalcédonisme," *Mélanges de Science Religieuse*, 3 (1946), 156–161, and the literature there cited.

A detailed analysis of Justinian's estimate of Theodore will be found in my book. Here I confine myself to Theodore's doctrine of the τρεπτότης of Christ.

[119] On the meaning of this term see Adhémar d'Alès, *De verbo incarnato* (Paris, 1930), 135–141. Eduard Weigl, *op. cit.* (n. 103 above), 187–192 and index *s.v.*; Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.* (n. 122 below), 293 f.

[120] See n. 51 above.

[121] Mansi, 6, 972AB; 7, 113C–116A. See the edition of the Tome by C. Silva-Tarouca, *S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum Episc. Constantinopolitanum* (*Ep.* 28), (Rome, 1932), and introduction, pp. 1–19. Cf. Trevor Jalland, *Life and Times of Pope St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941).

On Leo's espousal of the *assumptus homo*, see the Tome, *ed. cit.*, 26 n. 93, 28 n. 122; and P. Galtier, *De incarnatione ac redemptione* (*ed. nova*, Paris, 1947), 82 f. Cf. n. 52 above.

[122] For a good summary of this doctrine, see J. F. Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (4th ed., London, 1929), 288 ff.

Christology that contravened the Definition of 451 and even imperiled the Creed of Nicaea.

Because of the paucity of extant texts in Greek written from the Antiochene point of view, it is difficult to gauge the strength of this movement within the boundaries of the Byzantine Empire. But we know that two Nestorians, Mar Aba (Catholicos of Persia, 540–52) and Thomas of Edessa, had found a receptive audience of Greeks in Alexandria, the very stronghold of the Monophysites, and that the *Christian Topography* of their disciple, Cosmas Indicopleustes,[123] reproduced many of the leading ideas of this school, including Theodore's teaching that Christ did not receive his immortality, incorruptibility, and immutability until after the resurrection.[124] There were others, too, within the Empire, who clung to Nestorianism, and the Emperor had even felt constrained to issue an edict forbidding Nestorians the right to build or acquire churches.[125] Moreover, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the *fons et origo malorum*, had somehow escaped oecumenical censure, partly, because of his death (in 428) before Nestorianism had been assailed seriously, and partly, no doubt, because he was overshadowed by the dramatic figure of Nestorius.

Justinian, therefore, must have thought that the time had come to put an end officially to the type of Christology that Theodore represented, and protect the dogma of the orthodox church from further distortion of this sort. The history of the doctrine of the immutability of Christ, as summarized above, abundantly vindicates Justinian's anathematization of the term τρεπτός as applied to Christ. Actually, error on this point inevitably leads to heretical views on other major premises of Christian theology. It lies behind Theodore's extreme bifurcation of the person of Christ and is primarily responsible for the basic defects of his system. For if Jesus Christ be denied immutability until after the resurrection, it will be difficult to invest the Christ of the Gospels with the proper attributes of his divinity, and to avoid the impression that he was only a mere man (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος).

Devreesse and Amann[126] are inclined to believe that Theodore was orthodox in essentials, and guilty of only a few slight exaggerations. But in the history of dogma, where everything depends on precision and accuracy of a high order, what appear to be minor aberrations often have grave con-

[123] *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, No. 3 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1946), 76 f.

[124] Ed. E. O. Winstedt (Cambridge, England, 1909), 86.14–18. I will discuss the Christology of Cosmas at greater length in my book.

[125] *Novella*, 131, 14, 2, edd. R. Schoell et W. Kroll, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3 (5th ed., Berlin, 1928), 663.15 ff. Cf. *ibid.*, 115, 3, 14, pp. 541.24 ff., 543 (restrictions on wills of Nestorians and Acephali).

[126] Nn. 40, 42 above.

sequences. The theologians denounced as heterodox have rarely departed radically from the dogmatic decrees enacted by the oecumenical councils. Thus, in the fourth century the addition of a single iota, the smallest letter in the alphabet, to the word ὁμοούσιος of the Nicene Creed occasioned great scandals and was sharply repudiated,[127] although the difference between ὁμοούσιος (of the same nature) and ὁμοιούσιος (of like nature) would not ordinarily be accounted of great moment. Similarly, the distinction between orthodoxy and what the Church denounced as Nestorianism, significant as it is in the history of doctrine, arose solely because of the desire of Theodore and his group, perfectly innocuous in itself, to stress the humanity of Jesus against the Apollinarians, who in their turn sought to correct what they took to be an exaggerated insistence upon the human nature of Jesus Christ.

As far as Theodore is concerned, his deviation from orthodoxy can be measured by a single letter, an alpha privative. This is perhaps trivial philologically – actually it amounts to the difference between yes and no – but it makes Theodore an opponent of the most venerated creed of Christendom, and seems to have been of greater significance than has been previously realized.

CONCLUSION

It is not the purpose of this paper to prove that in every instance Justinian's criticism of Theodore rested on a solid basis. When, for example, he accused Theodore of having taught that there was no nature (φύσις) without an hypostasis and no hypostasis without a person (πρόσωπον),[128] he had before him a text quoted by Leontius of Byzantium, but recently proved, on the basis of a comparison with the Syriac version,[129] to have been reasonably free of error. Similarly, in his criticism of Theodore's exegesis of Psalm 8, Justinian, like Vigilius,[130] makes Theodore speak of the human and the divine in Christ as ἕτερος and ἕτερος (Vigilius says *alius et alius*); another form of the same excerpt from Theodore, however, is a little more cautious in posit-

[127] Gwatkin, *op. cit.* (in n. 6 above), 121, 133, 161, 169 f., 177, 178, 181 f., 183 ff., 231, and *passim.*

[128] *Against the Three Chapters*, ed. Schwartz, 60.20 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 1073AB. For Justinian's definitions of these basic Christological terms, see *Contra Monophysitas*, ed. Schwartz, 37.14–40.2; MPG, 86.1, 1137 D ff.

[129] Marcel Richard, *loc. cit.* (n. 47 above).

[130] Ed. Schwartz, 55.21–56.13; MPG, 86.1, 1062C–1063B; *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, ed. Robert Devreesse, *Studi e Testi*, 93 (Vatican City, 1939), 46 f.

For Pope Vigilius's rejection of mutability in Christ, see his *Constitutum de tribus capitulis*, c. 11, ed. O. Guenther, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, 35.1 (Vienna, 1895), 247.4 ff.

ing a division between the two, and is perhaps somewhat less obviously unorthodox. Nevertheless, for every passage in which Theodore makes use of unobjectionable terminology, there is another that is clearly heretical. A number of the latter that were cited by the Fifth Council were taken from Theodore's Catechetical Orations and are indubitably heterodox either in attributing mutability to Christ (pp. 132ff. above), or in dividing Jesus Christ into two persons, one human and one divine.[131] Despite Theodore's good intentions, therefore, he could not permanently escape condemnation, and the anathematization of his system as a whole was inevitable.

Justinian's authorities for taking this step have already been indicated in general terms, but it will be necessary to illustrate his method briefly here by a few examples. As we know, he appeals frequently to the Nicene Creed of 325 and to the decisions of the first four oecumenical councils.[132] In addition he leans heavily on the major patristic writers, and especially on Athanasius and Cyril.

In his treatise *Against the Three Chapters*, Justinian quotes from the *Oratio I contra Arianos* three bits of Athanasius's exegesis of Philippians 2.6 f., according to which "[Christ] did not advance from a lower to higher estate, but, being God, took the form of a servant and in so doing was not exalted but humbled."[133] This, it will be recalled, was an integral part of Athanasius's argument against the Arian conception of the mutability of Christ. In his *Contra Monophysitas* he reproduces *in toto* the letter of Athanasius to the Emperor Jovian in which Athanasius expounds the Nicene

[131] Mingana identifies the sections from the Catechetical Orations that were cited by the Fifth Oecumenical Council: *Woodbrooke Studies*, 5, 8 ff.; 6, xxiii.

For Theodore's endorsement of the doctrine of two sons in the Logos-Christ, cf. *ibid.*, 6, 66 f.: "There was also the Son [i.e., of God] in the One who was baptised [i.e., Jesus Christ], and by His [i.e., the Son's] proximity to Him [Jesus Christ] and by His union with the one who was assumed [Jesus Christ], He was confirming the adoption of children." *Woodbrooke Studies*, 5, 60: "Our blessed Fathers said that He became incarnate so that you might understand that He assumed a complete man, who was a man not only in appearance but a man in a true human nature, and that you might believe that He assumed not only the body but the whole man who is composed of a body and an immortal and rational soul. It is such a man that he assumed for our salvation and it is through Him that He effected salvation for our life . . ." Tonneau, *Homélies*, 453, 127; expressions of this sort abound in the Catechetical Orations.

[132] *Codex Iustinianus*, 1, 1, 2, 1 f., 3, 3; 7, 11 ff., ed. P. Kreuger, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 2 (10th ed., Berlin, 1929), 5 f., 9 f.; *Novella*, 42, pr.; 115, 3, 14; 131, 1, edd. R. Schoell et W. Kroll, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3 (5th ed., Berlin, 1928), 264, 541, 654 f. (Praedictarum enim quattuor synodorum dogmata sicut sanctas scripturas accipimus et regulas sicut leges servamus.)

Drei dogmatische Schriften, ed. Schwartz, 43.18 ff., 63.20–64.11, 64.36 ff., 88.38 ff., 100.30 ff., 102.29 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 1144D–1145C, 1079C–1081C, 1083B, 1013B, 1025AB, 1027AB. Cf. Mansi 9, 370C, 375ACD.

[133] Ed. Schwartz, 58.32 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 1069BC; MPG, 26, 93C, quoted in n. 69 above.

Creed of 325 with its anathemas as of divine and apostolic authority, and three times cites the condemnation of the Arian view of the mutability of Christ. The Arians, Athanasius writes, said that the Son of God was created out of nothing, and did not exist from all eternity but was mutable and a creature. For this reason they had been anathematized by the fathers of the Church, who believed the Son to be not only like the Father or like God, but truly God of God, of the same essence as the Father, and the true and legitimate Son of him, who was his Father by nature.[134] Farther along in the same treatise, Justinian takes over from the *Contra Apollinarium* a passage in which the pseudo-Athanasius affirms the immutability and ineffableness of the Logos.[135] There are many other points of contact, as for example in the use of the Bible, discussion of which lies beyond the scope of the present investigation.

Of even greater importance was Cyril, Justinian's favorite author. The Emperor makes use of Cyril's letter to Theodosius II and its reference to Christ's immutability, as we have seen,[136] and in the *Contra Monophysitas* quotes from Cyril's Commentary of the Gospel of St. John to prove that the Logos could suffer no change or passion.[137] He relies also on three other works of Cyril to support his refutation of Theodore's contention that Hebrews 2.9, Philippians 2.5 ff., and II Corinthians 8.9 refer to the man Christ joined to himself in the incarnation. These texts have been misinterpreted by Theodore, Justinian says, and actually prove that the Logos descended from heaven and took flesh for our salvation.[138]

These are just a few of the many references Justinian makes to Cyril in the course of reinterpreting the Christological problem in Cyrillian terms. He could not openly reject the Tome of Leo, which had been sanctioned by the Council of Chalcedon, but in expounding the Chalcedonian symbol he secured oecumenical validity for Cyril's Twelve Anathemas against Nestorius,[139] and himself constantly used and defended Cyril's Apollinarian formula, *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη* (one incarnated nature of the God Logos), which, like Cyril, he falsely attributed to Athanasius.[140]

[134] Ed. Schwartz, 21.23 ff., espec. 21.29 f., 36 f.; 22.23 ff.; 23.1 f.; MPG, 26, 813A ff.

[135] Ed. Schwartz, 30.26 f.; MPG, 26, 1164B. For a brief review of critical opinion on the authenticity of this work see Louis Bouyer, *op. cit.* (n. 69 above), 155.

[136] N. 24 above.

[137] Ed. Schwartz, 29.29 ff.; 31.5 f.; MPG, 73, 161B, 581A.

[138] Ed. Schwartz, 57.29–58.23; MPG, 86.1, 1067A–1069A.

[139] Mansi, 9, 374A, 376AB, 385C–388B; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, 3.1, 128 ff. On the anathemas, see Hubert du Manoir de Juaye, *op. cit.* (n. 51 above), 491 ff.; J. Mahé, "Les anathématismes de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 7 (1906), 505–542.

[140] Ed. Schwartz, 17.30 ff.; 33.13 ff.; 52.17 ff.; 78.8 ff.; MPG, 86.1, 1055B, 1001A.

In following Cyril here, however, in insisting on the immutability of Christ, and in rejecting the doctrine of the *assumptus homo*,[141] favored by Theodore, Justinian was not completely consistent. Theodore had said that Christ won his immortality, incorruptibility, and immutability at the resurrection; but the Fifth Council condemned only one third of this theory, and passed over in silence the question of whether Christ had been immortal and incorruptible before the resurrection. It was probably felt that to include these other two attributes in the condemnation of the mutability of Christ would be to deprive Christ of his full humanity. Logically, except for the Nicene anathemas, it might have been possible to consider all three of these epithets on the same level, and either reject or approve all of them together. Justinian himself at the end of his long reign became convinced that the body of Christ was always incorruptible.[142] Though discussion of this notion, known as aphthartodocetism, must be reserved for another occasion, there is little doubt that Justinian was led to espouse it for the sake of consistency with the doctrine of Christ's immutability, which he had accepted on the authority of the Nicene Creed and of its principal patristic exegetes.

[141] See nn. 52 and 121 above.

[142] See Martin Jugie, "L'empereur Justinien a-t-il été aphthartodocète?" *Échos d'Orient*, 31 (1932), 399–402. The best work on the theological principles involved is that of René Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ* (Louvain, 1924). Cf. also on an important aspect of the theology of Justinian not treated in this paper É. Amann, "Théopaschite (Controverse)," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 15 (Paris, 1946), 505–512.