Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies

Robert L. Wilken

Church History, Vol. 34, No. 2. (Jun., 1965), pp. 123-145.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-6407%28196506%2934%3A2%3C123%3ATEATCC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z

Church History is currently published by American Society of Church History.

TRADITION, EXEGESIS, AND THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES

ROBERT L. WILKEN, *Assistant Professor of Church History, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg*

In 430, Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, wrote in his treatise *Adversus Nestorium* that we must put away idle questioning and "receive with faith the simple and undefiled tradition."[1] Which tradition did he have in mind? About the same time, Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, defended a priest who denied the appellation *theotokos* to the Virgin Mary.[2] Nestorius claimed the term was not in accord with the tradition. Which tradition did he have in mind?

Both Cyril and Nestorius made quite clear that they were referring to the ancient tradition which the apostles received from Jesus and later handed on to the bishops of the Church. As bishops of two of the most important sees in Christendom—Alexandria even claimed to be founded by Mark—each believed that he had received from his predecessors this tradition handed over by the apostles. And though they might have been reluctant to admit it in 430, they thought this tradition was the common possession of all orthodox bishops in the Empire.

On examination, however, it is doubtful whether the tradition would have appeared as unified as they would have us believe. In fact, Cyril's own explication of the "undefiled" tradition betrays a suspiciously Alexandrian caste; and Nestorius' reasons for denying Mary the *theotokos* sound surprisingly like other writers in the orbit of Antioch. The twelve anathemas sent to Nestorius by Cyril are a good case in point. They were offered as a statement of the faith of the total Church, as a common and universally acceptable tradition, but they were nothing of the sort and bore all the marks of a peculiarly Alexandrian Christology.[3] In fact, as Liébaert has shown, much of Cyril's "undefiled" tradition is simply Athanasius lifted bodily—without notes—from his *Orationes Contra Arianos*.[4] Was Cyril, then, really referring to the ancient tradition supposedly shared by all? Or did he, without realizing or admitting it, really mean the particular redaction of the faith transmitted in the Church of Alexandria?

If we put the same question to Nestorius we discover immediately that he was wrong about the *theotokos* . The term had been in use for several centuries and could be documented in the writings of important fathers.[5] Cyril knew this and could produce telling evidence. Does this, however, mean that Cyril was right and Nestorius a dangerous innovator? Unfortunately the matter cannot be so easily decided, for, though wrong about the *theotokos,* Nestorius certainly had much more in mind than a few Greek letters. It hardly vindicates Cyril, as

many have supposed, simply to cite passages containing *theotokos* in earlier orthodox writers.[6] Cyril had indeed outflanked him on the term, but this did not wholly undercut Nestorius' position or the argument behind his rejection of *theotokos.*

Now it was hardly a new phenomenon in Christian history to appeal to tradition. For several centuries theologians had appealed to tradition in defense of the faith against heretics. Ireneaus had done it; Hippolytus had done it; and Tertullian gave the argument classic form in his *De Praescriptione haeriticorum.* But things were different in the second century, for heretics were seldom, if ever, bishops of important sees, and most bishops could offer proof—at least to their own satisfaction—that they possessed authentic apostolic tradition. But how things had changed by the fifth century! Here we behold bishops of the two most important and influential sees of the East engaged in a vicious and relentless battle, each marching forth armed with the conviction that he alone possessed the truth and appealing to what was considered one and the same tradition. What had happened to enflame such passion, bitterness, and profound misunderstanding? On the surface two patriarchs disagreed over a theological point. But this had happened before. Some have argued that the conflict be read primarily in political terms: the pope of Alexandria was seeking to crush the see of Constantinople, a young upstart challenging Alexandria's primacy in the East.[7] But this also was not new, for Theophilus, Cyril's predecessor, had sailed from Alexandria only a few years earlier to humiliate and destroy Chrysostom in Constantinople. The consequence of this encounter hardly equalled the disaster which sprang from the meeting of Cyril and Nestorius a generation later.

The following does not intend to suggest a new key to explain and interpret the Christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries. Nor does it seek to isolate theological factors at the expense of political and ecclesiastical factors.[8] Hopefully we have learned that any series of historical events can only be interpreted within a total web and complex of factors. While recognizing the multitude of factors which must be considered in any thorough and complete description of the events, I should like here to point to several aspects of the controversy which have generally been overlooked. How does the conflict look when viewed from the perspective of the exegetical tradition preceding Cyril and Nestorius?

When the question is phrased in this way we observe immediately that, beneath the surface of theological rhetoric and high-flown ecclesiastical maneuvering, there moved deep and disturbing currents soon to surface with massive destructive power. This article will try to locate these currents as they emerged in the exegesis of Cyril and Nestorius. At the same time it touches on the more general problem

of tradition in the ancient Church. For the classical argument from tradition, so finely etched into the mind of the Fathers, claimed to preserve the correct interpretation of the Scriptures. But it is precisely at this point that its limitations become most apparent. Perhaps the bishops of the fifth century were oblivious to what was happening, but it is plain: the argument is breaking into a thousand pieces. Once it had risen to its task, but now it is crushed by a burden it was never meant to bear. Though this article is primarily concerned with the Christological controversies, it tries, by suggesting what the controversy might mean for the argument from tradition, to place the upheaval of the fifth century into a wider Church historical and theological perspective.

What factors contributed to the explosion of the fifth century? What set Cyril and Nestorius on a fixed collision course destined to crash and explode like two express trains smashing each other at 100 m.p.h.? Without seeking a scapegoat or attempting to excuse Cyril or Nestorius, it must be granted that the trouble began with Arius and the varying responses to his teaching.

To be sure, his doctrine had been condemned at Nicaea long before the time of Cyril and Nestorius, but this was only a prelude to the violent battle stretching across the fourth century. The dismal procession of orthodox, semi-Arian, and Arian councils stretching from Nicaea to Constantinople is a striking reminder that Arianism was still very much alive. Historically, in fact, the dispute had supposedly been settled in the latter part of the century under the reign of Theodosius I at the Council of Constantinople. But was it? Could the churches now turn to other matters? One would expect this to be so, but our sources reveal a quite different picture. Surprisingly the years beteween 380 and 430 bear witness to condemned but nevertheless very lively Arian sects, with educated and resourceful leaders.

Just how important Arianism actually was during this period is revealed by the legislation against heretics from 380-430. In the *Codex Theodosianus* there is a constant stream of laws condemning the Arians or one of the sister heretical groups, the Eunomians or Macedonians. Only the Donatists can claim the dubious distinction of having as many laws proclaimed against them as the Arians. At this time Donatism was at the height of its power and influence and the churches in North Africa were continually faced by its threat. Extensive legislation against it could be expected. Arianism, however, was supposedly finished business, but specific references to Arian sects in the *Code* occur more than twenty times during this period.[9] Furthermore, the laws do not simply repeat ritual formulas of condemnation—as, for example, the condemnation of pre-Nicene heresies—but they prohibit prosyletizing and gathering of assemblies. Apparently the Arians did not comprise a few scattered individuals or communities, but were or-

ganized groups capable of commanding the attention of the theologians and disturbing the life of the churches.

Laws, however, can be deceptive and frequently do not offer the kind of information needed for accurate historical judgments. But if the inferences drawn from legislation only provide suggestions, the ecclesiastical histories of the period support the suggestions with a fuller and more satisfying account.

Socrates and Sozomen, who record the events of the fourth century and early fifth century, devote what seems an inordinate amount of space to a dying sect. At one place Socrates describes a tumult in Constantinople in 388 in which Arians burned the house of Nectarius, patriarch of the city. Elsewhere he tells of nocturnal assemblies of Arians even though Chrysostom had forbidden them to congregate. In these gatherings the Arians, whom he tells us were "very numerous," sang responsive verses adapted to their teaching. He also describes measures taken by Nestorius soon after his consecration in Constantinople to meet the menace of Arianism in that city.[10]

Finally, the literary remains of this period confirm the impression given by the laws and histories. Though we do find treatises on specifically Christological rather than Trinitarian topics, the bishops continued to deal with questions raised by the Arians and at this point they concentrated much of their polemic. The abortive attempt of Apollinaris to raise and answer the Christological questions implied by the dogma of Nicaea was shortlived.[11] In certain parts of the Empire he initially gained considerable support, but the swift condemnation of his teaching nipped in the bud the growth of this new heresy. For this reason the majority of the writings between 380-430 are concerned with Arius and the doctrine of the Trinity. In his sermons John Chrysostom, even while in Antioch, preached frequently on Arian perversions and regularly expounded his text in terms of Arian objections.[12] Didymus the Blind, writing in Alexandria, composed at least two works on the Trinity.[13] Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote a treatise against Eunomius and expressly mentions this polemical concern as part of the task he saw in expounding the Gospel of John.[14] And Cyril of Alexandria is almost exclusively concerned with the Trinity in his earlier writings. He wrote two massive dogmatic works on the subject, a *Commentary on John* which deals extensively with the Arians, and he frequently took up related questions when the occasion arose in his Old Testament commentaries.[15]

Thus at the beginning of the fifth century, Arianism in one form or another is still much on the scene. This led to a certain ossification of theological reflection and formulation, for the questions had really been answered years before; and it promoted a restricted vision, limited by the blinders of old questions, arguments, and answers. Even if something new had been sensed before Nestorius, it is doubtful the

bishops would have recognized it much less known what to do with it.[16] As Grillmeier points out, there was no "method" present in the early fifth century which could adequately deal with the issues raised by Nestorius: "At the time of the Ephesinum, the Church possessed no finished theological method that might have produced a scientific evaluation of the teaching of Nestorius."[17]

In terms of the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius this situation meant that the immediate background and presupposition of the controversy was not so much a question of Christology, but of the Trinity. Once hostilities began the uniquely Christological question came quickly to the fore; but much of the initial misunderstanding stems from the inability of both parties to even faintly understand their differing approaches to Arius. They both agreed on the orthodox dogma proclaimed at Nicaea and Constantinople; what they did not know, however, was that each had received a different tradition of how to get to it. In their opposition to Arius they were indeed united; but they opposed him with different arguments. And here was the rub.

Among the controversial points between the Athanasian and Arian parties, one centered on the proper interpretation of certain passages of the Gospels. The Arians were quick to point to any passage which explicitly stated or implied that Jesus did not bear the characteristics of God. For example, they singled out Luke 2:52, "Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature" and claimed this showed he was not equal with the father, because the text says he grew. God, it was assumed, could not "grow" in wisdom or change in any way. Other examples were the Baptism of Jesus, which showed he had to receive the Spirit; the statement that the "Son of man did not know the day or the hour," (Mk. 13:32; Mt. 24:36); Jesus' words: "My soul is troubled unto death" (Mt. 26:38; John 12:27; Mk. 14:34); and others.

Supported by such passages from the Scriptures the Arians had little difficulty in presenting the Nicene theologians with a powerful argument. Eudoxosius of Constantinople wrote: "Let them (the Nicenes) answer how one who is passible and mortal can be *homoousios* with the God who is above these things and who is beyond suffering and death."[18] What makes this argument difficult to refute is that its assumptions are shared by both sides of the debate. Both the Nicenes and Arians agreed that God is beyond suffering and death and that such predicates as "change" or "alteration" or "ignorance" could not be predicated of the deity. At the same time both sides agreed that the accounts of Jesus in the gospels were reliable and had to be taken into consideration in answering the problem. Hence, while disagreeing on the inferences drawn by the Arians, the Nicenes were coaxed into a debate in which all shared much the same ground rules. Any answer had to be given within these pre-established limits.

Recently Francis Sullivan in his monograph on Theodore of Mopsuestia outlined in syllogistic form the specific pillars in this Arian argument. His analysis not only provides a useful framework in which to interpret the Arian approach, but it also shows clearly the initial divergence between Alexandrian and Antiochene responses to the Arians. The syllogism runs as follows:

> The Word is the subject of the human operations and sufferings of Christ.
>
> Whatever is predicated of the Word must be predicated of him according to his own nature (*kata physin*).
>
> *ergo,* the nature of the Word is limited and affected by human operations and sufferings of Christ, and is subordinate to the Father.[19]

On the part of the Nicene theologians this situation required an adequate defense and an effective reply to the Arian argument, and at the same time it demanded a comprehensive pattern for interpreting the "problem passages" in accord with Nicene theology.[20] At this point the tradition diverged and this divergence set the stage for the later conflict. What was, however, to cause such difficulty for Nestorius and Cyril was not simply the divergent replies, but the inability to distinguish the defense from the doctrine it sought to defend. By the end of the fourth century the Nicene dogma had become Catholic tradition, but its defense rested on the peculiarities of local traditions. By the fifth century this two-fold defense had molded and shaped two theological traditions. The confusion between contrasting theological traditions and the universally acceptable tradition of Nicaea eventually helped undercut any serious appeal to tradition.

Athanasius, who sets the pattern for the later Alexandrian position, countered the Arians by exposing the weakness of the second (minor) premise. It is false, argued Athanasius, to claim that any action predicated of the Logos must be predicated of him according to his own nature (*kata physin*). For the gospel teaches us that the divine and eternal Logos took on human flesh and became a man. When he became man he assumed the characteristics of man such as weakness, hunger, suffering, etc. Therefore we can rightly say that it is the Logos who hungers, suffers, etc.; but we do not say he does so according to his own nature. Rather he suffers according to the flesh, according to his humanity (*kata sarka*). Such predicates differ from "eternity" and "unbegotten" for these belong to the Logos *qua* Logos, i.e., as he is according to his own nature. Thus two types of predication are possible, and it is of fundamental importance to distinguish between them. In Book III of his *Contra Arianos* he writes:

> This then is the scope (*skopos*) and character of the Holy Scripture, as we have often said; in the gospel there is a double (*diplēn*) account of the Savior; that he was always God and is Son, being the Logos and radiance and wisdom of the father; and that afterwards, he took flesh from the

> Virgin Mary, the *theotokos,* and became man. And this (*skopos*) is to be found signified throughout all the inspired Scriptures.[21]

By establishing the necessity of two types of predication of the Logos, Athanasius sought to safeguard the divinity of the Son and at the same time recognize the reality of the Incarnation and life of Jesus. His interest is completely Trinitarian, but the lines along which he shaped his answer were to provide the center of the later Alexandrian passion for the unity of Christ.

When applied to particular texts of the gospels Athanasius' exegetical principle provides a ready key to all the difficulties raised by the Arians. At times the Logos does things "divinely," such as heal the sick, raise the dead, know the thoughts of men; at other times he does things "humanly," such as hunger, thirst, suffer, etc. Of Lk. 2:52 Athanasius asks: If Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God how can he advance? It is obviously not the Word, qua Word (*eī logos estin*) who advanced, he answers; what is meant is that the Logos advances "humanly" (*anthropinōs*) since advance is proper to man. "Wherefore he (the evangelist) did not say 'the Logos advanced' but "Jesus" by which name the Lord was called when he became man, so that there is an advance of the human nature."[22] Thus Athanasius' strategy is to hold fast to the conviction that in both human and divine matters the subject remains constant. Be it divine or human actions which the Evangelists describe, the subject is always the divine Son. But depending on the kind of action described, they must be assigned to the Son either as he is in himself, or as he is according to his humanity.

But this was only one side of the reply to Arius. On the other side men such as Eustathius of Antioch hammered out a wholly different defense and a correspondingly different pattern for interpreting the passages from the gospels.[23] They also granted the initial assumption concerning the nature of the deity as well as the conviction that certain predications were improper for the deity. But in contrast to Athanasius they denied the major premise of the syllogism and granted the minor premise. This meant they said that only one type of predication was possible, namely predication according to the nature of the Logos (*kata physin*). But this suggested that the Logos hungers, thirsts, suffers according to his own nature (*kata physin*) and is therefore limited. If caught in this dizzy circle they would eventually have to grant the Arian claim that the Logos is subordinate to the Father. Therefore they answered that the Word is not the subject of the human operations and sufferings of Christ. Rather, passages which speak of suffering must not be attributed to the Logos, either by nature or according to the flesh, but they must be ascribed to the man Jesus. It is he who advances in wisdom, who does not know the day or the hour, who hungers, thirsts, and suffers. Here,

as in Athanasius, the argument is primarily concerned with a Trinitarian question; and it is in terms of this particular historical problem that it must be considered. It provided a way out of the dilemma posed by the Arians and set the pattern for the later Antiochene exegesis of the Gospels.

In briefest terms, then, this is the great fork in the road which divides the two orthodox replies to Arius and his followers. Both provided a defense of Nicene theology, a refutation of the Arian arguments, and a schema for expounding the gospels. The one seldom had difficulty recognizing that the Jesus of the gospels was God, but it tended to diminish the importance—if not the reality—of the human portrait of him presented in the gospels. The other seldom had trouble taking seriously this portrait, but it always found it difficult, as Theodore's exegesis of John amply demonstrates,[24] to say how this Jesus could be one with God. The one, initiated and worked out by Athanasius, was to find expression in his successor in the see of Alexandria, Cyril; the other, shaped by men like Eustathius, was to dominate the tradition centered about Antioch and to find expression in the fifth century in Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret of Cyrus. And it was the divergence of these two traditions which led to the mighty upheaval when the Alexandrian, Cyril, began reading what the Antiochene, Nestorius, had to say about Jesus.

Shortly after Nestorius was consecrated patriarch of Constantinople, he preached a series of sermons. Of these only fragments remain with one important exception: a sermon preached on Hebrew 3 and the priestly work of Christ.[25] Not only is it the only complete sermon preserved in Greek, but since it was forwarded to Cyril shortly after it had been preached (with a number of other writings), it provides an important document to observe Cyril's initial reaction to Nestorius. In fact, Cyril discussed in some detail and with quotations this particular sermon in Book III of the treatise *Adversus Nestorium.* Furthermore, the sermon is significant, for it deals precisely with the issue which had caused so much difficulty with the Arians, namely, how to interpret the biblical statements ascribing to Jesus human characteristics and emotions. For these reasons it sheds light on the beginnings of the Nestorian controversy before the strife began, shows the importance of the exegetical tradition to the controversy, and points to the way trinitarian questions are transformed to major problems of Christology.[26]

The text of the sermon is Heb. 3:1ff.

> "Therefore, holy brethren, who share in a heavenly call, consider Jesus, the apostle and high priest of our confession. He was faithful to him who appointed him, just as Moses also was faithful in God's house." (RSV)

At the outset, says Nestorius, we must remember that, when expounding the doctrines of the faith and the Holy Scriptures, we are dealing

with weighty and serious matters. For the faith is holy and precious and frequently beyond our grasp and comprehension. The heretics (i.e. the Arians), failing to recognize the profundity of the divine, throw all caution to the wind when they proceed to interpret heavenly matters. This passage is a good example, for they twist and turn it to match their purposes, "imagining themselves to have something of greater value in theology."[27] They dare to say that the text means the "son is created" (*tou ektisthai ton uion*) because St. Paul (i.e. the writer to the Hebrews) says that God made him (*poiesanti auton*).

Nestorius, with other opponents of the Arians, is placed on the defensive because of the words of Hebrews which seem to suggest that the Son is "made" (*poieō*) by the father. If this is the case the Son cannot be equal to the father nor can he have existed from all eternity. This passage, like the others discussed above, was at issue between the Arians and orthodox long before the fifth century, for it offered the Arians the same kind of support as certain texts from the gospels. Hence the question Nestorius places at the head of his sermon focuses on a theological as well as an exegetical problem which had been at the center of discussion for many years. At the height of the conflict with the Arians Athanasius produced a lengthy discussion of Heb. 3 along the lines of the developing Alexandrian pattern.[28]

Unfortunately it is difficult to trace the Antiochene exegesis of this passage in the fourth century, because the few remaining fragments do not touch on it. The most extensive and important evidence does not appear in our sources until Nestorius and Theodoret of Cyrus. Their exegesis, however, conforms so closely to the Antiochene pattern outlined above that we can safely conjecture that earlier writers had shaped the scheme which they follow. It is particularly disappointing that the fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Commentary on Hebrews* do not deal with this passage; but, in spite of this gap, it is clear from other sections of the commentary that he would have expounded it as did Theodoret.[29] In his reply to the *Twelve Chapters* of Cyril Theodoret immediately raises the Arian issue. We note, says Theodoret, that the writer to the Hebrews uses the term "made" when referring to Christ. The Arians, recognizing the support this gives to their argument, quickly jump to the conclusion that Hebrews says the Word was made and is therefore a creature like men. For if the Word is "made" then he must be subordinate to the Father. Therefore, we cannot apply this passage to the Word and remain orthodox. Furthermore, it is surely incorrect to say that the Word assumed the rank of the priesthood of Melchizedek, for this leads us to the same heretical conclusions of the Arians. Rather we say that the "one from the seed of David" was our priest and became a victim by offering himself to God for us.[30]

From these remarks it is clear how rigidly Theodoret conforms to the Antiochene type of defense against Arianism and the exegetical principles associated with it; furthermore it is striking how deeply he is concerned in 431 to guard his flank against Arians though he is in fact engaged in new conflict with Cyril. These remarks were written after the lines of the Christological debate had been sharply drawn. Thus, while answering Cyril's Christological extremism, Theodoret puzzles how Cyril could "confute the blasphemy of the heretic" (Arius) when he says that such passages as "The Son of Man does not know the day or the hour" can be assigned to the Divine Word.[31]

Let us now turn to Nestorius who, as it will be seen, stands precisely in this same tradition. When the Arians read the words "made him" in Hebrews they wrongly attribute these words to the Divine Logos and conclude from them that the Son is subordinate to the Father. Similarly, "when they hear the word 'apostle' they think that God the Word is the Apostle; when they read 'office or priest' they imagine that the Godhead is priest."[32] Such exegesis is customary among heretics, for it is their custom to say that human characteristics such as being a priest, or being "made" show that the divine Logos is not one with the Father. In the exposition of this passage then, orthodox exegetes must show the error of the Arian interpretation and the conclusion they draw from it, namely, that the Son is not truly God.

What then is the correct interpretation and how do we meet their objections? We must ask the Arians: "If divinity is a high priest, who is honored by the service of the high priest? If God is the one who makes the offering, there is no one to whom the offering is made." What could be greater than God to receive such an offering. Only a priest who is himself in need of perfection could bring an offering to God; someone who is perfect would hardly need to make offering. Every high priest "is bound to offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as those of the people" (Heb.). But God does not lack perfection. "Whence therefore is the Word of God thought to be called priest by them, he who did not need sacrifices for his own improvement as other priests?"[33]

To support this exegesis against his Arian critics Nestorius turns to the context of the passage. Immediately prior to the text, St. Paul says that Christ is "made like his brethren in every respect." This surely means that the text refers to Jesus, for Paul says it is "not with angels that he is concerned but with the descendants of Abraham." "Is the Godhead the seed of Abraham?" asks Nestorius. Furthermore "the lifegiving God does not suffer," as Arians read the texts, "but it is the seed of Abraham" who suffers.[34] This interpretation is confirmed by the Gospels, for here we observe a similar dis-

tinction. Some texts refer to the Logos as for example, "Before Abraham was I am." But this is not parallel to the passage in Hebrews. In this connection Luke is more appropriate where we read: "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature." Therefore, concludes Nestorius: "Humanity was anointed, heretic, not the divinity. This one (i.e. Jesus) is he who was made a faithful priest to God for he became a priest and did not exist as such from eternity."[35]

While there is much in this argument of importance for Nestorius' views on Christological questions, it is noteworthy that he is engaged primarily in a discussion of the Trinity. That is to say, he is determined to defend the Nicene Dogma against Arian perversions and show that the Son is truly the second person of the Holy Trinity, equal to the Father and begotten before all ages. Furthermore he supports his argument with the exegesis of a "problem" text that conforms precisely to the pattern set down by a writer such as Eustathius of Antioch. The Arian claim that such statements of the Scripture apply to the Logos cannot stand; for they refer to the man Jesus, the "one called the seed of Abraham, the one who in all things is similar to his brother, who became a high priest in time, who was perfected through sufferings."[36]

Once Nestorius is satisfied he has answered the Arian objections he takes up the question of the priestly work of Christ and its relation to the teachers and prophets of the Old Testament. Here he moves from the polemical situation to a more relaxed exposition of what kind of priest was called for.

> "A high priest, then, was needed to mediate the blessing, on the one hand from the race of Abraham by nature (*tei phusei*) and on the other hand, in honor above the prophets. He must be meek and blameless, capable of suffering as a descendant of Abraham, but who knew in times of danger to call out to God, 'not my will but yours.' Christ was born for this, not clothed with the nature of angels, for God did not promise a blessing to men from the race of angels, but from the seed of Abraham of the same (seed) as those who received the Gospel."[37]

The uniqueness of Christ does not lie in some innate quality or capability, for he is like other men in every respect. Rather his uniqueness lies in what he did: he lived a perfect life and offered to God a perfect sacrifice. In this he is greater than all the prophets and priests of the Old Testament.

This sermon can, I believe, be taken as an accurate reflection of the theological and ecclesiastical situation on the eve of the Christological controversies. While Nestorius does treat Christological matters in the latter part of the sermon, he is first and foremost interested in refuting the Arians rather than in developing a proper understanding of the person of Christ. It is the relation of the Son to the Father, not the relation of the Son to mankind which provides the basis for his exposition. And though he borders on questions soon to be raised,

he does so from the perspective of the controversies of the fourth century. With respect to the Trinitarian controversy he stands in the tradition of Antioch and its particular reply to Arianism, both exegetically and theologically. When Nestorius speaks of preserving the tradition of the fathers, it is this tradition which he has in mind. Unfortunately Nestorius could not, as Cyril also could not, see that this tradition was shaped and colored by particular historical and theological factors in the fourth century. And though he may have thought he gave expression to apostolic teaching, he is in fact reflecting the central strand of a particular rather than universal tradition.

It was this tradition which laid the groundwork for his rejection of the appellation *theotokos.*[38] Whether others before him had also rejected it is a moot question, but the basis on which he was able to reject it is clearly evident. When placed against the backdrop of the trinitarian discussion, instead of the Christological, the *theotokos* takes on a somewhat different character. For here it seems to suggest that the Logos bears all the characteristics of humanity and is limited by human affections. And, following the Antiochene argument, if it is only possible to predicate of the Logos *kata physin,* the term means that according to his very nature the Logos is born of a woman, and therefore grows and increases, is ignorant, hungers and thirsts, suffers and dies. But from this the Arians conclude that he is really not God, for God cannot be born of a woman, grow, be hungry, suffer and die. The conclusion seems inevitable; the Logos is not really God, but subordinate to the Father. As we have seen, it was to avoid this implication that the Antiochenes framed their exegesis and reply to the Arians. For this reason the *theotokos* can and must be placed in the same category with all the other statements in the Scriptures which caused such difficulty; that is to say, it raised the same problem as did the passage from Hebrews 3. The rejection of the term is totally consistent with the Antiochene exegetical and theological tradition. In view of the many passages in Scripture which seemingly gave support to the Arians, why, they asked, should we add another non-scriptural term to the debate. It only adds fuel to their fires and makes the orthodox defense doubly difficult. Whether ecclesiastical considerations made the use of the term unwise is another question; and Nestorius can perhaps be rightly criticized at this point.[39] But, he certainly saw the implications of the term and had good and substantial grounds for discouraging its use.

This sermon and others were quickly forwarded to Cyril in Alexandria. His response was swift and decisive, and it was destined to initiate a most bitter exchange between him and Nestorius. As a result of it the Church was never again to see or know the peace and unity—even with its divisions, competing parties, and controversies —it had known since the Council of Constantinople. Cyril's initial re-

action to Nestorius came in a letter to the monks of Egypt, and it is to this letter that we must now turn. Cyril's Christology and his attack on Nestorius have been the object of many studies, and it is not our intention to contribute to this discussion here. The following remarks are only intended to pinpoint the immediate response of Cyril and place it in the historical perspective of the two traditions being discussed here.[40]

Cyril begins by explaining the reason for his letter. He had heard that some questioned whether the Virgin Mary should be called *theotokos* and, since this caused no little disturbance, he proposes to say a few things apropos of the question. He expresses the hope that his remarks will not lead to more arguments but that they will assist the monks in opposing error, avoiding difficulties, and helping others to learn the truth. Either Cyril was unbelievably naive about theological controversy—and this is incredible after the events of the fourth century—or he had no idea of the magnitude of the problem on which he ventured to suggest an answer. Perhaps this is simply another indication of the deep and unbridgeable chasm which separated the two respective traditions. Cyril goes forth to battle with weapons poised and the banner of truth as standard; but he fails to grasp even at the most primitive level either the reasons upon which Nestorius denied the *theotokos* or the consequences of his deeds for the Church.

But monks are loyal and faithful, and Cyril is certain they are persuaded of the "faith once handed down to the churches from the Holy Apostles."[41] Because they possess this true and faithful tradition they can oppose the heretics and convince the gainsayers. About others Cyril can only express amazement, for it is beyond comprehension how anyone can be in doubt about the *theotokos*. "The blessed disciples handed over this faith to us even though they did not mention the term itself. And thus we were taught to think by the holy fathers."[42] Blessed Athanasius, who ruled the Church in Alexandria for 46 years opposed the Arians and wrote books against them. In Book III of his *Contra Arianos* Athanasius expressly calls the Virgin Mary *Theotokos*.[43] And though he was not yet bishop he defended this faith against error in the great and holy Synod of Nicaea.

Realizing that the term does not occur in Scripture, Cyril proceeds to explain why it is nevertheless appropriate. Some at the Council thought it best to employ terms which do occur in Holy Scripture and therefore did not mention *theotokos*. Cyril does not seem to be troubled by the number of other terms in the same category, notably *homoousios*. If, however, we consider the mystery of Christ as the fathers, guided by the Spirit have expressed it, the answer is plain. For if God is born of the Virgin Mary surely she is *theotokos*.[44]

Let us now look more closely, says Cyril, at the symbol of Nicaea: (The text of the creed follows.) The inventors of heresy do not con-

fess the creed with us, but say that "the son is a latecomer (*prosphaton*) and created by the God and Father just as other creatures. . . These wretches do not even blush to ascribe to him a beginning in time."[45] In fact they make of him a sort of intermediate creature between God and other creatures and then outrightly disobey the Scriptures by worshipping what is not God.

Cyril's reply is highly characteristic. He appeals to Athanasius and the tradition of the Alexandrian Church as though it were the ancient tradition handed to the Church by the apostles. While he is aware of the impossibility of finding Scriptural support for the term, and recognizes the difficulty of appealing to Nicaea, this does not deter him. What he fails to recognize, however, is that not everyone saw things the way Alexandrians did and that his own expression betrays a multitude of distinctively Alexandrian terms and concepts. This is especially evident in the latter part of the letter where he outlines his view of the Incarnation.

Secondly, though he lapses into a discussion of a Trinitarian question and reiterates the reply to Arius given by Anthanasius, he does not give any indication that this question might be related to Nestorius' criticism of the *theotokos*. Cyril is totally oblivious to the concern which prompted Nestorius' remarks and demonstrates no understanding whatsoever of the reasons behind them. As far as Cyril could see, what Nestorius had to say about Arianism and the *theotokos* was wholly beside the point. The answer to Arius had been worked out in detail and with great precision; in fact Athanasius had done such a good job that Cyril did not think it worth the time to formulate his own objections. From the time of Athanasius to Cyril the Alexandrian reply had undergone few, if any, alterations. The seriousness of the clash and the extent of the misunderstanding created by their respective exegetical traditions is perhaps best reflected in the widely divergent views of Christ's priestly work. We have already seen the shape of Nestorius' view of the priesthood as well as the reasons underlying it. Let us now turn briefly to the answer hurled across the Mediterranean by Cyril in his twelve anathemas.[46]

In the anathemas or chapters Cyril sought to isolate what he considered the most important points where Nestorius diverged from the tradition. Written in "anathema" style they first stated the true teaching as Cyril saw it, continued with an "if not" clause concerning this teaching, and concluded with the familiar "let him be anathema." The anathemas touch on a variety of issues such as the *theotokos,* the union of the Word and human flesh, the worship due the "god-man," the nature of Christ's flesh, et al. Of these the only anathema dealing specifically with an exegetical issue is Anathema 10 on the priesthood of Christ as expressed in Hebrews.[47] Anathema 4 lays down the Al-

exandrian exegetical principle concerning the proper interpretation of "problem" texts from the Gospels, and though it is couched in more technical language than the rule enunciated by Athanasius in his *Contra Arianos,* the meaning and intention are the same.

> "If anyone assigns to two persons or hypostases the words of the evangelic or apostolic writings, which are spoken either of Christ by the saints or of himself by Himself, and applies some to a man considered apart from the Word who is from God, and others, as God-befitting, solely to the Word from God the Father, be he anathema."[48]

As we have seen, this principle was forged by Athanasius in the heat of the Arian controversy and it became normative for the Alexandrian Church. Cyril, however, states the Alexandrian position here in primarily Christological rather than Trinitarian terms. He is no longer concerned, as was Athanasius, to provide an interpretation of the texts of the New Testament which could defend the faith against Arius; rather he turns this initial insight into Christological form by setting it against the Antiochene pattern of exegesis.

The tenth anathema discusses the same question in more particular terms. Cyril could have used a number of other examples, but the priestly work of Christ was the most natural, for he had observed Nestorius' exposition of it in the sermon. But before considering Cyril's interpretation of the text from Hebrews, let us look briefly at the manner Athanasius approached the question. As we have already noted, Heb. 3 apparently played an important role in the controversies with Arius, and Athanasius devoted a long section of the *Orations* to its exposition. When we look at the problem faced by Athanasius we quickly discover that it is precisely the same problem Nestorius posed in his sermon. Athanasius was pressed to answer how it could be that the Son was equal to the Father when the Apostle in Hebrews says that he was "made." If any passage gave support to the Arian cause this seemed to do so. For if the Son is "made" that means he is a "work," a "creature" and therefore not equal to God. Athanasius, in a lengthy and repetitive discussion, sets forth two lines of rebuttal. The first argues that, though the term "made (*poieō*) is indeed used, it does not mean made, but rather "begat," i.e., the word traditionally used of the generation of the Son. "Wherefore also when the essence (*ousia*) is a work or creature, then, the words 'he made,' and 'he became,' and 'he created' are properly spoken of it and designate the work. But when the essence is an Offspring and Son, then 'he made,' and 'he became,' and 'he created' no longer properly belong to it, nor designate a work; but in place of 'he made' we use without distinction 'he begat.' "[49]

This would perhaps be sufficient as a guiding principle for passages using such terms, but Athanasius proceeds to another explanation. Here he outlines the familiar pattern of the "two nature" exegesis displayed elsewhere in these *Orations.* Many passages in the

Scriptures are properly assigned to the Son according to his divine nature; but we also read passages which cannot be interpreted in this fashion and must be assigned to the Word "when he has become man, i.e., to his humanity."[50] Heb. 3 belongs to the latter category, for it signifies "his descent to mankind . . . and that in the process of time, when God willed, he became a high-priest."[51] Hence the expressions "he became" and "he was made," "must not be understood as if the Word considered as the Word were made, but that the Word, being Demiurge, afterwards was made High Priest, by putting on a body which was originate and made, which he is able to offer for us; wherefore he is said to be made."[52] In briefest terms this is Athanasius' exegesis of the passage from Hebrews in reply to the Arians. Instead of supporting the notion that the son is subordinate to the Father, as the Arians claimed they do, these passages point, says Athanasius, to the nature of the Son after he has become man, i.e., as he is *kata sarka,* according to his human nature. In conclusion Athanasius summarizes his view:

> "For so long as we confess that He became man it makes no difference, as was said before, whether 'he became,' or 'he has been made,' or 'created,' or 'formed,' or 'servant,' or 'son of an handmaid,' or 'son of man,' or 'was constituted,' or 'departed (life),' or 'bridegroom,' or 'brother's son,' or 'brother.' All these terms are proper to man's constitution; and as such they do not designate the essence of the Word, but that he has become man."[53]

When this exegesis is compared with that of Nestorius it becomes clear that they were both wrestling with the same problem—a problem concerning the Trinity. Each believes the Arians perverted and misunderstood the Scriptures by subordinating the Son to the Father; and each proceeds in his own fashion to refute the arguments of the Arians. What is striking about the parallel between Nestorius and Athanasius is that they lived almost 100 years apart. Though the dating of the *Orations* is somewhat disputed, at the inside at least 75-80 years (perhaps even 90) intervened between them and Nestorius' sermon on Hebrews. And in each case Athanasius and Nestorius are disturbed about the same question.

When we return to Cyril we note again that similar questions exercised him during the early part of his episcopate and provided the occasion for many of his dogmatic and exegetical writings. In the reply to Nestorius, however, we see the initial shift of emphasis which was eventually to frame the peculiarly Christological questions of the two centuries after Cyril. But, even though he does shift the question to new ground, his approach is fundamentally set by Athanasius and the direction his theology took in response to Arius. In the attack Cyril did not contribute in a substantive fashion to the theological tradition of Alexandria—at least not at this point—but he had ceased worrying about the Arians. And this in itself is no insignificant

step forward. Cyril was certain the divinity of the Son had been established beyond further refutation, and it was time now to turn to the implications of this conviction.

The anathema reads as follows:

> "The divine Scripture asserts that Christ was made 'the High Priest and Apostle of our confession'; moreover he offered himself for us 'as an odour of sweet savor' to God even the Father. If anyone therefore says that it was not the Word himself who is from God who was made High Priest and our Apostle when He was made flesh and man like us, but as it were another one born of a woman, considered separately from Him: or if anyone says that He offered the sacrifice for himself also and not rather solely for our sakes—for he 'who knew no sin' would have no need of a sacrifice—let him be anathema."[54]

Cyril begins with a straightforward statement of the content of the passage from Hebrews. Then, secure in the conviction that human predications no longer call into question the divinity of the Word, he says that it was the Word who was made High Priest and Apostle. This did not happen before he became man, i.e., in his pre-existence, but he became high priest "when he became flesh." Furthermore, if it was the Word who was high-priest it is obvious that he did not have to make offering for himself, even though he was a man. At two points he goes beyond Athanasius.[55] First of all, instead of arguing that Hebrews does not mean the Son is not equal to the Father, he assumes the Son *is equal* to the Father and seeks to show what it means that the Word was made man and became a priest. Athanasius could never move the discussion to this point—even if he wished to—for he was too pressed by his opponents to defend the prior point. Secondly, Cyril opens the question concerning the nature of Christ's priesthood. As high priest Christ is perfect and without sin and for this reason the sacrifice he offers is not offered for himself but for other men.

In the accompanying letter Cyril explains himself more fully. If Christ is truly God, then the sacrifice must be appropriate to him. It must be perfect and without blemish and offered for others because he himself is spotless and without sin.

> "For what offering or sacrifice did he need for himself, who as God was superior to all sin?"[56]

Cyril's understanding of priesthood is not pulled out of the air to criticize Nestorius; already many of these concepts had been developed and explained at length in his commentaries. In the course of the controversy Cyril took occasion to explain further the intention of the anathema, but it was in the treatise *Adversus Nestorius* (Book III) where he most fully articulated together the exegetical and theological dimensions of Christ's priestly work.[57] While important for Cyril's own Christology, a discussion of this cannot detain us here.

Before concluding, one final piece of evidence should be added

to the discussion. We have now seen that Nestorius was concerned in his sermon to refute Arian subordinationism. From his approach to the text and the problem he discussed, it became clear that he was troubled by the same questions which troubled Athanasius in the fourth century. When Cyril read Nestorius he saw red, for in his view, Nestorius had radically broken with the tradition he had received. Furthermore, Cyril, though working within the Trinitarian framework set down by Athanasius, saw Nestorius in Christological terms and gauged his comments accordingly. But how did Cyril's theology look to the Antiochene theologians who stood in the same tradition as Nestorius?

The best example here is Theodoret of Cyrus, because he sought to refute Cyril's anathemas. Theodoret's own Christology is an important representative of the Antiochene school without many of the exaggerations and infelicities of Nestorius or Theodore. What interests us here, however, is not his own Christology but the way he looked at Cyril's anathemas. In his remarks on the fourth anathema, which dealt with the proper exegesis of the texts from the Scriptures, Theodoret notes that Cyril is proud of his ability to contest Arius and Eunomius and other heresiarchs. But, says Theodoret, "let the exact professor say how he answers the blasphemy of the heretics when he says that the things spoken humbly and appropriately of the form of a servant apply to the divine Word."[58] For in these cases the Arians try to show that the Son is inferior, a creature, something made, and a servant.

Even though the controversy has by the time of this writing become explicitly Christological, Theodoret is still troubled by the Arians. And he misunderstands Cyril and the Alexandrian reply to Arius just as totally as Cyril misunderstood Nestorius and the Antiochenes. Neither had any inkling of the profound and unbridgeable chasm their predecessors had created when they refuted Arius. Consequently Theodoret proceeds to defend the divinity of the Son against Arius, though his supposed task is to refute Cyril. He simply cannot break loose from the old question, for Cyril's own view of the matter seems to open the floodgates to the perversions which the Church had fought for so long. "To whom," says Theodoret, "shall we apply the hunger and thirst, the weariness and sleep? To whom the ignorance and fear? . . . If these belong to God the Word, how was wisdom ignorant?"[59] Finally, at the end of his discussion he links both his own interpretation of the passages and the heresy of Arius. Unless, says Theodoret, these parts of the Gospels are applied to the form of a servant, we cannot hope to withstand the onslaughts of the Arians. "We shall therefore apply what is divinely spoken and done to God the Word; on the other hand we shall apply what is said and done humbly

to the form of a servant, in order that we are not infected by the blasphemy of Arius and Eunomius."[60]

In summary, let us now bring together the results of the foregoing analysis. The task before us was to show that on the eve of the Christological controversies the Trinitarian questions of the former century were still very much alive. The presence of Trinitarian questions was not incidental to the beginning of the Christological controversy, for they contributed to the direction the debate finally took as well as the profound misunderstanding between the competing figures. In part, the presence of Trinitarian questions springs from the very real presence of Arians in the empire during the years immediately prior to 430. Contrary to what one might expect as a result of the condemnation of Arianism at Constantinople, Arianism continued to exist and to foster troublesome sects with resourceful and capable leadership. It was against Arian teaching as well as Arian groups that laws were instituted and theological treatises written. And, though Apollinarism did indeed portend the questions of the future, it was Arianism which shaped the theological literature of the period.

To this theological and ecclesiastical situation, however, must be added the confusing fact of the divergent replies given to Arianism. The immediate occasion for the two types was a series of passages from the New Testament which seemed to suggest the Son of God was subordinate to the Father. In defense Alexandrian theologians argued that such passages were properly applied to the Son of God, but *kata sarka,* according to his human nature; Antiochene theologians, however, did not see how such passages could be applied to the Son of God without capitulating to Arian subordinationist claims. Taking another course, these theologians referred such passages to the man Jesus, the seed of Abraham, or the form of a servant. Cyril as an Alexandrian theologian stands in the former exegetical and theological tradition; Nestorius stands in the latter.

Trouble began when Cyril read what Nestorius had been preaching about one of these problem passages and about the *theotokos.* What Cyril did not realize, however, was that to Antiochene theologians the term *"theotokos"* raised the same problem as did these passages, for it suggested to the Arians that Christ was subordinate to the Father. In short, *theotokos* was for the Antiochenes a Trinitarian, not a Christological term. It seemed to give support to the opponents of the Divinity of the Son. Totally oblivious to the reasons why Nestorius rejected the *theotokos,* Cyril bombards him with a battery of Alexandrian arguments and expressions which only seem to betray his own parochial orientation. In the process Cyril does not stray from the basic Trinitarian pattern set down by Athanasius, but he does begin to shift its emphasis from a "Trinitarian" to "Christological" question. While

this shift is of great magnitude for the eventual development of the doctrine of Christ, in the immediate situation it only contributed to misunderstanding. Theodoret, who replied to Cyril's attack on Nestorius, is not only dissatisfied with some of Cyril's statements about Christ, but he is utterly bewildered how Cyril can say what he does and still hold out against the Arians. Thus, even after Cyril has begun to shift the center of the question, Theodoret is still disturbed by the prior question—now over 100 years old.

As this is happening we behold crumbling before us the classical argument from tradition, so dear to the Fathers. It is not, I believe, romantic to claim that there was a time in which, even amid diversity, the bishops could in truth appeal to a common tradition. But by the fourth century Athanasius could hardly point to a unified and consistent tradition.[61] In fact much of his difficulty arose precisely because he was an innovator who claimed that his innovations were absolutely necessary if the Church's faith was to be rescued from a theology which would surely destroy it. Similarly Augustine, writing against the Donatists, had to grant that the Donatists had Cyprian on their side. Nevertheless he argued that, by innovating and changing, he was more faithful to the Church's tradition than they. Each appealed to the tradition within the tradition, that is to a deeper meaning which gave unity, purpose and cohesion to its diversity. Athanasius spoke of the "scope" and "meaning" of the Scriptures and the tradition; Augustine appealed to the Catholic spirit, the bond of peace and love.

But in the case of Cyril and Nestorius, neither seemed able to offer the Church a "scope" or "meaning" or interpretation capable of demonstrating the unity and cohesion of the tradition. For, tragic though it be, there were in fact two "scopes" and two "meanings," each having the support of at least a century of exegetical and theological tradition. Neither man could see this; and, as a consequence, neither was capable of formulating a solution which met the demands of both traditions. In their madness each appealed to his own tradition and cast it in the face of the other, savagely hoping that, stripped of the garments of logic and good sense, force would prevail. Whether the collision which took place in 431 was resolved in 451 is, of course, a hotly debated issue—even today. One thing is plain—the classical argument from tradition had been forever destroyed, hopelessly crushed by the weight of a load it was never meant to bear. But what is even more tragic: it did not die. In fact, it blossomed anew and was transformed into what Harnack once called paleography, and Werner Elert wryly labeled *Dogmengeschichte*—the gathering of citations from the Fathers in support of one's own opinion.[62]

1. *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias,* iii.1; *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* ed. by Eduard Schwartz (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1914ff.), I,1,6, p.53; hereafter abbreviated A.C.O. Here as elsewhere the translation is my own, unless otherwise noted. For similar statements of Cyril cf. Ep. 1 (PG 77, 13b-c; A.C.O., I,1,1,10-11); Ep. 39 (PG 77, 176d; A.C.O., I,1,4,17).
2. A.C.O. I,5,1, p. 26; Friedrich Loofs, *Nestoriana* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905), pp. 250ff. In a letter to Cyril Nestorius frequently appealed to the "traditions of the Fathers," and at one place to the "traditions of the Gospels" in support of his rejection of the *theotokos* (Ep. 5 inter epistolas Cyrilli, PG 77, 49-57, esp. col. 56a-b; Loofs 174ff.).
3. A.C.O. I,1,1,33-42. It is generally agreed today that the anathemas were not accepted by the Council of Ephesus in 431. For literature discussing this problem see Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Westminister, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960), III, 134.
4. Jacques Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la Querelle Nestorienne* (Lille, 1951). In his recent article, "Das Scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht," *Scholastik,* XXXVI (1961), 327, Grillmeier points to Cyril's claim (Ep. 2, A.C.O., I,1,1,24) that Nestorius' teaching created an "ecumenical scandal." But this, it seems, can only be conceded if one chooses to side with Alexandria.
5. At least since Origen; see G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), pp. 639-671; cf. also P.-Th. Camelot, *Éphèse et Chalcédoine* (Paris: Editions de l'Orante, 1961), pp. 13-14.
6. "C'est donc à la piété et à la foi traditionnelles que s'opposait Nestorius," writes Camelot, p. 14.
7. For the classical political interpretation see Eduard Schwartz, *Cyril und der Mönch Viktor* ("Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien," Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, Band 208, Abhandlung 4: Vienna, 1928).
8. Once again see Camelot: "Une chose du moins paraît certaine. Quels qu'aient pu être les défauts de son caractère, saint Cyrille n'a été mû que par le souci de la vérité et le zèle de la foi," p. 35.
9. Th. Mommsen and Paul Meyer (eds.), *Theodosiani Libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis* (Berlin, 1905), xvi.5, pp. 855-880; cf. in particular 5, 11 (383 A.D.); 5,17 (388); 5,23 (394); 5,34 (398); 5,49 (410); 5,59 (423); 5,64 (428), *et al.*
10. Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* v, 13. 20; vi, 8; vii, 29; Sozomen, *H.E.* viii 8. Socrates also tells of two Arian leaders, learned in Greek literature and the Scriptures and eloquent in speech. He expresses surprise they continue to confess Arian doctrine (vii, 6).
11. Hans Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule* ("Texte und Untersuchungen von Hans Lietzmann, Vol. I; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1904), pp. 26ff; see also *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* I, 520.
12. PG, 59; see also his *Homilies on the Incomprehensible Nature of God* (PG 48, 701-812).
13. PG, 29, 671-774; PG, 39, 269-992.
14. Of the treatise against Eunomius only fragments remain. J. M. Voste (ed.), *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in evangelium Johannis Apostoli;* Text: *CSCO,* 115; Translation into Latin, *CSCO* 116 (Louvain, 1940). See also his Commentary on Psalm 2 (R. Devreesse, *Studi e Testi,* Vol. 93; "Pubblicazioni della Biblioteca Vaticana," Rome, 1939), pp. 11-12.
15. *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate* (PG 75, 9-656); *De sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate* (PG 75, 657-1124); *Commentary on John* (PG 73 & 74, 9-756); better edition of this commentary by P. E. Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in d. Joannis evangelium* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872; 3 Vols.).
16. Interestingly, Nestorius was initially attacked as a heretic on Trinitarian grounds (Socrates, *H.E.* vii, 32); cf. also the *Obtestatio publice proposita* of Eusebius of Dorylaeum (A.C.O., I, 1,1, 101-2). Marius Mercator, Nestorius' western critic also made the same charge in his *Comparatio dogmatum Pauli Samosateni et Nestorii* (PL, 48, 753ff., A.C.O., I,5, 5-70ff.).
17. Aloys Grillmeier, *Scholastik,* XXXVI (1961), 329.
18. August Hahn. *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche.* 3rd Ed. by Ludwig Hahn (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962; photographic reprint of 1897 ed.), p. 262. Cf. also Cyril of Alexandria's paraphrase of the Arian reaction to the account of Jesus' Baptism in the Gospels: They jump up, he says, with a "big laugh" and say: "What argument will you bring against what is written? The evangelist says the Spirit descends on the Son; he is annointed by the Father; he received that which he does not have." (PG 73, 196b-c; Pusey, I, 175).
19. Francis Sullivan, *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1956), pp. 158ff.

20. For a brief account of how these questions influenced the exegesis of the Gospel of John, cf. Maurice Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel; The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), pp. 112-147.
21. PG, 26, 385a.
22. *Ibid.*, 436a.
23. See the statement of Eustathius: "Si enim in Christo, inquit, plenitudo divinitatis inhabit, primum quidem aliud est quod inhabit, aliud autem quod inhabitatur. Si autem natura differunt ab alterutris, neque mortis passionem neque cibi appetitum neque poculorum desiderium, non somnum, non tristitiam, non fatigationem, non lacrimarum fluxus, non aliam quamlibet mutationem plenitudini divinitatis coexistere fas est, cum sit inconvertibilis per naturam. Homini haec adplicanda seorsim sunt, qui ex anima constat et corpore." (Fragment 47); see also fragments 18, 27, 28, 41, 47, 48 in M. Spannuet, *Recherches sur les écrits d' Eustathe d'Antioche avec une édition nouvelle des fragments dogmatiques et exégetiques* (Lille, 1948).
24. Cf., for example, the use of pronouns in the following passage: "Deus Verbum, qui *me* assumpsit *sibique* conjunxit, dat *mihi* cum fiducia victoriam iudicii. *Me* enim semel pro semper fecit *suum*, quando assumpsit *me;* atque evidens est *eum me* (!) non derelinquere ne temere agam." (Voste, CSCO, 116, p. 174). For other examples see T. Camelot, " De Nestorius à Eutyches," in A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* (Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1951), I, 217ff.
25. Loofs, pp. 230-242. Text also in W.T. M. Becher, *Joannis Chrysostomi Homiliae* (Leipzig, 1839); reprinted in PG 64, cols. 479-492. Concerning the homily Loofs says (p. 107): "Der Text der Predigt bei Becher zeigt nicht die geringsten dogmatischen Korrekturen, erweist sich, an den Fragmenten gemessen, überall als intakt. Es liegt also in dieser Predigt der einzig in der Originalsprache vollständig erhaltene Sermon des Nestorius vor." See also Sebastian Haidacher, "Rede des Nestorius über Hebr. 3.1, überliefert unter dem Namen des heiligen Chrysostomus," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XXIX (1905), 192-95.
26. It is not my intention to enter into a discussion of Nestorius' Christology, but to show how the exegesis of the sermon conforms to the pattern of Antiochene anti-Arian exegesis. For Nestorius' Christology, especially its dogmatic and philosophical aspects see Grillmeier, "Die theologische und sprachliche Vorbereitung der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon," *Chalkedon*, I, 144ff, and *Scholastik*, XXXVI, 321-56; Luigi Scipioni, *Ricerche sulla Christologia del 'Libro di Eraclido' di Nestorio* ("Paradosis: Studi di letteratura e teologia antica," Vol. XI: Freiburg, 1956); T. Camelot, "De Nestorius à Eutyches," *Chalkedon*, I, 213-229. The recent article by Carl Braaten, "Modern Interpretations of Nestorius," *Church History*, XXXII (1963), 251-67, is a helpful survey of the older literature; its usefulness is, however, limited, since it does not discuss these more recent works.
27. Loofs, p. 231.
28. *Oratio II Contra Arianos*, 1-10 (PG, 26, 145-168).
29. See the fragments in Karl Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* ("Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen," XV Band: Münster: Aschendorff Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1933), pp. 204-5; unfortunately we do not possess fragments of Diodore of Tarsus on Hebrews.
30. A.C.O., I,1,6,137. It is interesting that Theodoret in his more mature and less polemically oriented work, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, is more restrained in his comments. Here, in the exposition of Heb. 3:1, he assigns the passage to *"christos,"* which title he calls the *mēnuma tōn duo physeōn* (PG, 82, 697b). Similarly John Chrysostom's exegesis of this section of Hebrews does not conform so rigidly to the Antiochene pattern: see his *Commentary on Hebrews* (PG, 63, pp. 45ff.).
31. A.C.O. I,1,6,137 (14-19).
32. Loofs, p. 232 (8-11).
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 232 (14)-233(4).
34. *Ibid.*, p. 234 (14-16).
35. *Ibid.*, p. 235 (5-6).
36. *Ibid.*, 236 (7ff).
37. *Ibid.*, p. 238 (8-31).
38. Cf. Nestorius, Ep. V inter epistolas Cyrilli (PG 77, 49-51; Loofs, 174-5). Nestorius argues that the term *theotokos* is not only unbiblical, but it suggests the Logos is passible (*pathēton*). This is, of course, said in light of the Arians and the support the term would give to their contentions. At the end of the epistle he explicitly mentions the Arians and links Apollinarism with Arianism. Both heresies, said Nestorius, made the Logos subject, according to his own nature, to human affections; and this, according to Arian logic, showed he was not God. This linking of Arianism and Apollinarism is characteristic of Nestorius and significant for understanding the Antiochene position vis-a-vis Alexandria. Cf. the numerous places where Nestorius lumps them together: Loofs, 166, 19; 170,30; 179,4; 181,18; 182,8; 184,15; 185,12; 194,10; 208,16; 267, 15; 273,7.

39. Socrates' description of Nestorius' phlegmatic and incautious character has become classic: see *H.E.* vii, 32.

40. Ep. I (PG, 77, 9-40; A.C.O., I,1,1, 10-23). The literature on Cyril's Christology is extensive. See the bibliography in Quasten, *Patrology*, III, 140-141. The most extensive recent work is Liébaert, *La doctrine Christologique*. . . ; but see also Grillmeier, *Chalkedon*, I, 160-93; G. Jouassard, "Une intuition fondamentale de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie en christologie dans les premières années de son épiscopat," *Revue des Études Byzantines*, XI (1953), 175-186; and the discussion in the recent edition of two works of Cyril by G. M. de Durand, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux Dialogues Christologiques* ("Sources Chrétiennes," No. 97; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1964), pp. 81-150.

41. Ep. 1 (PG, 77, 13b; A.C.O., I,1,1, 10).

42. *Ibid.*

43. *Ibid.*, 13c; A.C.O., I,1,1,11). The citation comes from *Oratio III Contra Arianos*, 29 (PG 26,385a).

44. *Ibid.*, 13d; A.C.O., I,1,1,11).

45. *Ibid.*, 16d; A.C.O., I,1,1,13).

46. A.C.O., I,1,1,40-42.

47. *Ibid.*

48. A.C.O., I,1,1,41; T. Herbert Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*. 4th Ed. (London: Methuen & Co., 1950), p. 218.

49. PG, 26, 152c-153a.

50. *Ibid.*, 153c.

51. *Ibid.*, 161b.

52. *Ibid.*, 161d-164a.

53. *Ibid.*, 169a-b.

54. A.C.O. I,1,1,41; Bindley, p. 219.

55. Cyril had already discussed Hebrews 3 in his *Thesaurus* (PG 75, 361-3); here he was interested solely in the Trinitarian question and assigns the passage, following Athanasius, to the Incarnate Logos: "The Apostle is not explaining the nature of the Word, but the economy with flesh" (361b).

56. Ep. 17 (PG, 77, 117a; A.C.O., I,1,1 38).

57. A.C.O., I,1,7,65ff.; It is, I believe, important to note that Cyril's conception of the priestly work of Christ is not a hasty formulation shaped soley in response to Nestorius' sermon. Many of the concepts expressed in this work —blameless priest, spotless lamb, second Adam—were worked out in some detail in Cyril's commentaries before the controversy began. For the second Adam cf. his *Commentary on John* i.9 (PG, 73, 157ff.; Pusey, I, 138ff.); ii.1 (PG, 73, 196bc; Pusey, I, 175); concerning priesthood, note the following discussions of terms and phrases which appear in the anathema: "sacrifice of God's Son," *In Joannem* xi.12 (PG, 74, 585b: Pusey, III, 20-21); "blameless sacrifice," *Ibid.*, xi.10 (PG, 74, 545d: Pusey, 724); "offering for mankind, but not for himself," *Ibid.* x.8 (PG, 74, 508c-d; Pusey, II, 689); *Ibid.* ix (PG, 74, col. 153a; Pusey, II, 378).

58. A.C.O. I,1,6,121. The felicitous phrase "exact professor" comes from the *NPNF* translator; the Greek itself is more prosaic though not without a touch of sarcasm: *ho tōn theiōn dogmatōn didaskalos akribēs.*

59. *Ibid.*

60. *Ibid.*, 122.

61. He had to write a book, *De Sententia Dionysii*, to show that his use of *homoousios*—a term Dionysius rejected in the third century—was faithful to authentic Christian tradition as well as responsive to the present problem (PG, 25, 479-522).

62. Werner Elert, *Der Ausgang der altkirchlichen Christologie* (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1957), p.24; On the general practice of citing the fathers as authorities, see Robert M. Grant, "The Appeal to the Early Fathers," *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S., IX (1960), 13-24; in particular see Hubert du Manoir de Juaye, "L'argumentation patristique dans la controverse nestorienne," *Dogme et Spiritualité chez Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie* ("Études de Théologie et d' Histoire de la Spiritualité," ed. by Étienne Gilson and André Combes, No. 11; Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1944), 454-490; Manoir correctly observes that the practice of citing extensive lists (*florilegia*) of quotations first begins with Cyril; at the same time he shows that the use of florilegia is of a piece with the earlier argument from tradition. Though I have not entered into a discussion of the intricacies of the new form of appealing to tradition, the intention of my remarks should be plain: the new development of undergirding one's theology by lists of citations of earlier fathers presupposes a view of tradition which has become unworkable by the ecclesiastical and theological situation of the late fourth and early fifth centuries. For further literature, see Marcel Richard, "Les florilèges diphysites du Ve et du VI siècle," *Chalkedon*, I, 721-748.