

## THE DOGMATIC DEFINITION AT CHALCEDON

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.S.S.R.

*Immaculate Conception Rectory, Bronx, N.Y.*

THE Fourth General Council, assembled at Chalcedon in October, 451, brought to a climax the great Christological controversy concerning the union of the natures in Christ by declaring in its fifth session:

We now unanimously teach one sole and the same Son, our Savior Jesus Christ, complete as to His divinity, complete also as a man; true God and at the same time true man; composed of one rational soul and of a body consubstantial with ours, in all things like to us, sin alone excepted; begotten of the Father before the whole universe as to His divinity; as to His humanity, born for us in these last times of Mary the Virgin and Mother of God. We confess one sole and the same Jesus Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, whom we acknowledge to be in two natures, without any confusion, or change, or division, or separation between them; for the difference of the two natures is in no way suppressed by their union. On the contrary, the properties of each nature are preserved and concur in one sole person and one sole hypostasis. And we confess that they are not parted or divided in several persons, but are indeed one sole and the same Son, the only-begotten, God, the Word, our Savior Jesus Christ, such as He had been predicted by the prophets; such as Jesus Christ Himself has revealed Himself to us; and such as the creeds of the Fathers have made Him known to us.<sup>1</sup>

Into the formulation of that definition there entered at least a hundred and fifty years of theological speculation. Yet in the minds of the twenty-three men entrusted with the final hammering out of its phraseology in the martyrrium of the Church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon on October 22, 451, there were three principal currents of thought, all orthodox, each representative of doctrinal intransigency, that called for reconciliation. One stood for the terminology of the Antiochene party, ardently championed by the bishops of the Orient with Anatolius of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch as leaders; a second incorporated the clear, incisive phrases of the *Tome* of the Pope, Leo

<sup>1</sup> The Acts of the Council are edited in Eduard Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1932-38), t. II, vol. I: the Greek version; vol. III: the Latin (cited hereafter as *ACO*, II-I and II-III). For convenience, most references here will be to the Latin version. For the definition: *ACO*, II-I, 324 f.; II-III, 395 f.

the Great, urgently favored by his legates to the Council, with Paschasinus of Lilybeum and Julian of Chios at their head; the third held uncompromisingly to the terminology of Cyril of Alexandria, and tended in its fanatical fringe to trail off into heresy.

Strangely enough, the Council actually had no business drawing up a formula of faith at all, that endeavor having been explicitly excluded by the Pontiff both in his letter to the Emperor Marcian acceding to the convocation of the general assembly,<sup>2</sup> and in his instruction to the assembled Fathers which, unfortunately, was not read to them until after the formula had become a fact.<sup>3</sup> Leo's reasons for limiting the competence and the agenda of the Council were sound. Its convocation represented a desperate endeavor on the part of the newly chosen Emperor to bring ideological and doctrinal peace to his realm which, since the proroguing of Ephesus, twenty years previously, had been in the throes of a vast theological conflict that threatened the very unity of the empire.<sup>4</sup> The Pope saw little hope in saddling prejudiced and temperamentally diverse minds with a new statement of faith that might well but add to the volume of confusion. He himself had gone to great lengths to settle the matter with his famous *Tome* "in which," as he informed both the Emperor and the bishops, "there had been pro-

<sup>2</sup> Leo wrote four letters in immediate preparation for the Council, in each of which he stipulated explicitly that there was to be no discussion of doctrine: *Epp.* 90 to Marcian, 91 to Anatolius, 92 to Julian of Chios, his Constantinopolitan representative, and 93 to the Council itself (respectively in Philip Jaffé, F. Kaltenbrunner, etc., *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* [2nd ed.; Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1885-88; cited hereafter as *JK*], nn. 470-74, all dated as of June 26, 450). To the emperor he directed: "illudque potius iubetis ut Nicaenae synodi constituta, remota haereticorum interpretatione, permaneant" (*Ep.* 90, 2). Finally, on July 20, 451, Leo, *Ep.* 94 to Marcian (*JK*, 474), affirmed: "In eam fidem quam evangelicis et apostolicis praedicationibus declaratam per sanctos patres nostros accepimus, et tenemus," adding "nulla penitus disputatione cuiusquam retractationis admissa." Cf. Trevor G. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1941), p. 285 f.

<sup>3</sup> By some mischance, this letter was only read to the Council in its sixteenth session on October 31 (*ACO*, II-I, 31-32; *JK*, 473). Leo here explicitly forbids all discussion of doctrine, assuring them that "per litteras meas quas ad beatae memoriae Flavianum episcopum misimus, fuerit declaratum quid sit de sacramento incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi pia et sincera confessio." Despite strong imperial pressure, the bishops in the second and third sessions withstood the commissioners on this issue, resolutely refusing to draw up a new formula of faith.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930-33), I, 507 ff.; Louis Duchesne, *Early History of the Church*, trans. Claude Jenkins (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1948), III, 271 ff.

claimed what is the orthodox and true profession concerning the mystery of the Incarnation."<sup>5</sup>

Leo was fully aware of the national antipathies and personal ambitions that could and actually did mar the peaceable agreements of such a gathering.<sup>6</sup> He felt, first of all, that its convocation was too precipitate, not allowing adequately for the participation of the bishops of the West.<sup>7</sup> He was gravely concerned lest the partisans of St. Cyril be in any way estranged; hence in briefing his legates he had been insistent that "the statutes of the first Council of Ephesus against Nestorius, which had been presided over by the blessed Cyril of happy memory, be specially adhered to";<sup>8</sup> and it was his wish that the Council's chief endeavor should be turned to reconciling the discredited leaders of what he himself had termed the "Brigandage at Ephesus" of 449—Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia, possibly also Dioscorus of Alexandria, with even a hope for a *volte-face* on the part of Eutyches himself—in such fashion that "if, as we desire, all take leave of their error, no one should suffer the loss of his honor."<sup>9</sup>

It was impossible, of course, for the Council to avoid all discussion of doctrine. Yet in the first and third sessions the spotlight was turned upon the illicit conduct of the Patriarch of Alexandria and his abettors at the Robber Council of Ephesus in 449. Dioscorus' final condemna-

<sup>5</sup> Cf. note 3, *supra*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Christopher Dawson, *The Making of Europe* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945), pp. 128–29 and 179–80, for a discussion of the rising national consciousness reflected at the Council.

<sup>7</sup> In originally trying to have the Emperor dispense with the Council Leo wrote: "Sed sacerdotum provinciarum omnium congregari praesentis temporis necessitas nulla ratione permittit: quoniam illae provinciae de quibus maxime evocandi sunt, inquietatae bello, ab ecclesiis suis eos non patiuntur abscedere"—a clear reference to the invasions of the Huns (*Ep.* 83, 2 [*JK*, 463]). In a later letter (June 24, 450: *Ep.* 89 [*JK*, 469]), he said he would have preferred the Council's postponement to a more convenient season, "so that the Council might in a true sense be a universal one." It was in this letter that he appointed Paschasius as his personal legate: "Praedictum fratrem . . . vice mea synodo convenit praesidere."

<sup>8</sup> Leo, *Ep.* 93, 3 (*JK*, 473): "Prioris autem Ephesinae synodi, cui sanctae memoriae Cyrillus episcopus tunc praesedit, contra Nestorium specialiter statuta permaneant."

<sup>9</sup> *Loc. cit.*: "cum si, ut cupimus, errorem omnes relinquunt nemini quidem perire suus honor debeat." He expressed the same sentiment to the Emperor: "sed damnata impietate haereseos nullum de perditione cuiusquam catholica Ecclesia sentiat detrimentum" (*Ep.* 94 [*JK*, 474]).

tion was predicated more upon his ruthless obstinacy in excommunicating the Pope and repudiating the subpoenas of the Council than upon his doctrinal aberrations.<sup>10</sup> In actual fact, the pressure forcing the assembled Fathers to busy themselves with the formulation of a doctrinal decision came from the imperial commissioners presiding over the Council in the Emperor's stead. This is clear from the second session, at which, to placate the commissioners, were read the Creeds of Nicea and of Constantinople, along with the letters of Cyril to Nestorius and to the Orientals, as well as Leo's *Tome*.<sup>11</sup>

It was imperial intervention, too, that later caused the assembled Fathers to embark, under the guidance of Anatolius of Constantinople,<sup>12</sup> upon a detailed statement of the faith, and that then in the fifth session persuaded the Eastern bishops to sanction the scrapping of Anatolius' formula in favor of what was to become the Council's final statement. But, as Pope Leo had foreseen and cautioned, the mere multiplication of formularies would not put an end to doctrinal disagreement. Actually it gave further support to the heretically minded in their charges that the original faith of the apostles and of Nicea had been tampered with.

<sup>10</sup> Towards the close of the third session, Paschasinus, the papal legate, summed up the charges: "quoniam secundis excessibus priorem iniquitatem valde transcendit (praesumpsit enim et excommunicationem dictare adversus . . . archiepiscopum magnae Romae Leonem . . . et semel et secundo et tertio per deo amicissimos episcopos regulariter vocatus minime voluit oboedire, propria utique conscientia stimulatus) ideo ipse contra se elicuit sententiam . . . unde . . . Leo per nos et per praesentem sanctam synodum . . . nudavit eum tam episcopatus dignitate quam etiam et omni sacerdotali alienavit ministerio" (*ACO*, II-III, 305).

<sup>11</sup> On the order of the first three sessions, see Schwartz, *ACO*, II-I, vii; II-III, Part 2, vi-vii. This second session dealing with matters of faith is in *ACO*, II-I, 265 ff. The reading of these various documents was done to stave off the pressure of the imperial commissioners who were demanding a formula of faith. The bishops flatly refused their several requests, holding off until the fifth session. On the text of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, and the incidental imperial interference, see J. Lebon, "Les anciens symboles à Chalcédoine," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXXII (1936), 809-76; John N. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London: Longmans, 1950), pp. 296-331.

<sup>12</sup> In the fourth session both Paschasinus and Anatolius proposed that the Council should simply agree to confirm the doctrinal decrees of Nicea and Ephesus together with the dogmatic letters of Cyril and of Leo read in the second session. But the commissioners introduced a statement of faith drawn up by a group of Egyptians which significantly omitted any condemnation of Eutyches and passed over Leo's *Tome* in silence. This, of course, caused considerable difficulty, exposing some lack of unity in the assembly. It was evidently the commissioners' intent to force the Council to a doctrinal statement. Cf. *ACO*, II-III, 361-87.

The fundamental theological problem facing the Fathers at Chalcedon, of course, had to do with the composite being that was Jesus Christ, God and man. Unfortunately, with the condemnation of Nestorius at Ephesus in 431, and the subsequent reconciliation between Cyril and John of Antioch in 433, theological speculation did not come to a halt. In the reaction to the Nestorian heresy that had postulated a "superior union in the person of Christ," but actually admitted only a moral union between the two complete natures of the divinity and the humanity in Christ,<sup>13</sup> there was the obvious tendency to overstress the unity of the God-Man, utilizing the pseudo-Athanasian phrase, favored by St. Cyril, to the effect that in Christ there was "one sole nature of the Word, God made man."<sup>14</sup>

At this epoch, unfortunately, Greek theology had not as yet hit upon a happy terminology to express "the union of the two natures in the one person of Christ." Tertullian, it is true, had long before elaborated the phrase "proprietas utriusque substantiae in una persona,"<sup>15</sup> and Basil of Cappadocia had employed the words "treis hypostaseis, mia physis,"<sup>16</sup> in treating of the Trinity. But succeeding theologians such as Apollinaris of Laodicea, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia had merely further confused the issue. Nor, for all his theological competence, was Cyril of much help in clarifying matters, as is clear from the aftermath of Ephesus.

Cyril, as a matter of fact, used the key words *physis*, *hypostasis*, *ousia*, and *prosōpon* in an equivocal fashion despite the fact that his various statements were capable of a fully orthodox explanation. But it was this tendency to equivocation and inconsistency that got him into difficulty with John of Antioch, with Theodoret of Cyr, and with the anti-Monophysites of a later date. In Cyril's thought, since Christ as the God-Man was one sole subject, a complete individual, there was in

<sup>13</sup> Cf. B. Altaner, *Patrologie* (2nd ed.; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1950), pp. 293-94; Friedrich Loofs, *Nestoriana* (Halle, 1905), p. 272, n. 13; p. 277, nn. 21 and 25.

<sup>14</sup> The phrase really stemmed from Apollinaris of Laodicea in his *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei ad Jovianum* (PG, XXVIII, 256), which after imperial condemnation circulated under the name of Athanasius. The fraud was only exposed in the sixth century in the *Adversus fraudes Apollinaris*, probably by Leontius of Byzantium. Cf. Friedrich Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz* (Texte und Untersuchungen, III; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1887), p. 90; H. Leitzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea* (Tübingen, 1904), pp. 103-8.

<sup>15</sup> *Adversus Praxeam* (PL, II, 215).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Hubert du Manoir de Juaye, *Dogme et spiritualité chez s. Cyrille d'Alexandrie* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1944), p. 7.

Him but one *physis*, one *hypostasis*, existing in an independent manner. This unique nature or *hypostasis* could only be that of the divine Word since it had always been in existence and was in itself unchangeable. The formula “*mia physis tou theou Logou*” designated the concrete nature, the independent hypostasis of the person of the Word, to which had been added a human nature, “*sesarkomenē*.” However, while complete, the human nature of Christ is peculiar, for though an essence and a reality, it is not a nature-person, a *physis-prosōpon*, since it is not independent in itself, but from its very origin belonged to the person of the Word of God.<sup>17</sup>

It was this absolute insistence upon the unity of this composite being, Jesus Christ, that made for error on the part of Eutyches and his partisans. Intent upon avoiding the heresy of Nestorius, who had separated the two natures in the Son of God become man, influenced likewise by an Oriental tendency to eschew subtle reasoning in dealing with the Absolute, Eutyches allowed himself to be maneuvered into stating that “before the conception of Christ there were two natures, the divine and the human, but after the union there was but one nature, that of the Word, God made flesh.”<sup>18</sup> Susceptible as this was of an orthodox explanation at the hands of Cyril, it was likewise open to the charge of heresy, as Theodoret had branded it in his *Eranistes* wherein he had the beggar-heretic explain: “I say that after the Incarnation the divinity remains, and that it has absorbed the humanity just as the water of the sea dissolves and absorbs a drop of honey that falls into it. This is not to say that the humanity is annihilated in its union with the divinity, but that it is changed by it.”<sup>19</sup>

Not enough of a theologian properly to explain himself, but determined to be loyal to the thought and terminology of Cyril, Eutyches had fastened on Cyril’s favored statement: “One sole nature of the Word, God made flesh.” Under the pressure of the logic of Eusebius of

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, “Terminologie christologique cyrillienne,” pp. 124–34.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. R. Draguet, “La christologie d’Eutychès,” *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 441–57: “La manière dont Eutychès envisage le problème christologique lui est commune avec la généralité des monophysites. Ils sont particulièrement soucieux d’accentuer l’unité du Christ, Verbe et homme, Verbe fait chair ou fait homme—les deux expressions s’équivalent—plutôt que la diversité spécifique des éléments unis dans l’individu unique que le Christ constitue” (p. 451).

<sup>19</sup> *Eranistes*, II, 114 (PG, LXXXIII, 153).

Doryleum at Flavian's Synod of Constantinople in 448, Eutyches had almost wavered into orthodoxy—as even Pope Leo discovered from the acts of that synod<sup>20</sup>—but, pressed too insistently, he had fallen back into his prepared position on the line of the unicity of nature in the God-Man.<sup>21</sup>

Meanwhile in the West a happier solution to the problem had been brought forth by the Pope. Abreast of the Christological difficulties since the days before Ephesus when he had been instrumental in having John Cassian compose his *De Incarnatione*,<sup>22</sup> Leo in his *Tome* to Bishop Flavian, written as a result of the original condemnation of Eutyches in the Synod of Constantinople in 448, had clarified the doctrine by deciding that “Jesus Christ was one”<sup>23</sup>—“Unus enim idemque est vere Dei filius et vere hominis filius” (ch. 4); that the two natures exist together—“salva proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae et in unam coeunte personam” (ch. 3). Thence the Pope launched boldly into a discussion of the *communicatio idiomatum*: “Agit enim utraque forma

<sup>20</sup> Leo, *Ep.* 28, to Flavian (*PL*, LIV, 755–82; *ACO*, II–II, 24–33): “Cum autem ad interloquionem examinis vestri Eutyches responderit, dicens: ‘Confiteor ex duabus naturis fuisse Dominum nostrum ante adunationem, post adunationem vero, unam naturam confiteor,’ miror tam absurdam . . . professionem nulla iudicantium increpatione reprehensam . . . qui quidem sicut gestorum ordine patefecit, bene coepert a sua persuasione discedere, cum vestra sententia coarctatus, profiteretur se dicere, quod ante non dixerat, et ei fidei acquiescere, cujus prius fuisset alienus. Sed cum anathematizando impio dogmati noluisset praebere consensum, intellexit eum fraternitas vestra in sua manere perfidia.” Leo obtained this information from the Acts of the local Council of Constantinople of 448 held under Flavian (letter of Flavian to Leo, *inter Leonis ep.* 22 [*PL*, LIV, 724–28]). These Acts were reread in the first session of Chalcedon.

<sup>21</sup> In stating his belief at Constantinople, Eutyches had said he “recognized two natures before the Incarnation, but after the Incarnation he would only recognize one nature.” Eusebius of Doryleum then asked him: “Do you say that there are two natures in Christ?” Eutyches answered: “I say there were two natures before the union; but only one after the union.” Basil of Seleucia then said to him: “If after the union you do not admit two natures which are not intermixed, but which are distinct from each other, you suppose that there had been an admixture and a confusion.” Whereupon, troubled, Eutyches had said: “I do not remember saying that.” “But my words,” continued Basil, “come back to this: if after the union you speak of but one nature, you teach that there had been an admixture; but if you speak of only one nature incarnate and made man in the same sense as Cyril, you teach the same as we do” (*ACO*, II–III, 127 ff.). But in each instance Eutyches fell back on his original position of the two natures before and only one after the union; hence he was condemned at Constantinople, but exonerated by Dioscorus at Ephesus. Cf. R. Draguet, *art. cit.*, p. 448 ff.

<sup>22</sup> *PL*, L, 9–272; cf. Jalland, *op. cit.*, pp. 34–35.

<sup>23</sup> Leo, *Ep.* 28.

cum alterius communione quod proprium est, Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est." The Savior is thus at one and the same time "invisibilis et visibilis, incomprehensibilis et comprehensibilis, impassibilis et passibilis" (ch. 4).<sup>24</sup>

As Leo had foreseen with considerable perspicacity, a prime difficulty would be raised at Chalcedon over discrepancies between his own terminology and that of St. Cyril. Despite the fact that he had generously utilized Cyrillan documents in the composition of his *Tome*, and despite his several warnings to his representatives at the Council, the first disagreements occurred after the reading of his *Tome* in the second session. The Bishops of Illyricum and of Palestine, belonging to the strictly Antiochene party, showed themselves uneasy over three statements having to do with the communication of properties.

In the first of these statements Leo had said: "In order to pay the debt occasioned by our condition, an inviolable nature is united to one capable of suffering, that as a remedy suited to our situation, one and the same mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ, might be subject to death on the one hand, and incapable of it on the other."<sup>25</sup> The bishops professed to hear an echo of Nestorianism here. To pacify them, Aetius, the Archdeacon of Constantinople, quickly cited a section from Cyril's second letter to Nestorius, just previously read to the assembly, wherein the selfsame sentiment was expressed: "As indeed His proper body by the grace of God, as St. Paul says, tasted death for all of us, it is said that He suffered death for us: not indeed in the sense that He had the experience of being dead—for it is folly to say or think such—but, as I have said above, His flesh tasted death."<sup>26</sup>

Next the Illyrian bishops objected to a passage in the fourth chapter of Leo's letter: "For each nature in union with the other performs the actions which are proper to itself. That is to say, the Word accomplishes those things which are proper to the Word; the flesh, those which are

<sup>24</sup> It was Leo's particular virtue to have summed up the matter in as clear and forthright a manner as possible. "La doctrine christologique de S. Leo atteint une clarté qui n'avait pas été atteinte jusque-là" (du Manoir, *op. cit.*, p. 513). It was neither Cyril nor Leo, of course, who had first fully developed the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*, but Origen. Cf. his *De principiis*, II, 6, 3; IV, 31 (PG, XI, 211 and 405); thence the doctrine had been taken up by Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc., and set forth in terms bordering on Scholastic concepts by Gregory of Nyssa (cf. his *Contra Eunomium*, V [PG, XLV, 705]).

<sup>25</sup> *ACO*, II-III, 274, ll. 9-12.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268, ll. 14-18.



proper to the flesh. The one shines forth by its miracles, the other succumbs under injuries."<sup>27</sup>

Aetius again was on hand with a passage from St. Cyril, cited from his *Synodal Letter* to Nestorius that had accompanied the *Twelve Anathemas*: "Certain passages [in the Scriptures]," said Cyril, "refer most properly to God, and others are proper to the humanity. Finally, certain expressions are proper to the mixture, making it evident that the Son of God is God and man all together."<sup>28</sup>

Finally the same bishops questioned Leo's statement: "For although in the Lord Jesus Christ there is but one whole person, God and man, that whereby there is in both a common contumely is one thing, that whereby there is a common glory is another. Of us He has the humanity, inferior to the Father; of the Father, divinity equal to the Father."<sup>29</sup>

It was Theodoret of Cyr who now produced the parallel passage from Cyril: "He has become man, and His manner of being has not changed; but He remains that which He was. He is by all means understood as one thing in another, that is to say, His divine nature in His humanity."<sup>30</sup>

Despite the apparent acquiescence in these explanations, the imperial commissioners, at the suggestion of Atticus of Epirus, ordered a delay of several days in which Anatolius of Constantinople and the Roman legates might further clarify these passages for those bishops who still professed themselves either unsatisfied or at least somewhat confused.

The result of several such private conferences, held in the episcopal residence in Constantinople, was that in the fourth session these various bishops gave explicit declarations of their adherence to the expression of the doctrine as contained in Leo's *Tome*, announcing themselves completely satisfied with the explanations offered them by the Roman legates.<sup>31</sup> Despite further difficulties raised by the creed of a group of thirteen Egyptian bishops which was now introduced to the Council, but which contained no notice of either Leo's *Tome* or the condemnation of Eutyches,<sup>32</sup> and despite a second uproar caused by the open

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 274, ll. 22-24.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 274, ll. 28-30.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 275, ll. 1-3.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 6-8.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 365-72, for a list of the signatures and several statements attesting to this fact.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 373-75. The Egyptians begged off signing Leo's *Tome* because they had no archbishop to take the lead, Dioscorus having been deposed: "Petimus . . . magnam

Eutychianism of the Archimandrite Carosus and a group of monks admitted to the same session,<sup>33</sup> doctrinal agreement on the one person and two natures in Christ had been achieved.

However, it was the emperor's mind that a new formula of faith should be fashioned by the Council that would take into consideration the objections of the various factions now apparently pacified. Hence, in the interval between the fourth and fifth sessions, the Bishop of Constantinople and his immediate entourage were prevailed upon to produce a new profession of faith. Under the chairmanship of Asclepiadius, a deacon of Constantinople, this new formula was read to the assembled Fathers on Monday, October 22, in the fifth session. Unfortunately its wording was not recorded in the minutes of the Council. But it was immediately attacked on the score that it contained the statement "Christ is of two natures," instead of the Leonine phrase "Christ is in two natures." The significance of the exception taken to the preposition lay in the fact that Dioscorus, the deposed Bishop of Alexandria, would admit the first phrase, "of two natures," but would not subscribe to the second, "in two natures." It was on this very phrase, indeed, that he had based the condemnation of Flavian at the Robber Council of Ephesus in 449. The new text, however, did contain the expression *Theotokos*, and it was on this score that Anatolius tried to jam it through the session. But his maneuvering caused a near riot, in the course of which the Roman legates threatened to leave the gathering and invalidate the Council by proceeding home. Imperial pressure

---

synodum . . . ut misereamini nobis et expectetis nostrum archiepiscopum, ut secundum antiquas consuetudines illius sequamur sententiam, quia si extra voluntatem praesidis nostri aliquid facimus . . . omnes Aegyptiacae regionis insurgent in nos" (*ibid.*, p. 376, ll. 20-30).

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 381 ff. The monks were asked to condemn the doctrine of Eutyches and to accept Leo's *Tome*. But their spokesman, the Archimandrite Dorotheus, explicitly refused to do so, saying that he held to the faith of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers (of Nicea) in which he had been baptized, and to the definitions of the Fathers at Ephesus, "and I know no other" (*ibid.*, p. 384, ll. 4-7). This, then, was a principal source of the inchoative opposition to the Council's final determination. Unfortunately the bishops allowed themselves to be provoked by the unruly conduct of the monks, and condemned them out of court, Aetius quoting one of the canons of Antioch making it imperative for monks to follow their bishops in matters of faith. The commissioners, however, postponed final judgment for a month to give the monks time to reconsider their stand. Had greater effort been made to convince these zealots of the true doctrine, much grief might later have been avoided, for it was these monks who spread the news through Egypt, Palestine, and the East that Chalcedon had surrendered the true faith and discarded Cyril.

was resorted to once more, with the result that a commission of twenty-three bishops was delegated to reword the definition, retiring to the martyrrium of the Church for that purpose.<sup>34</sup>

Care was exercised in the selection of this commission. Under the chairmanship of Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople, it contained the three papal legates plus Julian of Chios, their mentor, six bishops of the Orient including Maximus of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea, three Asiatics of the exarchate of Ephesus, three Illyrians, three bishops of Pontus, and three others of Thrace—a balanced representation of the currents of thought stemming from Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. Unfortunately, again, the minutes of this session were not preserved, but it is reported as having been a lively discussion using as a point of departure the text of Anatolius' caucus, but changing to the Leonine phrase "in two natures."<sup>35</sup>

Despite the original insistence of the Roman legates that nothing but Leo's *Tome* should be the rule of faith, the Pope's dogmatic statement, while contributing several essential phrases, did not play an all-important part in the commission's final deliberation. The dogmatic definition confined itself severely to a straightforward elucidation of the basic doctrine involved. Leo had indicated the scriptural justification for the doctrine that "the distinctive character of each nature and substance [the divine and the human] is preserved intact, and the two coalesce in one person," and had then hurried on to elaborate the *communicatio idiomatum* in a bold and masterful fashion. But the doctrinal commission at Chalcedon, mindful it seems of the recent difficulties raised by the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops over some of Leo's statements elucidating the *communicatio*, avoided that development entirely.

In its preamble, the Chalcedonian statement declares for the sufficiency of the Creeds of Nicea and of Constantinople which it quotes as adequate statements of Catholic belief regarding the Trinity and the Incarnation;<sup>36</sup> but it justifies the doctrinal explanations of Ephesus and

<sup>34</sup> It was only when the commissioners warned: "Dioscorus dicebat: quod ex duabus naturis, suscipio; sanctissimus autem archiepiscopus Leo duas naturas dicit esse in Christo unitas inconfuse. . . . Quem autem sequimini? Sanctissimum Leonem aut Dioscorum?", that they got the assembly to agree (*ACO*, II-III, 392).

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392 ff.

<sup>36</sup> It was here at Chalcedon that the Creed of Constantinople made its first appearance. Cf. J. Lebon, *art. cit.*, p. 810 ff.

its own further elaborations on the score of mounting error, "which has attempted to disfigure the mystery of the Incarnation, rejecting the word *Theotokos*, and introducing a confusion of natures. . . even making the monstrous statement that 'there is but one sole nature of the flesh and the divinity' whence the Divine Son has become, by union with humanity, capable of suffering."<sup>37</sup>

Insisting upon the complete agreement between the teaching of Cyril and Leo,<sup>38</sup> the definition pins down current errors:

The Council opposes itself to those who seek to divide the mystery of the Incarnation into a duality of the Son; it excludes from participation in the sacred mysteries those who dare to declare the divinity of the only-begotten Son capable of suffering, and it contradicts those who imagine a mixture or confusion of the two natures in Christ. It rejects those who go so far astray as to say that the form of a slave, which the Son has taken on Himself for us, is of a heavenly nature, or anything other than the same nature as ours. It anathematizes those who have invented the fable that before the union there were two natures in the Savior, and that after the union there was but one.<sup>39</sup>

This was, of course, paying homage to Leo's *Tome*. But essentially it was the Antiochene influence that predominated in the deliberations, for despite a Leonine phrase or two, the heart of the Chalcedonian definition echoes in its basic text the letter originally sent from Ephesus by the Oriental bishops to the Emperor Theodosius II in 431, which was used by John of Antioch in addressing his own profession of faith to St. Cyril, and which Cyril in his turn made the basis of his acceptance of the Union of 433. This is noticeable in the preliminary state-

<sup>37</sup> *ACO*, II-III, 395.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 396: "Quibus [the letters of Cyril] etiam epistolam maximae et senioris urbis Romae praesulis beatissimi et sanctissimi archiepiscopi Leonis quae scripta est ad sanctae memoriae archiepiscopum Flavianum ad perimendam Eutychis malam intelligentiam, consequentissime coaptavit utpote et magni illius Petri confessioni congruentem et communem quandam columnam nobis adversum prava dogmata existentem, ad confirmationem rectorum dogmatum." In composing his *Tome*, Leo had been aware of the necessity of correlating his thought with that of Cyril. He drew heavily on his predecessors for that purpose, and in particular on Cyril's *Scholia de Incarnatione*, John Cassian's *De Incarnatione*, and several letters of St. Augustine. Cf. L. Salet, "Les sources de l'*Eranistes* de Théodoret," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, VI (1905), 748 ff.; F. L. Cross, "Pre-Leonine Elements in the Proper of the Roman Mass," *Journal of Theological Studies*, I (1949), 193 f.

<sup>39</sup> *ACO*, II-III, 396.

ments leading up to the profession of faith.<sup>40</sup> It is uncontested in regard to the actual profession itself, as its initial sentences show:

*Chalcedonian Definition*<sup>41</sup>

Ἐπόμειοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἀγίοις πατράσιν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν Θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, Θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

*Confession of the Oriental Bishops*<sup>42</sup>

1. Ὁμολογοῦμεν τοιγαροῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος.

[Leo's *Tome*: ὁ γὰρ ὢν Θεὸς ἀληθῆς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἀληθῆς.]

3. ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

It is evident, then, that great effort was made to satisfy the doctrinal prejudices of the several factions met at Chalcedon, particularly that of the Egyptians, and even of the monks who proved to be such fanatical partisans of the Cyrillian terminology. The great difficulty, unperceived, it would seem, by the assembled prelates, and in particular by the Antiochenes who maneuvered the wording of the definition, was that Cyril's acceptance of the Confession of the Oriental bishops had not been happily received by many of his own supporters. He had

<sup>40</sup> Compare for example:

*Chalcedon*

Propter hoc illis omnem machinationem contra veritatem volens claudere praesens nunc . . . synodus praedicationem hanc ab initio immobilem docens decrevit ante omnia fidem inrecusabilem permanere trecentorum decem et octo sanctorum patrum [Nicaeae] . . . quam illi omnibus nota fecerunt non quasi quod aliquid deesset antecedentibus (*ACO*, II-III, 395-96).

*Oriental Bishops*

De genetrice autem dei virgine quem admodum et sapimus et dicimus, et de modo incarnationis unigeniti filii dei necessario, non quasi in additamenti parte, sed in specie satisfactionis, sicut ab initio tam ex divinis scripturis quam ex traditione sanctorum patrum suscipientes habuimus . . . nihil penitus addentes sanctae fidei quae a patribus in Nicaea est exposita (*ACO*, II-III, 270).

<sup>41</sup> *ACO*, II-I, 325-26.

<sup>42</sup> The Greek version is truncated, giving only a few sentences in *ACO*, II-I, 277; for the text used here, see C. Heurtley, *De fide et symbolo* (London, 1889), p. 201. The arabic numerals refer to the original order of the sentences in the Bishops' Confession of faith. The section from Leo's *Tome* is in chapter 4 of that work (*ACO*, II-I, 14, ll. 23-24).

continually to write explaining his position after the Union of 433, and to moderate the zeal of his followers, particularly those in Syria.<sup>43</sup> Thus the fact that he had accepted the essential wording of the credal statement was not the guarantee that the Antiochene bishops evidently hoped it would be.

It is questionable, too, whether Leo's solution, confining the doctrinal activity of the Council to a confirmation of his *Tome*, would have worked any better, particularly after the obvious suspicions of the Egyptians and of the monks that Leo's position might not be in full accord with that of Cyril. The most unfortunate part of the matter, of course, was Leo's subsequent intransigence in dealing with the disciplinary dispute over the precedence of the See of Constantinople, which proved so useful a tool in the hands of the Monophysite heretics, particularly in Palestine and Egypt, who utilized papal opposition to the emperor's wishes in the field of ecclesiastical politics to buttress their own differences in dogma.<sup>44</sup>

The immediate response, however, to the reading of the doctrinal definition at the fifth session at Chalcedon was one of wholehearted concurrence and applause.<sup>45</sup> The same definition was solemnly repeated again in the sixth session, on October 25, in the presence of the Emperor and Empress, Marcian and Pulcheria, and then promulgated as an imperial edict with the signatures of some four hundred and fifty bishops.<sup>46</sup>

Doctrinally, the aftermath of the Council was anything but happy. Monophysitism broke out in Egypt and the eastern provinces, and continued to plague the Church for the next two hundred years and more. It was the doings of the unruly monks, of course, and of their abettors

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Cyril's letters to Acacius of Mylitene (*Ep.* 40), to Eulogius, his apocrisarius in Constantinople (*Ep.* 44), to Valerian of Iconium (*Ep.* 50), to Succensus of Diocaesarea (*Ep.* 45 and 46) (*PG*, LXXVII, 131, 223, 255, 227, 237).

<sup>44</sup> Leo's confirmation of the definition of faith was slow in coming because of his displeasure over the so-called "28th canon" (cf. his four letters of March 21, 453, to Marcian, Pulcheria, Julian of Chios, and to the Council [*ACO*, II-IV, 67-71]); but the confirmation was absolute and definitive. This is shown by his letter of July 11, 457, to Julian, demanding that he obtain "ut sanctae synodi Chalcedonensis statuta nullis haereticorum pulsantur insidiis neque liceat quisquam de illa definitione convelli quam ex inspiratione divina non dubium est per omnia evangelicis atque apostolicis consonare doctrinis" (*ibid.*, p. 97).

<sup>45</sup> *ACO*, II-I, 326.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 335 ff.

among the dissatisfied bishops, particularly in Egypt and Palestine. And yet, it was not, as is usually charged, the substitution of Leo's terminology for that of Cyril that gave occasion for the outbreak. It was rather a continuation of the disagreement between the Antiochene party whose terminology triumphed at Chalcedon, and the intransigent Egyptians. The fact that all parties agreed in the condemnation of Eutyches indicates that political and social antipathies played a considerable part in the subsequent troubles. But in any case Pope Leo's prognostication that the discussion of doctrine and the formulation of a new definition would not bring about ecclesiastical unity and peace proved completely correct.