

# JESUS CHRIST, THE *KYRIAKOS ANTHRŌPOS*

ALOIS GRILLMEIER, S.J.

*St. Georgen, Frankfurt-Main*

**I**N THE Christology of the post-Nicene and post-Chalcedonian periods a singular term for the designation of the human reality of Jesus Christ is to be observed which up to now has not been fully examined and explained: the term *kyriakos anthrōpos* or, in its Latin version, *homo dominicus*—in English, “the dominical man.”

*Kyriakos anthrōpos* is found chiefly in the famous *Epistula ad Antiochenos* (henceforth *EAA*), nearly completely preserved in an Armenian version edited by R. P. Casey,<sup>1</sup> now attributed to Marcellus of Ancyra (+ about 374)<sup>2</sup> this document is contained in excerpts in the Greek florilegium of the Codex Laurentianus IV, 23.<sup>3</sup> *Kyriakos anthrōpos* is then found in the *Expositio fidei* (henceforth *EF*), handed down under the name of St. Athanasius, a text which in nos. 3–4 is very akin to *EAA*.<sup>4</sup> Close to the use of the term in these documents is that found in

**AUTHOR'S NOTE.**—This paper was read in a first draft at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, Sept. 8–13, 1975. It is a shorter version of a more comprehensive study that will appear in *Traditio*. I thank Brian E. Daley, S.J., for his help in translating the paper, and Walter J. Burghardt, S.J., for his interest in publishing it. In *Traditio* the reader will find a more complete bibliography about the history and theology of the vast subject. Here we distinguish “the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*” (with article and majuscule), as far as Jesus Christ is meant; “*kyriakos anthrōpos*” (without article, with minuscule), as far as the linguistic term is in question.

<sup>1</sup> R. P. Casey, *The Armenian Version of the Pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes and of the Expositio fidei* (SD 15; London-Philadelphia, 1947); the Armenian text and English translation of the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* and the fragments in Greek. For the Greek text, the edition of E. Schwartz is used: *Der s.g. Sermo maior de fide des Athanasius* (Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften, Philos.-histor. Kl., 1924, 6; Munich, 1924); H. Nordberg, *Athanasiana: Five Homilies, Expositio fidei, Sermo maior* (Societas Scientiar. Fennica, Comment. Humanar. Litt. 30, 2; Helsingfors, 1962).

<sup>2</sup> F. Scheidweiler, “Wer ist der Verfasser des sog. Sermo maior de fide?” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954) 333–57; M. Tetz, “Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra 1: Eine Markellische Schrift ‘De incarnatione et contra Arianos,’” *ZKG* 75 (1964) 217–70, at 240 f., 268 f. (n. 191); against this attribution: M. Simonetti, “Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcell di Ancira,” *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 9 (1973) 313–29, at 316–22; id., “Ancora sulla paternità dello ps.-athanasiano ‘Sermo maior de fide,’” *Vetera christianorum* 11 (1974) 333–43. Here the term *kyriakos anthrōpos* is a link in the chain of argumentation against the attribution to Marcellus and for the authorship of Didymus. See below.

<sup>3</sup> See Schwartz, *Der s.g. Sermo*, frags. 1, 19, 23–28, 37–46, but above all 54–74, 77–78; and cf. M. Richard, *MScRel* 6 (1949) 130–33; Scheidweiler, n. 2 above.

<sup>4</sup> Ps.-Athanasius, *Expositio fidei* (PG 25, 200–208); Nordberg, *Athanasiana* 1 (see n. 1 above) 49–56; for the relation of *EF* to *EAA*, see M. Tetz, “Les écrits ‘dogmatiques’

Mark the Hermit, especially in his *Ad Nicolaum praecepta animae salutaria*.<sup>5</sup> It is supposed, on the basis of references in Jerome and Severus of Antioch, that Athanasius made use of this term in his genuine writings; this has not attracted a consensus.<sup>6</sup> It is found in the writings of Didymus of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis, and Gregory of Nyssa, then in another writing of Mark the Hermit, this time in another context than in his *Praecepta salutaria*.

Latin authors know it: besides Jerome, Pope Damasus, Augustine, and John Cassian. But Augustine disapproves of this expression in his *Retractationes*, which might have caused its disappearance in the West, though Thomas Aquinas esteems it worth noting and discussing (*Sum. theol.* 3, 16, 3).

Up to our time historians of Christology have been at a loss to explain this expression. I might mention, as examples, Petavius, Lenain de Tillemont, A. Stülcken, E. Schwartz, and H.-G. Opitz. Recent investigations of it have been made by A. Gesché,<sup>7</sup> Alasdair I. C. Heron,<sup>8</sup> and Manlio Simonetti,<sup>9</sup> the latter two especially in order to clarify some questions of authorship in connection with *EAA*, *EF*, and Didymus. But neither Gesché nor Heron nor Simonetti has made a closer investigation into the history of the use and meaning of this expression by itself. Together with all the other historians mentioned above, they supposed that the term had only one meaning, equally to be found in all Eastern texts or even in Eastern and Western texts. Therefore, their conclusions on questions of authorship derived from *kyriakos anthrōpos* are based on too narrow a foundation to lead to wholly reliable results. It is my concern here to delineate a differentiated picture of the use and meaning of this expression, if only on rough lines.

There is a first group of uses of the phrase, to which belong *EAA*, *EF*, and, it seems, Mark the Hermit with his *Ad Nicolaum praecepta animae salutaria* (*Opusculum* 5).<sup>10</sup> In his other writing, *Pros tous*

d'Athanase," in C. Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie: Actes du Colloque de Chantilly*, Sept. 23-25, 1973 (Paris, 1974) 181-88, at 186.

<sup>5</sup> PG 65, 1028D-1053A. See O. Hesse, *Markos Eremites und Symeon von Mesopotamien: Untersuchung und Vergleich ihrer Lehren zu Taufe und Askese* (Diss. Göttingen, 1973).

<sup>6</sup> See J. Lebon, "S. Athanase a-t-il employé l'expression *ho kyriakos anthrōpos*?" *RHE* 31 (1935) 307-29; A. Gesché, *La christologie du "Commentaire sur les Psaumes" découvert à Toura* (Gembloux, 1962) 71-72, 80-90.

<sup>7</sup> See n. 6 above.

<sup>8</sup> Alasdair Heron, "The Two Pseudo-Athanasian Dialogues against the Anomoeans (Dial. I-II de sancta trinitate, Migne, PG 28, 1115-1201)," *JTS*, n.s. 24 (1973) 101-22, at 110 f., n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Simonetti, n. 2 above.

<sup>10</sup> Chap. 9 (PG 65, 1044B-1054A).

*legontas mē hēnōsthai tēn hagian sarka tou kyriou meta tou lo-gou. . .* (*Opusculum* 11),<sup>11</sup> Mark seems to initiate a partly new concept of *kyriakos anthrōpos*, which we will find then in an extremely specialized dogmatic use in Leontius of Jerusalem. Between the first group (*EAA*, *EF*, and the Mark of *Opusculum* 5) and the other (Mark of *Opusculum* 11 and Leontius) we have a block of Greek and Latin Fathers such as Didymus, Epiphanius, Pope Damasus, John Cassian, even Severus of Antioch, who do not combine any advanced Christological reflections with this expression, although Augustine has his own way of differentiating common patterns of thought. Of special interest in this second group will be the text of the pseudo-Athanasian *Dialogus 4 de s. trinitate*.

Now let us try to establish the special characteristics of each group in the use of *kyriakos anthrōpos*.

#### EAA, EF, AND MARK, OPUSCULUM 5

The Christological language of *EAA* and of *EF* rarely uses the abstract terms "divinity" (*theotēs*) or humanity (*anthrōpotēs*) of Christ, but more often the concretions "Christ is God, is the Son of God, the Son of Man, the Man," and finally the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*. Jesus has a body, taken out of Mary. This body belongs to the Kyrios, it is the body of the Lord. As such it is the House of Wisdom, its Temple. When the author wants to explain that no one has seen the divinity of Christ, but only his humanity, he says: "Observe that until then no one saw the Son of God even as he is until he revealed himself to us. But we have seen the Son of Man with whom he clothed himself for our sakes. . ." (Armenian text, chap. 14; Casey, p. 23; Greek frag. 65). In this context the use of the name "Jesus" is of importance. In the Armenian text, chap. 18 (Greek frag. 67), the author affirms that St. Paul at Damascus did not see the divinity of the Lord (here we have the abstract *theotēs*) but "Jesus, the man of the Saviour" (*Iēsoun ton anthrōpon tou sōtēros*). The name "Jesus" denotes not the divine subject but the human reality in

<sup>11</sup> The first edition was made by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus according to cod. Sabb. fol. 188<sup>a</sup>-195<sup>b</sup> (St. Petersburg, 1891); this text then was taken over by J. Kunze, *Marcus Eremita: Ein neuer Zeuge für das altkirchliche Taufbekenntnis* (Leipzig, 1895); a new edition according to a better MS of Grottaferrata was made by I. Cozza-Luzi, *B. Marci Monachi tractatus dogmaticus de incarnatione dominica*, in *Novae patrum bibliothecae ab Ang. Card. Maio collectae* 10, 195-247, with a parergon by A. Rocchi, *ibid.* 248-52. For the title of *Op.* 11, see O. Hesse, "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markus Eremita: Die Datierung seines Op. XI," in *Paul de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Göttinger Arbeitskreis für syrische Kirchengeschichte (Göttingen, 1968) 90-101; see *id.*, "Markus Eremita und seine Schrift 'De Melchisedech,'" *OrChr* 51 (1967) 72-77; *id.*, "Markus Eremita in der syrischen Literatur," *ZDMG Supplementa* 1 (Wiesbaden, 1969) 450-57.

Christ. Nevertheless, it would be unjust to charge *EAA* with Nestorianism, as is clear from the Armenian, chap. 25 (Greek frags. 70, 41), where the author rejects the Arian interpretation of 1 Cor 15:28, that the Son will be subject to the Father. The Arians saw therein a proof of the creation of the Son. But *EAA* says: "Now if anyone shall say that he [Paul] did not say that Jesus was subject but the Son, let him hear that Jesus was called God's Son and is so because of the Word of God concealed in him. . ." (Casey, p. 30). But let us see now the use of *kyriakos*, which we find in two combinations: *kyriakos anthrōpos* and *kyriakon sōma*.

No difficulty seems to arise from *kyriakon sōma*. This formula can be resolved into the other, the body of the Lord (*to tou kyriou sōma*), that is, a formula which designates the relation of possession or propriety. The subject is the Kyrios, who bears his own body or possesses it. This, in any case, may serve as a preliminary statement, since another meaning, given below under *kyriakos anthrōpos*, also cannot be excluded for *kyriakon sōma*.

Even *kyriakos anthrōpos* can be partly explained as the man of the Lord (*ho tou kyriou anthrōpos*). In this case the Kyrios would be the subject or the owner of the human nature of Christ. But *kyriakos anthrōpos* shows such a breadth of use that it is impossible to limit its meaning to the relation of propriety or possession.

Now the chief point is this: *kyriakos* contains a *qualitative* characterization of the body or the man of Christ. We can show that *kyriakos* designates the man Jesus under a certain respect which is not always simply given. In order to understand the following arguments, we must remember that *EAA* and *EF* are anti-Arian writings and use a certain method in order to eliminate the Arian interpretation of Scripture: that is, the Arian custom of referring all humble and humiliating verses of Scripture to the Logos as Logos, in order to demonstrate that he is a creature, is refuted by the Fathers through a differentiated attribution of the Christological predicates. Those denoting transcendent qualities or activities are referred to him as God, that is, to the Logos as Logos; those suggesting humble qualities are referred to Jesus as man or to his human nature.

Here *EAA* and *EF* take a special position, precisely in the use of *kyriakos anthrōpos*. Other sources, as we shall see, can attribute even passion and death to Jesus, the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*. Not so *EAA* and *EF*. In what concerns the human predicates or the human titles of Christ, they distinguish between the qualities which belong to the man Jesus before the event of the Resurrection and those which belong to him after this event. And only in this latter context do they speak of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*. To give a convincing demonstration of this pecu-

liar usage, I should have to examine all the passages which make use of the expression. This has been done in my larger contribution to be published in *Traditio*. Here it may suffice to propose some striking examples. Moreover, there is need of a counterproof, namely, to demonstrate that the qualities of the risen Christ are never attributed to a subject simply designated by "Jesus" or "Jesus of Nazareth" as he is seen in the time between his birth and his death. This limit is of some importance; for whenever the whole way of Christ from his pre-existence up to his glorification, including his earthly life, passion, and death, is taken into account, that is, whenever the Lord is described as *archē*<sup>12</sup> and completion of our salvation, then he is called the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*. As soon as an isolated consideration of the visible history of Jesus is meant, then we hear only of "Jesus."

*Kyriakos anthrōpos*, therefore, is especially found in the context of Prov 8:22, Heb 3:1-2 ("Consider the apostle and high priest of our profession, Jesus Christ, who is faithful to his maker"), and particularly of Ps 109:1 ("sitting at the Father's right hand") together with Acts 7:56 (vision of Stephen) and Heb 10:12 (sitting at the right hand of God). I choose the central text out of chap. 14 of the Armenian text, corresponding to frag. 65 of Schwartz:

Therefore John says of the Lord, "When he will be revealed, we shall be like him and shall see him even as he is" (1 Jn 3:2). Observe that until then no one saw the *Son of God* even as he is until he revealed himself to us. But we have seen the *Son of Man* with whom he clothed himself for our sakes, of whom Paul said, "Look to Jesus, the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who is faithful to his maker" (Heb 3:1-2). Of him also Stephen said, "I see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of God's power" (Acts 7:56). He did not say he saw the Word or the Father's Wisdom but the Son of Man, the *Dominical Man* who was from Mary [Schwartz, frag. 65, 17, has: *to ek Marias kyriakon sōma*], of whom also Paul says, "seated at the right hand of God" (Heb 10:12); of whose body David also speaks prophetically on the Father's behalf, "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Ps 109:1), which enemies he knew beforehand would arise, that is, the Adversary and his ministers, hostile forces, some of whom became enemies of the *Dominical Man* (*tō kyriakō anthrōpō*), who by his death made known their suppression and that of Satan, who had the power of death, and of his enemies, the Jews, about whom the Scripture is fulfilled, "they hated me unjustly" (Ps 24:19; Jn 15:25). . . .

Therefore it was written by David of the Lord's body, "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool". . . . At least let ignorant and

<sup>12</sup> For this important term, see *IN PRINCIPIO: Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse* (Études augustinienes; Paris, 1973); J. M. van Winden, "Frühchristliche Bibelexegese 'Der Anfang,'" to be published in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte u. Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* (Festschrift Joseph Vogt; Berlin-New York: de Gruyter).

untutored persons realize that this was written of the Saviour considered as man, for in like manner David writes thus about the *Dominical Man* (*tou kyriakou anthrōpou*), "No enemy shall offend him and troubles will not approach thy house" (Ps 88:23; Ps 90:10). . . (Casey, pp. 23-24; Schwartz, pp. 24-25).

Now *EAA* makes an interesting distinction. As long as it speaks of the Son's sitting at the Father's right hand, that is, sitting in glory, the expression *kyriakos anthrōpos* or *kyriakon sōma* is used, this in opposition to the Arians, who wanted all these prophecies to be applied to the Logos as Logos, in order to lower him. *EAA* insists against this that sitting belongs to a body, concretely to the body of the Lord. But this body has to be seen in a double state: in glory and in humility; as far as it is seen in glory, the *Epistula* speaks of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, as chap. 17 repeats: "Sit thou on my right hand; for the Dominical Body is meant" (Casey, p. 25). As far as "Jesus" in his earthly life is considered, the following words are used in chap. 15: "Now it is proper for a body to stand on its feet and to sit down because it gets tired—as also *Jesus* sat down exhausted at the spring on the journey which he took for our sakes" (cf. Jn 4:6) (Casey, p. 24).

We can now sum up the use of *kyriakos anthrōpos* in *EAA*: (1) *kyriakos* never is applied to the Logos as Logos; (2) it belongs exclusively to the Logos as Son incarnate, (3) but under a double or even triple aspect:

a) *Kyriakos anthrōpos* exclusively designates Christ the man in his glorification, that is, *after* resurrection and ascension, in his sitting at the right hand of the Father. *Ho Kyriakos Anthrōpos* is Christ in his glory.

b) This glorification can also be seen in a kind of ideal pre-existence of Christ the man, according to Prov 8:22: "Before the ages he established me from the beginning." The Arians wanted to apply this quotation to the Logos as Logos, as *EAA* notes in chaps. 19-23 (Schwartz, frags. 68-69): "And on account of them saying 'Before the ages he established me from the beginning,' the materialists maintain that the divinity of the Word was created and determined and established, not realizing that Solomon as on behalf of the Dominical Body (*kyriakon sōma*) says: 'He created me' and 'He established me before the ages' . . ." (chap. 21; Casey, p. 28).

But how can this *kyriakon sōma* be created before all times? Chap. 22 answers as follows: After the quotation of Eph 1:4 f. (in chap. 21), that is, that all the saints are chosen from the beginning of the world in Christ, this verse is applied to Christ:

. . . the Dominical Man, who did not exist before the ages, was created before the ages. For if he who is included in the human race is adorned with so much glory,

having been chosen and predestined before the beginning of the world, how much more is the glorified Dominical Body, which surpassed man and all creatures [and] which bore the fulness of the Word's divinity, fixed before eternity in anticipation in the Father's mind? And the great Apostle recalls this verse, who writes in agreement with the proverb-writing Solomon, "For no one can lay another foundation than that which has been laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 3:11); for the Dominical Body is an immovable foundation on which the saints build their works into a holy temple for God's habitation. . . . For the Lord's Body became the foundation of all the saints who built their virtues upon it. . . . Surely, then, he who was established by foreknowledge in the secret places of the Father's mind was also the Dominical Man whom [God] was to create from Mary (Casey, p. 28).

As in the eternal knowledge and will of God, the Dominical Man can also be considered as pre-existent in the vision of the prophets, as chap. 23 says: "And Micah clearly prophesied concerning the Dominical Body saying: 'Judah, in thee will be my chief and ruler and his course [will be] from the beginning of the days of the world forever' (cf. Mic 5:1), as indeed at the end of the ages the divine Word assumed a man from the tribe of Judah" (Casey, p. 29).

As well as the birth of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, so too his resurrection is foreseen by the prophets, especially by Ezekiel (34:2, 4): "Now when Ezekiel prophesied this, David had been dead for fourteen generations, but he prophesied that the Dominical Man would arise from David's seed, of whom also Paul writes to Timothy saying: 'Be mindful of Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead, of the seed of David after the body' (2 Tim 2:8)" (chap. 39; Casey, p. 42; Schwartz, frag. 77).

c) Finally, in this ideal pre-existence the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* seen in his full career, humiliation and exaltation included, is already the *archē*, the keystone of creation and salvation.<sup>13</sup>

But as long as the earthly way of Jesus (from his birth to his death) is exclusively considered, *kyriakos anthrōpos* or *kyriakon sōma* is never used.

There are also excellent texts which demonstrate the same for *EF*, but I want to focus attention on Mark the Hermit, who in his work *Ad Nicolaum praecepta animae salutaria* speaks of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, but explicitly recalling to mind Phil 2:5-11. Nicholas is admonished to follow the humble path of Jesus Christ, the single stages of which (in later times called "the mysteries of the life of our Lord"<sup>14</sup>) are carefully enumerated, right to the exaltation. But this Christ in exaltation is the

<sup>13</sup> *EAA*, chap. 23 (Casey 29-30): "In many passages and sayings, it has been written concerning the 'beginning.'" There are quoted Gen 1:1; Isa 41:27; Mic 5:2; Prov 8:22, 23.

<sup>14</sup> See A. Grillmeier, "Das Mysterium und die Mysterien Christi," in id., *Mit ihm und in ihm* (Freiburg, 1975) 716-35.

"first-born of the dead" (1 Cor 15:20) and the *Kyrios* (according to Phil 2:11). Mark then concludes: "See now the reasons for all that was said before, to what glory and height they raised the Dominical Man" (PG 65, 1044B-1045A).

In my longer article for *Traditio* I attempt also a counterproof: I examine all the passages where the earthly, humble Jesus is exclusively in question. Neither *EAA* nor *EF* nor Mark the Hermit *Ad Nicolaum* uses *kyriakos anthrōpos* in this context. *Kyriakos anthrōpos* in these writings, therefore, must have a special application. It is not only the expression of the relation of propriety or possession between our Lord and his body, in the sense that the man Jesus Christ is the human existence of the Son of God; but it designates exclusively the state of glory of Christ the man, this seen either in his ideal pre-existence or in the state of exaltation which follows after his passion and death.

Therefore *kyriakos* has to be translated here by "in glory" or "glorified," and *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* means "the man Jesus Christ in his glory," this glory either being foreseen or prophesied, or else seen in its reality after his resurrection and ascension, or as born of the Virgin (*EF*). Though these writings are aware of the mystery of the divinity of Christ, the "union" between Christ's Godhead and manhood is not adduced as the reason (*aitia*) for the application of *kyriakos anthrōpos*. Here we have, therefore, an interesting biblical theology, which considers precisely the different stages of Christ the man and limits the use of *kyriakos anthrōpos* exclusively to a state of this manhood in its foreseen or real glory.<sup>15</sup>

#### KYRIAKOS ANTHRŌPOS IN FRAMEWORK OF UNION OF GOD AND MAN

Now I shall consider another group of Fathers who use *kyriakos anthrōpos*, especially Didymus of Alexandria, Epiphanius, and some Latin writers. Very interesting will be the *Dialogus 4 de s. trinitate*. Here the issue is less complicated: *kyriakos anthrōpos* simply designates the Son of God incarnate; and *kyriakos* can be applied to Jesus even in his earthly and humble existence.

#### Didymus

Let us examine briefly Didymus' *Liber de Spiritu sancto* and the *Commentary on the Psalms* found in Toura. In chaps. 51-52 of the

<sup>15</sup> It is very interesting that Athanasius in *Or. 1* and *2 c. Arianos* (PG 26), in his interpretation of Acts 2:36 and Phil 2:5-11, avoids focusing the state of glory of Christ's humanity after his resurrection, in order to cut the ground from under the feet of the Arians, who attributed every growth of the human reality of Christ, be it before or after his resurrection, to the Logos as Logos. See *Or. 2 c. Arian.* 12-17 (Acts 2:36; PG 26, 172A-184A); *Or. 1 c. Arian.* 40-43 (Phil 2:5-11; PG 26, 93B-96B, 97BC, 97C-100B, 101B). For Athanasius, *kyriotēs* and adoration are already based in the name "Jesus." We are far from the exegesis of *EAA* and *EF*. Anti-Arian suspicions would not allow Athanasius the use of *k.a.*



former, Ps 118:16-17 is explained: "The right hand of the Lord is elevated, the right hand of the Lord is working with power. I shall not die but live, in order to announce the deeds of the Lord." Didymus explains: "Certainly this saying is pronounced in the person of the Dominical Man, whom the only-begotten Son of God has deigned to assume out of the Virgin . . ." (PG 39, 1076C-1077A).

Immediately after this Didymus comments on the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, fulfilled after the exaltation of Christ. In reality, this communication of the Holy Spirit was already a fact during the historical life of Jesus according to the Gospel, e.g., Lk 4:1 and 4:14. Didymus adds: "Without any calumny we must accept this about the Dominical Man (in the spirit of piety), not as if he were two separate persons (*alter et alter*), but as it is pronounced about the one and the same, here according to his divine nature and there according to his humanity; for God the Logos, the only-begotten Son of God, did not suffer any mutation or augmentation, as he is the fulness of all good" (PL 39, 1077BC).

Note the difference in comparison with *EAA*, *EF*, and Mark, *Op.* 5: *kyriakos anthrōpos* designates now even the earthly Jesus and is not reserved to the state of glory. It is applied to this earthly Jesus because he is "God the Word, the only-begotten Son of God incarnate." Moreover, we are already in another phase of Christological discussion: *kyriakos anthrōpos* already seems to be suspected of inferring a double subject in Christ, an *alter et alter*, which would be an Apollinarist objection, as we shall see. *EAA* and *EF* did not feel the need to answer such a danger.

In the *Commentaries* of Toura<sup>16</sup> the expression *kyriakos anthrōpos* occurs several times, e.g., in the commentaries on Pss 20:4, 21:30, and 31:2. But each use of the term includes the earthly life of Jesus, especially the commentary on Ps 31:2 ("Beatus vir cui non imputavit Dominus peccatum. . ."). This verse may be said about every just man. "It can, however, be referred to the 'example' (1 Pet 2:21) of the saved, that is, to the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*. He is blessed (*beatus*), as no sin is imputed to him, as sin was neither known nor committed by him."<sup>17</sup>

The conclusion is clear: *kyriakos anthrōpos* can be predicated of Christ in glory as well as of Christ in his humble earthly life. The reason is his union with the only-begotten Son of the Father. We have left the framework of a Christology of glorification and find ourselves now based on a Christology of the union of divinity and humanity in Jesus Christ.

<sup>16</sup> See *Didymus der Blinde, Psalmenkommentar (Tura Papyrus) 1: Kommentar zu Psalm 20-21*, ed. and tr. L. Doutreleau, A. Gesché, and M. Gronewald (Papyrol. Texte u. Abhandlungen, ed. L. Koenen and R. Merkelbach, 7; Bonn, 1967), 3: *Kommentar zu Psalm 29-34*, ed. and tr. M. Gronewald (PTA 8; Bonn, 1969).

<sup>17</sup> Didymus, *In Ps 31:23* (Gronewald 158-59).

### *Epiphanius*

Epiphanius' use of *kyriakos anthrōpos* is strictly contrary to that of *EAA* and the other representatives of that group. He uses the term twice in a context which would have ruled out its usage in *EAA*: Epiphanius speaks of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* in the context of the *descensus ad inferos*, the descent to the dead (*Ancoratus* 34, 1 [Holl 1, 43]), and again in the context of an extremely human event in the life of Jesus, his moment of dereliction on the cross, according to Mt 27:46 (*Panarion* 69 [Holl 3, 213]). The cry "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" according to the Arians was brought forth by the Logos, who therefore is not truly divine; according to Epiphanius, it was uttered by the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* – in Greek, *apo prosōpou autou tou kyriakou anthrōpou, toutesti tēs autou enanthrōpēseōs* (Holl 3, 213).

### *Athanasius and Some Pseudo-Athanasian Writings*

Jerome and Severus of Antioch affirm that Athanasius made use of the expression *kyriakos anthrōpos*. In 382–84 Jerome had been asked by Pope Damasus to write an exposition of faith to be proposed to the Apollinarians during their stay in Rome. In it he made use of our term, citing Athanasius as witness to its legitimacy. The Apollinarians were excited and accused Jerome of a forgery. E. Schwartz was of the opinion that Jerome had in view nothing else than the *Expositio fidei (EF)* we examined above. This is impossible. J. Lebon proposed the genuine *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae*.<sup>18</sup> But he had to take refuge in a very uncertain textual tradition to find the term *kyriakos anthrōpos* in this letter. Martin Tetz therefore proposes another pseudo-Athanasian writing, the *Professio Arriana et confessio catholica*,<sup>19</sup> where indeed *dominicus homo* is found:

We have to hold and to confess sincerely that man is growing and making progress to God, that is, to the Son of God. For the Evangelist says: "But as many as received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God" (Jn 1:12). And how [not] the Dominical Man and the form of the servant (*servilis forma*) makes progress to God. But God the Word, the virtue and the wisdom of the Father, was always perfect and equal to the Father in the substance of Godhead [and in this context Phil 2:6 is quoted].<sup>20</sup>

We know that the Arians always misused Lk 2:52 ("And Jesus advanced in wisdom and age and grace with God and men"). Now the pseudo-Athanasian writing refers this verse to the Dominical Man, not to God the Logos. The conclusion is: this *Professio Arriana et confessio catholica* refers "dominical man" to Jesus in his earthly existence and differs therefore from *EAA* and its relatives.

<sup>18</sup> See Lebon, n. 6 above.

<sup>19</sup> M. Simonetti, ed., *Pseudathanasii De trinitate LL X–XII* (Bonn, 1956) 43–68.

<sup>20</sup> Ed. Simonetti 61, 12–18.

Putting aside the pseudo-Athanasian *Disputatio contra Arium*, chap. 20 (PG 28, 467A-C), consider the pseudo-Athanasian *Dialogus 4 de s. trinitate*, studied and edited by C. Bizer.<sup>21</sup> We have here a discussion between an "Orthodox" and an "Apollinarian." This text is of great interest, as attempts have been made to identify Apollinarianism as the source of the term *kyriakos anthrōpos*. The chief point here is this: Did God the Logos in his incarnation assume a human soul or not? The Apollinarian denies it and affirms that the *sarx* of Christ is transformed by the Logos as the animating principle and emits godlike light and energies.<sup>22</sup>

The Orthodox answers: If Christ has no human soul, he has no human body as well. But since—even according to Apollinarianism—Christ's body is *homoousios* with Mary, therefore the Dominical Body (*to kyriakon sōma*) as a human body is consubstantial with us. But now the Apollinarian grows excited and answers: "How can you call the body of Christ a 'dominical body' (*kyriakon sōma*), since according to you it is the body of a man?" Here we have a hint towards the solution of the question, whether the Apollinarians made use of *kyriakos anthrōpos* or not. The answer: as far as this term contains the affirmation of a human soul in Christ, it is rejected. *Anthrōpos kyriakos* as a designation of Christ is impossible in the mouth of the Apollinarian of this dialogue.<sup>23</sup> In his eyes it is a *contradictio in adiecto*. To attribute to Jesus a human soul and a human body would make of him a "mere man" (*psilos anthrōpos*) without any lordly or dominical characteristics, without any *kyriotēs*. But as far as the divine *physis* is animating the human body in Christ, the Apollinarians are able to speak of a "dominical body" or a "dominical flesh," whether this *sōma* or this *sarx* be seen before or after resurrection. We are far from the use of *kyriakos* in EAA and its followers.

But the author of the *Dialogus 4* or the "Orthodox" has an interesting statement: "I call dominical the body, dominical the soul, dominical the blood, and dominical the tomb, and dominical the whole man, [and now the decisive reason:] *henōsei tou theou logou*, by reason of the union with God the Logos. The one and the same, namely, is God and man; and we can call him at the same time wholly God and wholly man."<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Chr. Bizer, *Studien zu pseudathanasianischen Dialogen: Der Orthodoxos und Aetios* (Diss. Bonn, 1970) with an edition of the text *ibid.* 307–34 (PG 28, 1249, 33–1265, 20).

<sup>22</sup> The "Apollinarian" assumes a *theia empsychia* in the *sarx* of Christ (PG 28, 1252, 10; ed. Bizer 309). The humanity of Jesus, therefore, shows always a physical "radiation of divine energy" (PG 28, 1264, 37–39; ed. Bizer 332–33). As far as this radiation is considered a sign of a permanent state of glory, independent of the fact of resurrection, properly no *status exinanitionis* in Christ can be admitted. This is quite another concept of glory and *kyriotēs* in Christ than in EAA and EF.

<sup>23</sup> Jesus is "man" only "according to the material element" in him (PG 28, 1264, 34–36; Bizer 332). It is, therefore, impossible to derive the term *k.a.* from the Apollinarian concept of Christ.

<sup>24</sup> PG 28, 1264, 51–1265, 6; Bizer 333–34.

In this text we have the position of the second group, and that in very clear lines: the Orthodox ascribes the *kyriakos* to the body, to the soul, to the blood, even to the tomb of Jesus, but especially to the whole man, independent of considerations of earthly state or glorification, this on the single basis of the "union" of God and man in Jesus. The Apollinarian starts from the fact of this union, but on a basis quite other than the Orthodox. *Kyriakos* presupposes exclusively the vital symbiosis of divinity and *sarx* in Jesus Christ, without any mediation of a human soul. The Orthodox finds the *kyriotēs* in body and soul, in the man Jesus Christ, in every phase of his career, even in his tomb, as he says: "He, one and the same, is God and man; he is God by nature, he is man by his gratuitous participation in manhood."<sup>25</sup>

We have, therefore, a second group of writers using *kyriakos anthrōpos*, represented by Didymus, Epiphanius, and *Dialogus 4 de s. trinitate*; we can add St. Augustine and John Cassian. The title of Christ as the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* is based on the fact of the union between godhead and manhood in Jesus Christ and can be used comprehensively for all the different states or phases of the career of Jesus. We are far from the biblical conception of the first group.

It would be interesting to see the doctrine of Augustine on the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, on the *Homo Dominicus*; this can be found in my forthcoming *Traditio* article. As for John Cassian, one point is noteworthy. The opinion has been expressed that *kyriakos anthrōpos* may have had a bad Nestorian reputation and for that reason came to be rejected. Augustine gives no hint that this was the reason of his retraction; and John Cassian, Mark the Hermit, and Leontius, all writing against any separation of God and man in Jesus Christ, use the term without hesitation. On the contrary, for Cassian *homo dominicus* is the right phrase, as against the *solitarius homo* (the *psilos anthrōpos*), which he attributes to Nestorius. Only Severus of Antioch later set the suspicion in motion that *kyriakos anthrōpos* would be precisely the same as *psilos anthrōpos*. Did he undergo Apollinarian influence?

But let us see now a third group of theologians using *kyriakos anthrōpos*, who seem to have made a synthesis between the first and the second group: Mark the Hermit in his *Opusculum* 11, and especially Leontius of Jerusalem.

#### A DOGMATIC USE OF KYRIAKOS ANTHRŌPOS

##### *Mark the Hermit, Opusculum 11*

Through an erroneous enlargement of the title by some additions made in later times, this work seemed to be a post-Ephesian, anti-Nestorian writing of Mark.<sup>26</sup> Closer investigation, however, showed

<sup>25</sup> PG 28, 1265, 18-20; Bizer 334.

<sup>26</sup> See Kunze, *Marcus Eremita* 6, 1-4, where the Nestorians are quoted as the adver-

that it has to be dated earlier, even back to the end of the fourth century, that is, to the time of the first Origenist controversy under Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria (385–412) and uncle of Cyril.<sup>27</sup> Mark is troubled by a group of theologians who divide Jesus Christ, by ascribing the Incarnation not immediately to the Logos as a subject, but to the "soul," which mediates between the Logos and the *sarx*, in such fashion that the immediate union between the Logos and the human flesh in Christ is no longer possible. According to Mark, his adversaries consider Jesus a mere man, *psilos anthrōpos*. The Incarnation, therefore, is in vain, as the divine power of the Logos cannot be communicated with the sinful *sarx*. Those theologians incline toward idle speculations. They continually oppose their questioning "how?" to the "kerygma," to the simple mysteries of the life of Jesus, and especially to the mystery of the union between God and man in Jesus Christ. If they do not find an answer, they suspend their belief. They seem to incline toward a dualism, so that the flesh is not for them the way of salvation. Their ideal is a higher "gnosis." We cannot find another group of theologians better fitted to be the adversaries of Mark than the Origenists of the Nitrian desert and of the Kellia, who were researched in so brilliant a manner by Antoine Guillaumont.<sup>28</sup> Probably we have a pre-Evagrian state of this Origenism, but already such that it is understandable how Evagrius could find there a good audience or even some orientation toward his own gnosis and Origenism.

In refuting such a divisive, gnostic, and intellectualistic Christology, Mark starts with 1 Cor 1:21, 23, in order to unfold a Christology of glory, of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, but this on the basis of a new theology of union or *henōsis*, which bears the whole career of Christ, so that Jesus Christ is the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* even as the crucified: "Christ the crucified is, as one and the same, even God's power and God's wisdom, as in him God the Logos is united with the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*" (chap. 12; Kunze, pp. 14, 30–15, 2).

---

saries of *Op.* 11. By this superscription Kunze was seduced into misdating the book. See *ibid.*, chap 8, pp. 87–106: "Die in der Schrift adversus Nestorianos bestrittenen Gegner"; against this. Hesse, *Erwägungen* 90–93. Rocchi (n. 11 above) considers *Op.* 11 an anti-Eutychian writing from the year 446. This is totally erroneous. H. Chadwick, "The Identity and Date of Mark the Monk," *Eastern Churches Review* 4 (1972) 125–30, identifies Mark the Hermit with a monk and presbyter named in two letters of Severus of Antioch written between 515 and 518. Against this Hesse, *loc. cit.* He himself believes that *Op.* 11 is written against the "Antiochenes" (Diodore of Tarsus etc.).

<sup>27</sup> A. Grillmeier, "Markos Eremites und der Origenismus: Versuch einer Neudeutung von *Op.* XI" (prepared for the Festschrift Marcel Richard 3, to be published in TU, perhaps in 1978). There I try to show that an early Origenism (probably in Egypt, Nitrian desert, Kellia) is the object of Mark's attacks.

<sup>28</sup> A. Guillaumont, *Les "Kephalaia gnostica" d'Evagre le Pontique et l'Origénisme chez les grecs et les syriens* (Patristica Sorbonensia 5; Paris, 1962).

Mark is combining two aspects in order to justify this expression of *kyriakos anthrōpos*: even on the cross or as the crucified, Jesus is, according to 1 Cor 1:21, 23, God's wisdom, God's power, and according to chap. 2, 9, "the Lord of glory." His adversaries, therefore, are in error in considering Christ the crucified as "a mere man and a dead body" (chap. 13; Kunze, p. 15, 8–9). But how can Jesus, even as a dead body on the cross, be considered as Lord in glory? Mark answers: because of the indissoluble and hypostatic union: "Him whom Paul confesses to be God's power and God's wisdom and Lord of glory, you call a mere man and dead body, separating by human afterthought (bad human inspiration) what in all eternity is inseparable and unified in hypostasis (*kath' hypostasin*) in a godlike manner" (chap. 13; Kunze, p. 15, 7–10).

This union *kath' hypostasin* is the central idea<sup>29</sup> and reason for the *kyriotēs* even of the crucified and dead Jesus on the cross. Already the *Dialogus 4 de s. trinitate* had seen this nexus but had not used the expression *henōsis kath' hypostasin*. Nor did it stress the idea of *kyriotēs* in the same manner as Mark. After quoting Gal 1:3 and 1 Cor 15:3, Mark says:

If the dead and risen (Christ) is a mere man, then we live for a mere man and not for the Son of God; for it is written that we do not live further for ourselves but for him who has died and been raised for us. When you hear this in the Scripture, will you then confess in the future the *kyriotēs*, the dominical dignity of this one who has died for us? But if you still speak of the "mere man" or of the dead body, how can you believe that he who is the Lord of glory and God's power and wisdom is a mere man? So namely the Apostle calls the crucified Christ . . . If you do not accept the union of God and man on the cross, you will not escape denying the kerygma. For the apostles call the suffering Christ not "mere God" nor a "mere man," but both God and man, who is Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory (chap. 13–14; Kunze, pp. 15, 18–16, 15).

Mark, therefore, retains the point of view of his *Opusculum* 5, which sees Christ in his historical career, at the end of which there is the *kyriotēs*, but he combines it now with a more ontological view, expressed

<sup>29</sup> The formula *hypostatikōs hēnotai* is used in *Op.* 10 (*De Melchisedech*) 5 (*PG* 65, 1124B). In *Op.* 11, Mark seems to initiate the first important phase of the orthodox use of the formula of *henōsis*, esp. *henōsis kath' hypostasin*. See the Index of Kunze s.v. *henōsis, hypostasis*. We are still in a pre-Cyrrillian state of this use. In their divisive Platonic concept of Christ, the adversaries of Mark believed that the Logos could not be united immediately with a human *sarx*. They stressed the mediating part or function of the soul of Christ, to which the Incarnation seems to be ascribed, not to the Logos as a subject (Kunze, chap. 9). Christ, therefore, is conceived as the direct union of the pre-existent soul with the *sarx*; the Logos is only concomitantly in the world. "They separate (Christ) according to parts: on the one hand, the flesh from the Logos, on the other, the Logos from the flesh" (chap. 9; Kunze 12, 16–17, 20–21). In this manner they betray human salvation, which needs an immediate and direct union of the flesh with the Logos, that is, with the hypostasis, the undiminished reality of the Logos.

by the term *henōsis kath' hypostasin*. On this new grounding, the idea of *kyriotēs* can be conceived in a more extensive manner, comprehending not only the state of exaltation after the Resurrection but even the cross. In opposition, however, to the "Orthodox" of *Dialogus 4 de s. trinitate*, Mark would not be pleased with stressing simply the fact of the union as the reason for calling cross and tomb "dominical." He does not separate the fact of the union from its manifestation in the body and in all the events of the life of Jesus Christ. In his *Opusculum 10 (De Melchisedech)*, *kyriakos* is stressed in such a manner that the danger of a Monophysite Christology is imminent—*saltem ad litteram* (cf. *De Melch.* 5 [PG 65, 1124A-D]). That will be precisely the risk of Leontius of Jerusalem.

### *Leontius of Jerusalem*

Leontius (writing before 533) composed a treatise against the Nestorians in which he opposes a resolutely descendant Christology to their ascendant type.<sup>30</sup> He is the proponent of *henōsis kath' hypostasin*, deducing all Christological statements from the fact of the hypostatic union. Though he is referring to the "historical" data of the Incarnation, to the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, that is, to the events of the economy of salvation, all is considered under the aspect of unity and the substantial union of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* with the hypostasis of the Logos. Exactly here we have the starting point for the dogmatics of the term *kyriakos anthrōpos*. It is impossible to follow all the meanderings of the thought of Leontius, but perhaps it may suffice to discuss the very interesting chap. 18 of his *Adversus Nestorianos*,<sup>31</sup> which in certain points is very near to the *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, today ascribed to Marcellus of Ancyra by Martin Tetz,<sup>32</sup> and also close to some ideas of Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>33</sup>

At the beginning of this chapter Leontius marks out the point of discussion with the Nestorians. He asks: If the Logos enters into a synthesis with a man, who is one of us, who profits from the union? The Logos himself, or the man with whom he is united, or both, or neither of them but rather we ourselves? The last of these is the case:

Out of the great liberality of the divine nature the Incarnation happened. On account of the union with God the full riches of deification (divinization) fell to

<sup>30</sup> See C. Moeller, "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle," in A. Grillmeier-H. Bacht, eds., *Das Konzil von Chalkedon 1* (Würzburg, 1951, 1973) 686 f., 693-96, 701-30; M. Richard, "Léonce et Pamphile," *RSPT* 27 (1938) 27-52; Ath. Basdekis, *Die Christologie des Leontius von Jerusalem: Seine Logoslehre* (Diss. Münster i. W., 1974).

<sup>31</sup> Leontius of Jerusalem, *Adv. Nestor.* 1, 18 (PG 86, 1465C-1472A).

<sup>32</sup> M. Tetz, n. 2 above.

<sup>33</sup> R. M. Hübner, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Philosophia patrum 2; Leiden, 1974) esp. 269-324.

the share of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, of him as the first fruit of the human mass and the first-born of so many brethren and the head of the body, the Church, to his share in the first place, in first reception, without mediation, on account of the hypostatic union of the divine nature with him (*prōtōs kai prōtodochōs kai amēsōs dia kath' hypostasīn pros auton synanakratikēs henōseōs autēs, eis tēn idikēn physin autou, ton plouton tēs ektheōseōs, ek tēs pros theon symphyias*) (PG 86, 1468BC).

From the first-gifted *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, by his mediation, all his gifts flow over to this body, but in such a way that he always remains the first, the head, the mediator. There is a notable dependence on the language of the fourth century, especially on that of the *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, in which only one term is not found: *kyriakos anthrōpos*. Did the author of *Adversus Nestorianos* know *EAA* and *EF*? These writings, together with *De incarnatione* and with Mark the Hermit (*Op.* 11, but also 10), contain all the various elements of this theology of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* in Leontius.

But what exactly does he mean by *kyriakos anthrōpos*? We have found that in *EAA*, in *EF*, and in the *Præcepta salutaria* of Mark *kyriakos anthrōpos* always signified the man Jesus Christ in his glory after the Resurrection (and Ascension). Leontius does not make this distinction; that is, Jesus Christ in all the phases of his career is the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, but Leontius sees even the earthly Jesus in such union with the Godhead that he is almost always the deified man, always in full radiation of his *kyriotēs*. When *EAA* and *EF* were written, the theology of the *henōsis* was in its infancy. But this changed precisely during the life of Mark and continued to develop after Chalcedon in the time of Neo-Chalcedonism. If in the eyes of the author of *EAA* the *kyriotēs* is manifest only after the passion of Jesus, for Mark of *Op.* 11 and especially for Leontius it is given with the hypostatic union; so Leontius speaks of "the riches of deification" (1468C). His understanding of the *henōsis* fulfills all that *EAA* and *EF* would require for the designation of Christ as the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* – even more.

But *EAA* and *EF* have still another idea which returns in Leontius: Christ is there the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* in his function as *archē*, as mediator of creation and salvation. (One should repeat here chap. 22 of *EAA*; see above.) The main difference is that Leontius does not derive the glory of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* from the fact of the Resurrection but makes it depend on the idea of the hypostatic union. Even the immortality and the incorruptibility of the risen body of Christ he refuses to derive from the fact of the Resurrection. In that case, he says, the Redeemer would have only an accidental *apatheia* and *aphtharsia*, which would not come out from the internal essence of the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*. Jesus Christ would have our *apatheia*, our *aphtharsia*, not his own. In that case he could not be the *archē* of our resurrection and



the *aparchē* of our salvation. Virgin birth as well as resurrection flow out of the "substantial union with the Logos" (*Adv. Nestor.* 2, 21 [PG 86, 1581C-1584A]). In opposition to *EAA*, Leontius does not insist on the fact of the Resurrection as the base of his *kyriotēs*; he finds "the more comprehensive reason" (1581C) to attribute to the *sarx* of Christ all the single elements of the *kyriotēs*: "the effluence of the divine idiomata and properties, which include the Virgin Birth, the sanctity of Jesus' life, the fulness of his wisdom, his omnipotence in working miracles, his divine virtue" (1581D).<sup>34</sup>

Thus the title *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*, which for Severus of Antioch, a contemporary of Leontius, raises suspicions of Nestorianism, is for Leontius the summary of all the single elements of deification and all the divine prerogatives of Christ the man. An analytical consideration of the term might uncover a Nestorian trend: the term "man" has the role of the subject, *kyriakos* is the adjective; therefore the "man" seems to be a second subject besides the Logos. Nevertheless, Leontius does not admit any Christology of ascendance or any autonomy of Christ's human nature. His "Christ" is exclusively centered in the Logos and conceived from the viewpoint of the divine *physis* of the Logos. *Kyriakos* is stressed in a manner which does not admit any Christology of humiliation. Here *EAA* had a much more sensitive biblical and theological instinct.

#### SUMMARY

Negatively, (1) *kyriakos anthrōpos* did not have its origin in Apollinarian surroundings; it was discussed there and rejected. (2) It is not found in the writings of Nestorius, as far as we know them, although he uses the adjective *kyriakos* in different combinations. *Kyriakos anthrōpos*, later suspected of Nestorianism, was in use much more in writings preferring a Christology of *henōsis* and rejecting the *psilos anthrōpos*, such as those of Mark the Hermit (fighting against the Melchisedechians in his *Op.* 10 and against an early Origenist Christology in his *Op.* 11) or those of John Cassian and Leontius of Jerusalem (fighting against Nestorius and Nestorianism).

Positively, we have to distinguish different groups in the use of this expression:

In the first group (*EAA*, *EF*, Mark the Hermit, *Op.* 5 [*Praecepta salutaria*]), *kyriakos anthrōpos* is the central term of a biblical Christology according to Phil 2:5-11, 1 Cor 1:21, 23 and 2:9, within the framework of the economy of salvation. *Kyriakos* is only then combined with *anthrōpos* if the real *kyriotēs* of the risen Christ is in question. This

<sup>34</sup> We find this important nexus of *henōsis*, *kyriakon sōma*, and *archē* in Mark, *Op.* 10 (*De Melchisedech*) 5 (PG 65, 1124A-D).

*kyriotēs* is also given in the eternal predestination of Christ the man and in the prophetic view, that is, if Christ can be considered as *archē* according to Prov 8:22, or as *prōtotokos*, *kephalē*, *aparchē* according to Paulinian soteriology. The *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* is the beginning and the end of all the saving acts of God in the preparation of the Church. In this group of writings *kyriakos anthrōpos* has to be translated as "Jesus Christ the man in his *kyriotēs*, in his Lordship, the glorified man, the man in his exaltation," or generally by terms expressing the actual and manifest glory of Christ as the *Kyrios*.

In the second group (Didymus, Epiphanius, *Dialogus 4 de s. trinitate*, Latin Fathers such as Jerome, Augustine, John Cassian), *kyriakos anthrōpos* can be translated "the man of the Lord," that is, the manhood of the Lord. *Kyrios* in this case is the Logos incarnate; and all that belongs to him can be qualified as *kyriakos*, his body, his soul, his blood, his cross, and his tomb. We have a more dogmatic usage: *kyriakos* is applied to Jesus by reason of his union with the pre-existent Son or Logos, whether the Incarnate Word be seen in his earthly or in his glorified state. Understood in this broad sense, the application of the term became enlarged as well as colorless.

The third group (Mark the Hermit, *Op. 11*, and especially Leontius of Jerusalem [with Pseudo-Pamphilus and Anastasius of Sinai, here omitted]) combines the views of the first group with an intense dogmatic reflection on the *henōsis hypostatikē*. This *henōsis kath' hypostasin* is considered as bringing about the efficacy, the effluence, of the divinity of Christ into his human existence. Christ is seen in his permanent and perfect *kyriotēs*:

a) Still in a moderate sense in Mark the Hermit, who in this context inaugurates the use of the formula *henousthai kath' hypostasin* in a certainly pre-Cyrrillian phase of Christology. His *kyriakos anthrōpos* is an answer to a rationalist and intellectualist Origenism with its divisive Christology. A monastic kerygmatic view of Christ as the Logos incarnate stands over against a monastic gnostic separation between the Logos and the *sarx*, so that the "soul" emerges as the centering point of Christ or, in the interpretation of Mark, rather the destruction of the *henōsis* or of the *kyriakos anthrōpos*.

b) In an excessive manner in Leontius of Jerusalem, whose whole Christology is focused on the *enhypostasis* of Christ the man in the *hypostasis* of the Logos. And this *enhypostasis* is the comprehensive reason of an all-embracing *kyriotēs*, including the earthly and the risen Christ. In describing this *kyriotēs*, Leontius integrates important elements which were used by *EAA*, *EF*, and especially the pseudo-Athanasian *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*; we find the same in Gregory of Nyssa, where *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* is exploited (see R.

Hübner). Again we encounter the terms *aparchē*, *kephalē*, *phyrama*, but this time explicitly combined with *kyriakos anthrōpos*.

But this brilliant flaming up of the term *kyriakos anthrōpos* was the very end of its patristic history.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Pamphilus, *Dogmatica panoplia* [a wrong title] 4, 1, in A. Mai, *Novae patrum bibliothecae* 2 (Rome, 1844) 611 (the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos* born out of the Virgin), and Anastasius the Sinaite, *Hodegos* 13 (PG 89, 205A), are of no special interest.