

## Will, Action and Freedom

# The Medieval Mediterranean

Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1500

*Managing Editor*

Hugh Kennedy

SOAS, London

*Editors*

Paul Magdalino, St. Andrews

David Abulafia, Cambridge

Benjamin Arbel, Tel Aviv

Larry J. Simon, Western Michigan University

Olivia Remie Constable, Notre Dame

VOLUME 77

# Will, Action and Freedom

## Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century

*By*  
Cyril Hovorun



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2008

*Cover illustrations*

Front: A fresco depicting Christ from a cave church in Cappadocia. Photograph by Cyril Hovorun.

Back: A fresco of a cross from a cave church in Cappadocia. Photograph by Cyril Hovorun.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Hovorun, Cyril.

Will, action, and freedom : christological controversies in the seventh century / by Cyril Hovorun.

p. cm. — (The medieval Mediterranean, ISSN 0928-5520 ; v. 77)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-16666-0 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Monothelitism. 2. Heresies, Christian—History. 3. Free will and determinism—Religious aspects—Christianity—History of doctrines. 4. Jesus Christ—History of doctrines. I. Title. II. Series.

BT1430.H68 2008

273'.6—dc22

2008009745

ISSN 0928-5520

ISBN 978 90 04 16666 0

Copyright 2008 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*To my mother*



## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	ix
Abbreviations .....	xi
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One Early Monenergisms .....	5
1.1. Apollinarius of Laodicea .....	6
1.2. The Antiochian tradition .....	9
1.3. Anti-Chalcedonian Monenergisms .....	15
1.3.1. The Monenergism of Severus of Antioch .....	15
1.3.2. The Monothelitism of Severus .....	25
1.3.3. Julian of Halicarnassus .....	28
1.3.4. The Agnoetes .....	30
1.3.5. Criticism of the concept of ignorance .....	33
1.3.5.1. Theodosius of Alexandria .....	33
1.3.5.2. Anthimus of Trebizond .....	35
1.3.5.3. Colluthus .....	37
1.3.5.4. Constantine of Laodicea .....	37
1.3.6. Sergius the Grammarian .....	38
1.3.7. Conclusions .....	40
1.4. Theopaschism .....	41
1.5. The eve of the Monothelite controversy .....	50
Chapter Two History .....	53
2.1. Historical premises .....	53
2.2. Setting up the new doctrine .....	55
2.3. Union at Alexandria .....	67
2.4. The <i>Ecthesis</i> .....	73
2.5. Maximus and the West: strategic alliance .....	76
2.6. The <i>Typos</i> .....	82
2.7. The Lateran council .....	83
2.8. The 680/1 council .....	86
2.9. Attempts at a renewal of Monothelitism .....	91
2.10. The Maronites .....	93
2.11. Conclusions .....	102

Chapter Three 'Imperial' Monenergism-Monothelitism <i>versus</i> Dyenergism-Dyothelitism .....	103
3.1. Key notions .....	103
3.1.1. The oneness of Christ .....	103
3.1.2. One hypostasis and two natures .....	104
3.1.3. Natural properties .....	105
3.1.4. <i>Energeia</i> .....	108
3.1.4.1. Notion .....	108
3.1.4.2. 'A new theandric <i>energeia</i> ' .....	111
3.1.4.3. Two <i>energeiai</i> .....	120
3.1.4.4. Created and uncreated <i>energeiai</i> .....	122
3.1.5. Will .....	124
3.1.5.1. Notion .....	124
3.1.5.2. One or two wills .....	125
3.2. Relations between main categories .....	135
3.2.1. <i>Energeia</i> —One-Who-Acts .....	135
3.2.2. Will—One-Who-Wills .....	143
3.2.3. Will—'nous' .....	147
3.2.4. <i>Energeia</i> —nature .....	149
3.2.5. Will-nature .....	154
3.2.6. <i>Energeia</i> —will—natural properties .....	160
3.2.7. <i>Energeia</i> —will .....	162
Conclusions .....	163
Bibliography .....	169
Editions of texts consulted .....	169
Secondary literature .....	181
Index of names, places, and subjects .....	193



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book originated as a doctoral thesis submitted in 2003 to the University of Durham, England. In the first instance I wish to express deep gratitude to my supervisor Prof Andrew Louth. Subsequent valuable comments and suggestions from my examiners, Dr Richard Price and Prof Iain Torrance prompted me to make corrections and reconsiderations of several points in the thesis. I also feel indebted to my teachers at the University of Athens, Prof Stylianos Papadopoulos and Prof Vlasios Pheidas, both of whom indicated to me the primary directions in my studies of the Fathers. Professor Pheidas also suggested the topic. Last, but not least, I would like to thank Prof Dimitri Conomos and Rev John Innes for assisting me in matters of language and editorial details.



## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Analecta Bollandiana
ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. ACO <sub>1</sub> : series prima, ed. E. Schwarz; ACO <sub>2</sub> : series secunda, ed. R. Riedinger
BBKl	Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon
BF	Byzantinische Forschungen
BZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift
CACHss	Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi
CCh.SG	Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca
CChSL	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CJP	Canadian Journal of Philosophy
CorpAvel	O. Guenther. <i>Epistulae imperatorum, pontificum, aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio</i> . Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 35. Wien, 1895
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum
CPL	Clavis Patrum Latinorum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
DACL	Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie
DomStud	Dominican Studies
DTC	Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique
EO	Échos d'Orient
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
FES	<i>Философский энциклопедический словарь</i> . Москва: Советская энциклопедия, 1983.
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
GOTR	Greek Orthodox Theological Review
HJGG	Historisches Jahrbuch der Gorres-Gesellschaft
HPQ	History of Philosophy Quarterly
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
JES	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies

Mansi	<i>Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio</i> . Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1961.
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
MSR	Mélanges de Science Religieuse
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
OCA	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
OCP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OLP	Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica
PBE	Prosopography of the Byzantine Empire I: 641–867 [CD]. Ashgate.
PG	Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Accurante J.-P. Migne. Series Graeca.
PL	Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Accurante J.-P. Migne. Series Latina.
PmbZ	Lilie, R.-J. and F. Winkelmann. <i>Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit: 1. Abt. (641–867)</i> . Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998.
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum
RHE	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
SCh	Sources chrétiennes
SE	Sacris Erudiri
Sherwood	Sherwood, P. <i>An annotated date-list of the works of Maximus the Confessor</i> . Rome: 'Orbis Catholicus', Herder, 1952.
SP	Studia Patristica
StT	Studi e Testi
TQ	Theologische Quartalschrift
TRE	Theologische Realenzyklopädie
Winkelmann	entries in: 'Die Quellen zur Erforschung des monenergetisch-monothelletischen Streites.' <i>Klio</i> 69, 2 (1987); <i>Der monenergetisch-monothelletische Streit</i> . Frankfurt am Main; Oxford: P. Lang, 2001.
ZK	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte

## INTRODUCTION

This book concerns itself with a theological controversy that erupted in the seventh century. The issue, Christ's activities and wills, has received scant attention from scholars, and, in the main, has remained a subject of interest for only a minority. Where treated, historians have touched on it incidentally, often in the context of researching other matters.<sup>1</sup> Only recently has some scholarship appeared which sheds more light on the controversy and its historical background. Relatively old, but still valuable, research by Garegin Owsepian,<sup>2</sup> Venance Grumel,<sup>3</sup> and Erich Caspar<sup>4</sup> has been significantly enriched by the extensive studies of Jan Louis van Dieten,<sup>5</sup> Pietro Conte,<sup>6</sup> Franz Dölger,<sup>7</sup> and, most recently, Friedhelm Winkelmann.<sup>8</sup>

Scholarship on the civil history of Byzantium in the seventh century has also advanced dramatically, owing to the contributions of Andreas Stratos,<sup>9</sup> John Haldon,<sup>10</sup> Walter E. Kaegi,<sup>11</sup> *et al.*<sup>12</sup> In addition, critically edited sources on seventh-century theology have endowed this discipline with powerful research tools. Among the most important are the acts of the Lateran (649) and Constantinopolitan (680/1) councils edited by Rudolf Riedinger,<sup>13</sup> the works of Maximus the Confessor, published

---

<sup>1</sup> See Elert, Maurer, and Bergsträsser (1957); Helmer (1962).

<sup>2</sup> Owsepian (1897).

<sup>3</sup> Grumel (1928); (1929); (1930); (1972).

<sup>4</sup> Caspar (1930).

<sup>5</sup> van Dieten (1972).

<sup>6</sup> Conte (1971).

<sup>7</sup> Dölger and Wirth (1977).

<sup>8</sup> Winkelmann (2001). This book is based on an earlier article (1987) 519–59. (Henceforth, both works will be referred to as 'Winkelmann,' with the number of the entry following, *e.g.* 'Winkelmann 3'.)

<sup>9</sup> Stratos (1968).

<sup>10</sup> Haldon (1990).

<sup>11</sup> Kaegi (1981); (2002).

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, Köpstein and Winkelmann (1976); Brandes (1989); Ditten (1993); Reinink and Stolte (2002).

<sup>13</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I; ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup>. The same author published a series of materials related to the text of the acts and the history of the councils (München 1979); (Wien 1979); (1985); (1998).

in the series *Corpus Christianorum*,<sup>14</sup> together with the sources on his life,<sup>15</sup> and the writings of Anastasius Sinaita published by Karl-Heinz Uthemann.<sup>16</sup>

The primary task of this study is to illuminate in systematic fashion two theological approaches to the issues of *energeia* and will in Christ. These currents of thought issued forth and flowed from fourth-century sources but, over the next three centuries, they parted ways, developed and broadened. Their courses eventually came to a confluence in the seventh century when they gave rise to two distinct controversies: one over *energeia* and the other over will. I will refer to these approaches as Monenergism-Monothelitism and Dyenergism-Dyothelitism and treat them as two integral doctrines.

My analysis of these two doctrines will be undertaken in terms of hypostasis, nature, natural property, *energeia*, and will, terms that formed the framework of theological argument throughout the seventh century. Inquiry into the relationships between these notions will help us understand better the differences and similarities between the two rival positions. The writings of the major protagonists in this controversy will also be considered in this framework, in particular those of Theodore of Pharan, Pope Honorius, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Macarius of Antioch (among the Monenergists-Monothelites), and Sophronius of Jerusalem, Maximus the Confessor, the Popes John, Theodore, Martin, and Agatho (as the major representatives of the Dyenergist-Dyothelite party).

The leading figure among the Dyothelite theologians was undoubtedly Maximus the Confessor (ca. 580–662). We shall not, however, present his theological contribution separately from the rest of his fellow theologians, but rather as an integral part of the united polemical effort against Monenergism-Monothelitism. Any consideration of Maximus

---

<sup>14</sup> *Quaestiones ad Thalassium: una cum latina interpretatione Ioannis Scotti Eriugenae iuxta posita* (CCh.SG 7); *Quaestiones et dubia* (CCh.SG 10); *Ambigua ad Iohannem iuxta Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae latinam interpretationem* (CCh.SG 18); *Opuscula exegetica duo. Expositio in Psalmum LIX. Expositio orationis dominicae* (CCh.SG 23); *Liber asceticus* (CCh.SG 40); *Ambigua ad Thomam una cum epistula secunda ad eundem* (CCh.SG 48).

<sup>15</sup> See the Syriac *Vita* of Maximus published by Sebastian Brock AB (1973); see also *Scripta saeculi VII vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia* (CCh.SG 39); Allen and Neil (2002).

<sup>16</sup> *Anastasii Sinaitae Viae dux* (CCh.SG 8); *Anastasii Sinaitae Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem Dei; necnon opuscula adversus Monotheletas* (CCh.SG 12).

as a self-sufficient theologian or thinker apart from the context of the Monenergism-Monothelitism controversy may be misleading since he composed his best Christological writings in response to the challenge of Monenergism-Monothelitism. His works constituted only a part, though a very important part, of the overriding polemical campaign. I agree, therefore, with Andrew Louth who remarks that 'Although Maximus the Confessor is a speculative theologian of genius, he does not see himself, as would some later theologians, as *constructing* a theological system. He sees himself as interpreting a tradition that has come down to him, and interpreting it for the sake of others.'<sup>17</sup>

My purpose here is to demonstrate that the issues of Christ's *energeia* and will were not of secondary importance, but among the most important challenges that Christology was ever to face. I will also try to show that both Monenergism-Monothelitism and Dyenergism-Dyothelitism, in the forms they assumed in the seventh century, despite their antagonism, had the same neo-Chalcedonian origin. Monenergism-Monothelitism, in particular, developed as an attempt to reach a compromise with the Severan tradition, an important feature of which was a belief in a single *energeia* of Christ. Severus' Monenergism, however, was not the first; it was preceded by others that were cultivated within traditions linked to Apollinarius of Laodicea and Theodore of Mopsuestia. One of the intentions of the present book is to describe these types of Monenergism and to disclose what they had in common with 'imperial,' or Chalcedonian, Monenergism.

---

<sup>17</sup> Louth (1996) 21.





## CHAPTER ONE

### EARLY MONENERGISMS

Those who possess a rudimentary knowledge of the history of Christian doctrine generally agree that the teaching on a single activity and a sole will in Christ appeared in the seventh century AD and was dealt with at the council of Constantinople in 680/1. This is only partly true. As it emerged in the seventh century, this teaching was not born in a vacuum. By way of precedent, there had been at least four forms of Christological doctrine that promoted emphatically a single *energeia* and will. The first, established at the dawn of the Christological controversies by Apollinarius, firmly placed Christological problems on the agenda of Christian theology. The Antiochian Theodore of Mopsuestia produced his own Christology which opposed that of Apollinarius. His version implied a specific sort of Monenergism-Monothelitism. The Alexandrian tradition, personified by Severus of Antioch, presented a new version of a single *energeia* and will; it contrasted with the Antiochian understanding. For Severus and his followers, the doctrine of a single *energeia* became more important than for the Antiochians and became central to their perception of Christ.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, some lesser variations of Monenergism-Monothelitism, expounded by the Julianists, Agnoetes *etc.* emerged within the anti-Chalcedonian sphere. Finally, in the seventh century, a new type of Monenergism-Monothelitism was articulated in the framework of the neo-Chalcedonian or Cyrillic Chalcedonian interpretation of Christological doctrine.<sup>2</sup> Paradoxically, the doctrine on the two wills and the two activities in Christ (Dyenergism-Dyothelitism), which opposed Monenergism-Monothelitism, also arose from neo-Chalcedonianism.<sup>3</sup> That the two antagonistic doctrines had emerged from the same neo-Chalcedonianian tradition suggests that

---

<sup>1</sup> See Pheidas (1995) 727.

<sup>2</sup> See Moeller (1951) 695 n. 167; Pelikan (1974) vol. 2, 62; Winkelmann 14; Louth (1996) 56; Thunberg (1965) 40–41; Farrell (1989) 71; Uthemann (1997) 373–413.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, the fifth anathema of the Lateran council, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 372<sup>1–8</sup>. Cyril of Alexandria was the most quoted author at the Dyenergism-Dyothelite councils (649 and 680/1). In the acts of the Lateran council, he was cited 66 times, and in the acts of the 680/1 council, 42 times. See Louth (1996) 27–28; Farrell (1989) 23.

this tradition underwent an internal crisis at the beginning of the seventh century.<sup>4</sup> Even so, this did not undermine neo-Chalcedonianism in either of the two camps. Thus, because neo-Chalcedonianism produced Monenergism-Monothelitism, nobody from the Dyenergist-Dyothelite camp doubted or criticized either Cyril<sup>5</sup> or even the ambiguous ps-Dionysius, author of the rather Monenergist formula: ‘a certain theandric *energeia*.’ Interpreting Chalcedon via the language of Cyril remained foundational for the Dyenergist-Dyothelite polemic against Monenergism-Monothelitism.

### 1.1. *Apollinarius of Laodicea*

Apollinarius of Laodicea’s (d. *ca.* 392)<sup>6</sup> specific teaching on the Incarnation instigated lengthy Christological controversies whose echoes reverberated even in seventh century Monenergism-Monothelitism. He struggled to promote his own interpretation of the unity of Godhead and humanity in Christ. Essentially, his position opposed Adoptionism with its notion of the indwelling of the Logos in a man.<sup>7</sup> As he saw it, the idea of adoption or indwelling did not reflect sufficiently the unity and integrity of divinity and humanity in Christ. In order to emphasise this unity, Apollinarius presented the Incarnation as the integration of the Logos and animated flesh. The flesh assumed by Christ is, on its own, not complete humanity for it lacked a νοῦς/πνεῦμα. As such, Christ remains a single and integral entity. Both the animated flesh and the Logos are for Apollinarius parts of Christ’s single nature. These parts, however, should not be considered as equal. The divine part dominates the human and is the life-giving spirit, in which the whole life of Christ is concentrated—the sole and self-sufficient source of movement and activity in Christ: ‘The divine intellect is αὐτοκίνητος and παντοκίνητος.’<sup>8</sup> Animated flesh, on the contrary, is passively subordinated to the God-

<sup>4</sup> See Farrell (1989) 71.

<sup>5</sup> See Sophronius, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 472<sup>15–17</sup> and Pope Martin at the Lateran, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 358<sup>28–32</sup>. For Maximus, Thunberg remarks: ‘As an authority Cyril of Alexandria plays a rather outstanding role in Maximus’ writings.’ (1965) 40.

<sup>6</sup> On account of his life and theology see Voisin (1901); Lietzmann (1904); Raven (1923); de Riedmatten (1948) 239–260; (1951) 553–572; *JTS* (1956, 1957); *SP* (1957) 208–234; Prestige and Chadwick (1956); Norris (1963).

<sup>7</sup> See, for instance, Lietzmann (1904) fr. 186 p. 318<sup>17–24</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> *adIulian*, Lietzmann (1904) fr. 151 pp. 247<sup>30</sup>–248<sup>1</sup>.

head. It does not move by itself, but is being constantly moved and led by the Godhead: 'The flesh is always moved by him who moves and leads.'<sup>9</sup> Animated flesh and the Godhead together constitute a perfect unity of components that are passive and dynamic, supplementary to each other. This supplementarity of Christ's 'elements' makes him a single and complete being:

It (= the flesh) was adopted by him (= the heavenly ruler) according to its passibility (κατὰ τὸ παθητικόν) and received the divine (Logos), who indwelt in it, according to the activity (κατὰ τὸ ἐνεργητικόν). Therefore, he was a single living being composed of what is moved and what moves (ἐκ κινουμένου καὶ κινητικοῦ), but not two (beings), neither (was he composed) of two perfect and self-moving (entities).<sup>10</sup>

Thus, for Apollinarius, Christ's *energeia* could be but one, and is divine. It is exclusively provided by the Logos:

In him is confessed... a nature which is made up of two parts, as the Logos with his divine perfection contributes a natural activity to the whole (μερικὴν ἐνέργειαν... εἰς τὸ ὅλον). This is also the case with ordinary man, who is made up of two incomplete parts, which produce one nature and display it under one name.<sup>11</sup>

The humanity of Christ participates in the divine *energeia* because it is totally subjected to the Godhead:

For the human (*energeia*) takes part in the divine *energeia*, as far as it can reach (it), being lesser than what is the greater. Also, man is a slave of God, and God is not a slave of man, nor of himself. Also, the former is a creature of God, while the latter is not a creature of man nor of himself.<sup>12</sup>

Apollinarius made a distinction between Christ's divine *energeia* and his human 'movements' (σαρκικὰ κινήσεις). The former is pure and sinless, whereas the latter are weak, passive, and subject to sin, suffering, and death. Apollinarius avoided speaking of the activities of the flesh as *energeiai*. To him, they were merely movements (κινήσεις):

For God, enfleshed in human flesh, retains his own proper operation unsullied (καθαρὸν ἔχει τὴν ἰδίαν ἐνέργειαν). He is Intellect unconquered by psychic and fleshly passions, and he guides the flesh and the motions

<sup>9</sup> Lietzmann (1904) fr. 107 p. 232<sup>10-11</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Lietzmann (1904) fr. 107 p. 232<sup>14-18</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> *deUnioneCorp*, Lietzmann (1904) p. 187<sup>5-11</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Lietzmann (1904) fr. 130 p. 239<sup>6-10</sup>.

of the flesh (τὰς σαρκικὰς κινήσεις) divinely and sinlessly; and not only is he unmastered by death, but he is also the looser of death.<sup>13</sup>

The *energeia* of Christ is single on the level of the spirit. Once passed through the prism of the flesh, however, it disperses as a multiplicity of particular actions. Gregory of Nyssa quotes this point of Apollinarius:

... Distinguishing the operation according to the flesh and making it equal to one according to the spirit.

He says, he who is equal in power has distinction of operations with regard to the flesh according to which he has vivified not all but those whom he wished.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, the *energeia* of the flesh, in comparison with the activity of the Godhead, is not *energeia*, but a passive movement initiated by the divinity. This becomes clearer when a general Apollinarian perception of the unity of Christ is taken into consideration. According to this understanding, the unity is not static, but dynamic and lively (ἐνότης ζωτική).<sup>15</sup> Christ is one because he has one life and one power, which proceeds from the Godhead and imbues humanity.<sup>16</sup> Apollinarius equates this life of Christ with the *energeia*, which, it follows, is not simply an activity, but also a life-giving power of the Godhead. In this way, Christ's human actions cannot be termed *energeiai*, but merely 'movements.' Apollinarius went further and asserted that the *energeia* of the Logos substituted his human soul and mind.<sup>17</sup> Hence, the concept of *energeia* became crucial for Apollinarius' entire system.

Another important element in Apollinarius' argument was that of will. Christ has only one will, as well as one nature and one *energeia*:

<sup>13</sup> *FidesSecPart*, Lietzmann (1904) p. 178<sup>13-17</sup>/transl. R. Norris <http://divinity.library.vanderbilt.edu/burns/3224/apollinaris.htm> (24/07/2003).

<sup>14</sup> *advApol* 3.1.176<sup>4-5; 10-13</sup>, Lietzmann (1904) fr. 59, 60 pp. 217<sup>30-31</sup>, 218<sup>3-5</sup>/modified transl. Richard McCambly <http://www.bhsu.edu/artssciences/asfaculty/dsalomon/nyssa/apollin.html> (24/07/2003).

<sup>15</sup> Lietzmann (1904) fr. 144 p. 242<sup>4</sup>. The dynamic aspect of Christ's unity was first underlined by de Riedmatten (1948) 239-260; *SP* (1957) 208-234.

<sup>16</sup> See *deFidelInc*, Lietzmann (1904) p. 198<sup>16-17</sup>. Also, when interpreting 1 Cor 15, 45 ('the first man, Adam, became a living being; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit'), Apollinarius ascribed to Christ only one life, and this life is that of the Godhead (see *adDion I*, Lietzmann (1904) p. 261<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>17</sup> See *deUnione*, Lietzmann (1904) fr. 2 p. 204<sup>7-9</sup>.

For this reason, we confess a single Christ; and, because he is single, we worship his single nature, will, and *energeia*, which is preserved equally in the miracles and the passions.<sup>18</sup>

The will is divine:

But they are troubled with the trouble of the unbelievers and do not remember that this will is said to be not a proper (will) of a man who is of the earth, as they think, but of God who has descended from heaven (see 1 Cor 15, 47); it (= the will) was adopted for his unity.<sup>19</sup>

The will is single and divine because it is closely linked to the single and divine *nous*. The *nous* has absolute control over the volitional capacities. It is the sole subject of willing. The will and its subject are so closely linked to each other that nothing separates them. Two wills would introduce two subjects of willing, which would of necessity wish things opposed to each other:

For if every intellect rules over his own will, being moved according to nature, then it is impossible for two (subjects) who will what is opposite to one another (δύο τοὺς τὰναντία θέλοντας ἀλλήλοις), to coexist in one and the same subject; for each one would do what is desirable to it, according to a self-moved impulse (ἐκατέρου τὸ θεληθὲν ἑαυτῷ καθ' ὁμὴν αὐτοκίνητον ἐνεργοῦντος).<sup>20</sup>

Thus, Apollinarius *a priori* rejected two wills, as well as their possibility of having one subject and function in respect of each other. These arguments were insistently repeated by all later generations of Monothelites.

### 1.2. The Antiochian tradition

Within the framework of 'Antiochian' theology, a different and particular kind of Monenergism-Monothelitism developed that may be attributed primarily to Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 350–428/429).<sup>21</sup>

<sup>18</sup> *adIulian*, Lietzmann (1904) fr. 151 p. 248<sup>5-7</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Lietzmann (1904) fr. 63 p. 218<sup>20-24</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> *adIulian*, Lietzmann (1904) fr. 150 p. 247<sup>23-27</sup>. See also *deUnione*, Lietzmann (1904) fr. 2 p. 204<sup>11-14</sup>. This idea was reproduced by the disciples of Apollinarius (see, for instance, Vitalis in Lietzmann (1904) fr. 175 p. 275<sup>22-26</sup>).

<sup>21</sup> For an account of his life and works see K.-G. Wesseling in the *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor\\_v\\_mo.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor_v_mo.shtml) (13/10/2002), in which also extensive bibliography.

Theodore compiled his Christology chiefly in opposition to Arianism and Apollinarianism and criticized what modern scholarship characterizes as Λόγος-σάρξ Christology. This Christology, according to Alois Grillmeier, means the ‘vital, dynamic influence of the Logos on the flesh of Christ. Within the Λόγος-σάρξ framework, this stoic idea of the Logos as ἡγεμών is far more decisive than a mere oversight of the soul of Christ. It is, in fact, the real source from which the whole pattern of a Christology of a soul-less Christ (whether as a theological or a physical factor) has developed.’<sup>22</sup> Opposing this Christological pattern, Theodore developed the schema Λόγος-ἄνθρωπος.<sup>23</sup> His main concern here was the completeness of humanity in Christ. In order to defend this completeness, Theodore accentuated the distinction between Christ’s two natures. In so doing, he drew a picture of Christ composed of two independent entities: the Logos and the man. In other words, the two natures of Christ were each given concrete existence. To clarify his viewpoint, Theodore applied to Christ the language of indwelling and assumption: the Logos indwelt in a man<sup>24</sup> and a whole man was assumed by the Logos.<sup>25</sup>

These ideas contrasted with Apollinarius’ views that the Logos substituted the human *nous* in Christ. Theodore indicated various negative consequences of these views, including the elimination of Christ’s human activities *e.g.* hunger, thirst, and tiredness. One of Theodore’s major concerns was to defend the reality and fullness of the human faculties in Christ, including his human activities and wills. In his fifth *Catechetical homily* he wrote:

Consequently, if the divinity takes the place of the soul, it (= the body of Christ) had neither hunger, nor thirst, nor was it tired, nor did it have need of food.<sup>26</sup>

There are in Christ two sources of action: one is the Logos and the other the man. The two natures co-operate with each other:

Moreover (the divine Son) furnished his co-operation in the proposed works to the one who was assumed. (Now) where does this (co-operation) entail that the Deity had replaced the (human) *nous* in him who

<sup>22</sup> Grillmeier (1975) I 426.

<sup>23</sup> Grillmeier (1975) I 428–439.

<sup>24</sup> See *inPsalm 44*<sup>9a</sup>, *HomCatech* 161/Grillmeier (1975) I 429.

<sup>25</sup> See *HomCatech* 5, 127/Grillmeier (1975) I 427.

<sup>26</sup> *HomCatech* 5, 112/Norris (1963) 150.

was assumed? For it was not his wont to take the place of the nous in any, whoever they were, to whom he accorded his cooperation. And if moreover he accorded to the one who was assumed an extraordinary co-operation, this does not mean (either) that the Deity took the place of the nous. But suppose, as you would have it, that the Deity took the role of the nous in him who was assumed. How was he affected with fear in his suffering? Why, in the face of immediate need, did he stand in want of vehement prayers—prayers which, as the blessed Paul says, he brought before God with a loud and clamorous voice and with many tears? How was he seized of such immense fear that he gave forth fountains of sweat by reason of his great terror?<sup>27</sup>

He also applied to Christ's humanity the ability to will:

With indissoluble love he formed himself according to the good, receiving also the co-operation of God the Word in proportion to his own choice of the good... He held fast to this way by his own will, while on the other hand this choice was made secure in him by the co-operating work of God the Word.<sup>28</sup>

Thus, as Grillmeier remarks, in the theology of Theodore, 'the human nature of Christ regains its real physical-human inner life and its capacity for action.'<sup>29</sup> In other words, Theodore ascribed to each nature a capacity to act and will.

Nonetheless, he surprisingly preferred to speak of a single common *energeia* and will in Christ.<sup>30</sup> His conception of a single *energeia* and will can best be comprehended through his understanding of the notion of *prosopon*. A close link between these three categories can be observed for instance in the following passage:

The idea of unity according to the essence (κατ' οὐσίαν) is true only if applied to (the beings) of the same essence, but is wrong if applied to (the beings) of different essences; otherwise it (= the idea) could not be free from confusion. At the same time, the way of unity according to benevolence (κατ' εὐδοκίαν), while preserving natures unconfused and undivided, indicates a single person of both, as well as a single will and *energeia* which are followed by a single power and dominion.<sup>31</sup>

Notions of activity and will are here put on the same level as that of πρόσωπον. The latter will help us in explaining the former. In his

<sup>27</sup> *inPaul* (Swete (1880) 2, 315)/A. Grillmeier, (1975) I 428.

<sup>28</sup> *deIncarn* 7, fr. 3.

<sup>29</sup> (1975) I 427.

<sup>30</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> I 332<sup>20-23</sup>, Maximus, *SpiritualisTomus* 173.

<sup>31</sup> *adDomn* 20-26.

*Commentary on John*, Theodore interpreted *Rom* 7 (in which Paul speaks about a man who feels himself subjected simultaneously to the law of God and to the law of sin) and remarked that the Apostle refers to two different entities. Paul unites, however, these entities using a common point of reference—the pronoun ‘I’ (ἐγώ). Theodore applied to Christ what Paul says about himself. Thus, the two natures are united in the single ‘I’ of Christ, which signifies his ‘common person’: ‘So our Lord, when he spoke of his manhood and his Godhead, referred the pronoun ‘I’ to the common person (*par̄sôpâ*).’<sup>32</sup> Theodore explained in detail what he meant by saying *prosopon*, in his *Contra Eunomium*:

*Prosopon* is used in a twofold way: for either it signifies the hypostasis and that which each one of us is, or it is conferred upon honour, greatness and worship; for example ‘Paul’ and ‘Peter’ signify the hypostasis and the *prosopon* of each one of them, but the *prosopon* of our Lord Christ means honour, greatness and worship. For because God the Word was revealed in manhood, he was causing the glory of his hypostasis to cleave to the visible one; and for this reason, ‘*prosopon* of Christ’ declares it (= the *prosopon*) to be (a *prosopon*) of honour, not of the ousia of the two natures. For the honour is neither nature nor hypostasis, but an elevation to great dignity which is awarded as a due for the cause of revelation. What purple garments or royal apparel are for the king, is for God the Word the beginning which was taken from us without separation, alienation or distance in worship. Therefore, as it is not by nature that a king has purple robes, so also neither is it by nature that God the Word has flesh. For anyone who affirms God the Word to have flesh by nature (predicates that) he has something foreign to the divine ousia by undergoing an alteration by the addition of a nature. But if he has not flesh by nature, how does Apollinarius say that the same one is partially homoousios with the Father in his Godhead, and (partially) homoousios with us in the flesh, so that he should make him composite? For he who is thus divided into natures becomes and is found (to be) something composite by nature.’<sup>33</sup>

It is clear, therefore, that Theodore was aware that πρόσωπον might signify ὑπόστασις or a concrete being. When applied to Christ, however, it has another meaning, namely one common honour, one greatness, worship, dignity *etc* of his divinity and manhood. It refers to the way that God appears and reveals himself through manhood in Christ. According to Grillmeier, ‘In Theodore, as also later in Nestorius and in Theodoret, before Chalcedon, the word *prosopon* should not simply

<sup>32</sup> *inIoan* 8<sup>16</sup> (CSCO 116) 119/Grillmeier (1975) I 431.

<sup>33</sup> *contEunom* 101/Grillmeier (1975) I 433.



be rendered “person,” giving the word the strictly ontological content which it had later. *Prosopon* here should not be interpreted in the light of the definition of person in Boethius or Leontius of Byzantium. At this stage, we must also exclude the full Chalcedonian sense of *prosopon*. The Antiochene concept of *prosopon* derives from the original meaning of the word *prosopon*, “countenance.” *Prosopon* is the “form in which a physis or hypostasis appears”. Every nature and every hypostasis has its own proper *prosopon*. It gives expression to the reality of the nature with its powers and characteristics.<sup>34</sup> Although Theodore sometimes ascribed *prosopon* to each of Christ’s two natures,<sup>35</sup> he preferred to attribute the term to Christ as single being. Therefore, when he speaks about *prosopon*, in most cases he means the common *prosopon* of God and man in Christ.

It now becomes clear why Theodore preferred to speak of a single common will, and not of two activities and wills in Christ. Both will and activity, as aspects of Christ’s *prosopon*, constituted for Theodore a joint manifestation of the two natures. As the *prosopon* was a single manifestation of both divinity and manhood in Christ, so were activity and will.

Theodore’s approach to the single activity and will is to some extent similar to that of Apollinarius, though Theodore fervently argued against his views. The *prosopon* of Christ, in Theodore’s interpretation, alludes to the lively and life-giving power of the Logos. Hence his idea of the single *energeia* and will which corresponds to the dynamic Monenergism-Monothelitism of Apollinarius.

Theodore’s thesis was in due course implemented by Nestorius<sup>36</sup> who re-stated Theodore’s concept of *prosopon* as the common glory and worship of Christ’s Godhead and manhood: “The two natures have one Lordship and one power or might and one *prosopon* in the one dignity and in the same honour.”<sup>37</sup> As an appearance of both God and man in Christ, the *prosopon* denoted to Nestorius a common space, where the ‘energetical’ and volitional capacities of the two natures manifested themselves. This was a space for Christ’s single *energeia*<sup>38</sup> and will.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Grillmeier (1975) I 431.

<sup>35</sup> See *deIncarn* 8, fr. 8.

<sup>36</sup> On Nestorius see E. Reichert, ‘Nestorius,’ *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/n/nestorius\\_v\\_k.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/n/nestorius_v_k.shtml) (07/01/2003).

<sup>37</sup> *adAlex* 196<sup>15–17</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> I 334<sup>9–10</sup>/Grillmeier (1975) I 462.

<sup>38</sup> See *Sermo II* 223–224; ACO<sub>2</sub> I 332<sup>35–38</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> See *Sermo IV* 224<sup>12–15</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> I 334<sup>3–5</sup>.

In conclusion, the Antiochian tradition, associated with the names of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, considered the single activity and will of Christ as aspects of the common *prosopon*, which in turn was an exposure and revelation of the two natures.<sup>40</sup> Activity and will, together with the *prosopon*, constituted a common manifestation of the two natures, which do not appear separately, but always together. Therefore, the *prosopon*, the will, and the *energeia* were single. This crucial detail of the Theodoran-Nestorian tradition was noticed by Maximus the Confessor who used it in his dispute with Pyrrhus. Maximus more pointedly said that the Monothelites, while rejecting Nestorianism, accepted the Nestorian conception of the single will:

Those who say ‘one will’ vindicate his (= Nestorius’) teachings, for their *Ecthesis* testifies, advocates, and decrees ‘one will,’ which is exactly what Nestorius advocated: the doctrine of one will in two persons was invented by him.<sup>41</sup>

Did not Nestorius, who indeed maintained that there were two persons, rather say that there was but one energy?<sup>42</sup>

Maximus criticized Pyrrhus because he, like Nestorius, ascribed the activity of Christ to his person:

But according to what you say, if persons (πρόσωπα) be introduced along with the energies, and *vice versa*, energies with persons, then you are compelled, following the same principles, either to say that because of the one operation of the Holy Godhead there is one person as well, or because of its three Hypostases that there are three operations. Or you might maintain that their union is relational (σχετικήν), as Nestorius said of Christ, for the one energy was the union, as Nestorius and his party maintained in their writings.<sup>43</sup>

It appears that Maximus was first among Dyenergists-Dyothelites to suggest that the tradition associated with the name of Nestorius actually contained elements of Monenergism and Monothelitism. He attempted

---

<sup>40</sup> See a *florilegium* with the fragments from the works of other ‘Nestorian’ authors collected apparently by Maximus, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 332–334. As an additional example, ‘Nestorian’ patriarch Timothy I can be mentioned here, for whom hypostasis of the man assumed by the Logos had ‘a single will and action with the Logos who had clothed himself in him.’ *ep* 34 (CSCO 75) 127; (CSCO 74) 186. He rejected ‘one will and another will,’ for ‘everything was brought together into an ineffable union.’ *ep* 36 (CSCO 75) 179; (CSCO 74) 258.

<sup>41</sup> *Disputatio* 313<sup>b</sup>/Farrell (1990) 36.

<sup>42</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>d</sup>/Farrell (1990) 56.

<sup>43</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>d</sup>–337<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 57.

to identify these elements and may have collected a *florilegium* of those relevant Theodoran-Nestorian texts which were eventually included in the acts of the Lateran council.

In drawing a parallel between the Monenergism-Monothelitism of Nestorius and that of Pyrrhus, Maximus exaggerated the similarity between them. He may have done this for polemical reasons. Theodoran-Nestorian Monenergism-Monothelitism was not as radical as Pyrrhus'. For Theodore, and consequently for Nestorius, the categories *energeia* and will were not so much 'substantial', as they were for Pyrrhus. Both Theodore and Nestorius recognized the 'energetical' and volitional capacities of both God and man in Christ, though they avoided calling them *energeia* and will. What they in fact labelled *energeia* and will was a common manifestation of the 'energetical' and volitional capacities of Christ's two natures. As manifestations, both the *energeia* and will were single, for Christ and his *prosopon* of unity were also single.

### 1.3. *Anti-Chalcedonian Monenergisms*

A conviction that affiliated itself with Cyril of Alexandria and rejected the council of Chalcedon with its 'two natures,' continued to support the 'Nestorian' belief in the single *energeia* and will in Christ. This teaching had something in common with ideas developed earlier by Theodore of Mopsuestia. We should not, however, exaggerate this similarity, since it was rather superficial. The theological rationale that led to the 'Nestorian' Monenergism-Monothelitism was different from that which resulted in anti-Chalcedonian Monenergism-Monothelitism. The two Monenergisms-Monothelitisms originated from different theological presuppositions and different understandings of the categories *energeia* and will. In this chapter, an investigation into anti-Chalcedonian Monenergism-Monothelitism will be undertaken.

#### 1.3.1. *The Monenergism of Severus of Antioch*

The most prominent theologian of the pro-Cyrrillian and, at the same time, anti-Chalcedonian trend in the Christology of the 5th and 6th centuries was Severus of Antioch (465–538).<sup>44</sup> Available testimonies

---

<sup>44</sup> See Wigram (1923); Lebon (1951) 425–580; Frend (1972); Chesnut (1976).

indicate that Severus was first among the principal teachers of anti-Chalcedonian Christology who explicitly dealt with the issue of Christ's activities. This may come as a surprise, since he was a highly conservative follower of Cyril who himself had not specifically touched on the issues of *energeiai* and wills. Severus, nevertheless, risked challenging these themes (mostly *energeia*) and thus became the most important contributor to anti-Chalcedonian Monenergism. He was engaged with this doctrine by his adversaries from both the anti-Chalcedonian and the Chalcedonian camps. Of the former his main opponents were Julian of Halicarnassus and Sergius the Grammarian whereas in the latter were John the Grammarian and Nephalius. The notion of *energeia* as such was not the focal point of Severus' theology. He only referred to it when the wider problem of Christ's essence(s) and property(ies) was being discussed. The concept of *energeia* that emerged from this discussion became a pattern that would be followed by later generations of 'Severans.'

For Severus, Christ's *energeia* was primarily single: 'There is only one single activity, only one single operative motion.'<sup>45</sup> Any duality with respect to it should be avoided, as he made clear in the surviving Greek fragment from his third epistle to John the abbot: 'One composite (activity) cannot be interpreted other than as a rejection of every duality.'<sup>46</sup> Severus explored the oneness of the *energeia* as an argument in favour of the oneness of Christ's nature. The oneness of the *energeia* was for him the more evident of the two. In ascribing Christ's single *energeia* exclusively to Christ as an acting subject, Severus unsurprisingly condemned Pope Leo who linked the *energeiai* to the natures:<sup>47</sup>

If he (= Leo) in spirit were to hold and confess the hypostatic union, he could not say that each of the two natures keeps its property without detraction, but he would say, like Cyril, that the Logos now and then permitted the flesh to suffer what is proper to it and to operate according to the laws of its nature. Thus the Logos would bear that as its own which

<sup>45</sup> *contGram* III 38 (CSCO 102) 175<sup>6</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 163.

<sup>46</sup> *adloan* 309<sup>20-22</sup>.

<sup>47</sup> Severus refers here to the famous formula from the Tome of Leo: 'Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium habuit, Verbo quidem operante quod Verbi est, carne autem exequente quod carnis est, et horum coruscat miraculis, aliud vero subcumbit iniuriis.' *adFlav* 28<sup>12-14</sup>.

is of the flesh, and still not relinquish what he has according to his essence (οὐσία), also not the superiority to suffering and his highest nobility.<sup>48</sup>

Having relegated the *energeiai* to two natures, Leo, in the eyes of Severus, introduced two subjects of activity and had thereby divided Christ. The single *energeia*, according to Severus, was the inevitable condition of the unity of Christ. Concerning the single *energeia*, it is not only its subject who is divine, but the *energeia* itself is mostly divine as well.<sup>49</sup> Grillmeier characterizes it as an activity, which ‘flows from above.’<sup>50</sup> Severus had this to say:

In fact when the God-Logos in his august union with humanity... allowed this to change, even transformed this, not indeed into his own nature—for this remained what it was—but into his glory (δόξα) and into his own power (ἐνέργεια), how then can you refer to the teaching of the *Synod* of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, which have distributed (the *operationes*, the activity of the ἐνέργειαι) to the Logos and the human being in Christ?<sup>51</sup>

The question here is what should be the place of a human ‘component,’ if any, in this activity. The humanity of Christ, which Severus designated as ‘flesh endowed with a rational soul,’<sup>52</sup> is an ὄργανον through which the

<sup>48</sup> *contGram* III 29 (CSCO 102) 79<sup>18–25</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 162.

<sup>49</sup> As Grillmeier remarks, ‘The Logos is always conceived by Severus as *agens*, as ἐνεργήσας, always involved in the works mentioned. He is not only the final, bearing subject, to which according to the law of the communication of *idiomata* even purely human acts are ascribed, while the ability (*facultas*), which releases them from itself, would be the human nature. According to Severus, in every activity of the Emmanuel, that is, the incarnate Logos, the divinity participates as *facultas*, as nature principle, and not only as final, bearing subject.’ Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 165.

<sup>50</sup> Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 163.

<sup>51</sup> *Philalethes* (CSCO 134) 266<sup>28–267</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 83; also *adOecum* 184<sup>4–7</sup>. In this way Severus interpreted the following passage of Cyril: ‘Now we say that the coal represents for us the symbol and the image of the incarnate Logos... One can see in the coal, as in an image, the Logos who has proceeded from the Father and has been united to the humanity; but he has not ceased to be that which he was; rather he has transformed into his *doxa* and power (εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ δόξαν τε καὶ ἐνέργειαν) what had been assumed, i.e. united to him. Just as the fire informs the wood and expands itself in it as it takes possession of it, without at all causing the wood to cease being wood, rather allowing it to blend into the appearance and power of the fire, as this (= the fire) effects in it (= the wood) what is proper to the former and thus appears to be completely one with it, so, also, represent to yourself the things with Christ! For God has... in an ineffable way united with humanity, retained what this was but also what he was; once truly united, it (the humanity) is one with him. For he has made his own what is its (humanity’s) and now pours out into it the power of his own nature (ἐμποιήσας δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτῇ τῆς ἰδίας φύσεως τὴν ἐνέργειαν).’ *Scholia* 154 ff./Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 82.

<sup>52</sup> *contGram* III 33 (CSCO 102) 134.

Logos acts.<sup>53</sup> This ‘instrument’ must not be considered independent of its consummate unity with the Logos. It is not detachable from Christ’s single nature, but constitutes an integral part of it. Severus made this clear in the following passage:

The incarnate has done and said this, for it is united hypostatically to the body and through adhering together (συνφυΐα) it had this as an organ for the deeds, as the soul too, which is peculiar to each one of us, has chosen its own body as organ; the Logos does not act through an extrinsically (united) God-bearing human being, as the ravings of Nestorius would have it, nor in the way in which an artisan uses a tool and thus completes the work and (not) like the way a cithara player strikes the cithara.<sup>54</sup>

This clarified the place of the human component in Christ’s activity; it can be regarded as a vehicle of the dominating divine *energeia*, helping it to be manifested in the world. This ‘vehicle’ is an integral part of the single activity, though not as significant as the divine. Severus illustrated this by referring to the Gospel story about the healing of the leper:

While the incarnate God spoke with human tongue and said with human and clear voice to the leper: ‘I will, be clean’ (Matt 8, 3), he showed through the effect that the voice, in keeping with the mixing worthy of God, has gone forth from the incarnate God; for the healing of the leper went together with the heard word.<sup>55</sup>

Such is an illustration of how Severus understood the process of Christ’s action, as reconstructed by Grillmeier: ‘The activity starts from the divinity as the real source; it mixes itself with the human voice (or as well with the touch of Jesus’ hand) and produces the miraculous effect in the sick person. The human voice is only the vehicle of the divine flow of will.’<sup>56</sup>

Anticipating later Monenergists, Severus constructed his concept of the single *energeia* upon the famous expression from the fourth epistle of ps-Dionysius to Gaius:

For, even, to speak summarily, He was not a man, not as ‘not being man,’ but as ‘being from men was beyond men,’ and was above man, having truly been born man; and for the rest, not having done things Divine as God,

<sup>53</sup> See *contGram* III 33 (CSCO 102) 136<sup>17–20</sup>; *adSerg* I (CSCO 120) 62<sup>8–21</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> *contGram* III 33 (CSCO 102) 135<sup>2–10</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 168. Severus based his conception of flesh as ὀψυαὸν on the teaching of Athanasius; see Severus, *contGram* III 33 (CSCO 102) 135<sup>20–22</sup>, Athanasius, *deIncarn* 8.3<sup>7–10</sup>.

<sup>55</sup> *contGram* III 32 (CSCO 102) 94<sup>27–32</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 163–164.

<sup>56</sup> Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 164.

nor things human as man, but exercising for us a certain new theandric energy of God having become man.<sup>57</sup>

Severus was the first theologian to interpret the phrase in a Monenergist way. Among his *scholia* to the above text is a fragment from his letter to John the abbot in which he stated:

As we have already developed in full breadth in other writings, we understood and understand the statement of the utterly wise Dionysius the Areopagite, who says: 'Since God has become a human being, he performed among us a new theandric activity,' of the one composite (activity); it cannot be interpreted other than as a rejection of every duality; and we confess the incarnate God, who operated in this new manner, as the one theandric nature and hypostasis and also as the one incarnate nature of the God-Logos. Because the reason of salvation, which has established new natures, together with them has established new appellations. So that if Christ is one, than we ascend, so to say, to a high mountain and profess one—because he is one—nature, hypostasis, and *energeia*, (which are also) composite; also we anathematize all those who, concerning this (question), teach about a dyad of natures and activities after the unity.<sup>58</sup>

This passage provides rich material for reflection.<sup>59</sup> Firstly, Severus once again affirmed that the *energeia* of Christ is single, and this because he is one. It is also single because Christ's nature-hypostasis<sup>60</sup> is single. Apart from this, he demonstrated that the *energeia* is intimately linked to the nature-hypostasis which, with the *energeias* have common features and can be characterized in a similar way.<sup>61</sup> For instance, as Christ's single *energeia* is 'theandric' so is his nature-hypostasis: 'We confess one theandric nature and hypostasis.'<sup>62</sup> On the other hand, the single *energeia* of Christ is one and composite, as is the nature-hypostasis. What Severus meant when speaking about the single composite nature

<sup>57</sup> *CorpDionys* II 161; PG 3, 1072<sup>b-c</sup>/modified transl. John Parker, The Saint Pachomius Library <http://www.ocf.org/OrthodoxPage/reading/St.Pachomius/diolet4.html> (23/07/2003).

<sup>58</sup> *adloan* 309–310.

<sup>59</sup> On the theological interpretation of the text see Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 170–171; Lebon (1909) 319–320, 451–453; (1930) 893–895.

<sup>60</sup> Severus considered the terms 'nature' and 'hypostasis' in application to Christ as synonyms (see Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 150–152).

<sup>61</sup> See *adloan* 310<sup>8–11</sup> and the comment by Lebon: 'La nature et l'hypostase du Verbe incarné sont dans les mêmes conditions que son activité: si l'on dit que l'activité est unique, théandrique et composée, il est logique de donner ces qualificatifs à la nature et à l'hypostase.' (1909) 320.

<sup>62</sup> *adloan* 309<sup>24</sup>.

and hypostasis, can help us to reconstruct his idea about the single composite activity of Christ.

Severus' use of the term σύνθεσις with respect to Christ had been formally justified by Gregory of Nazianzus<sup>63</sup> and Cyril of Alexandria<sup>64</sup> to whom he referred. However, the expression 'one composite nature and hypostasis' was hitherto unknown.<sup>65</sup> It is synonymous—at least for Severus—with the classic formula 'one incarnate nature of the Word.' Gregory contrasted the σύνθεσις to the 'mixing' (μίξις), making it synonymous with the 'unity' (ἑνώσις). In using the expression 'one composite nature and hypostasis,' he attempted to avoid two extremes, that of division and that of mixture or confusion in Christ. As Grillmeier remarked, σύνθεσις for Severus was 'not so much a static ontological end result, as rather the characterization of the historical process of the assumption of the flesh by the Logos according to the *hypostasis*.'<sup>66</sup> It also signified that Christ's humanity and divinity 'exist only in the status of the composition' (ἐν συνθέσει ὑφεστῶτων). Out of Christ, they exist on an entirely different level of being, as independent monads (ἐν μονάσιν ἰδιοσυστάτοις).<sup>67</sup> All of these characteristics of the composite nature-hypostasis can be applied to the composite *energeia* of Christ. As such, the *energeia* is not a mixture, but a dynamic unity of its divine and human 'components.' In fact, it is an entirely new *modus* of activity, which can be identified as neither purely divine nor purely human.

Severus, a devotee of Cyril, ardently struggled to emphasise the unity that is in Christ. He extended the concept of unity to the *energeia* and stressed its oneness. At the same time, he did not ignore a certain diversity in Christ, even in his *energeia*. In particular, he recognized a

<sup>63</sup> See Severus' *adSerg* II (CSCO 120) 84–86.

<sup>64</sup> Severus, *adSerg* II (CSCO 120) 80. He refers to Cyril, *adSuccen* II; *QuodUnus* 689<sup>ab</sup>.

<sup>65</sup> See Lebon: 'En somme, Sévère est le seul témoin de la formule: μία φύσις (καὶ ὑπόστασις) σύνθετος, qu'il emploie dans un passage de sa 3<sup>e</sup> lettre à Jean l'higoumène.' (1909) 319.

<sup>66</sup> (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 128.

<sup>67</sup> Leontius of Jerusalem ascribed the expressions to Severus (*contMonoph* 1848<sup>a</sup>; see Lebon (1951) 476 n. 59; Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 127). Lebon: 'Sévère déclare qu'il ne peut comprendre cette expression, si ce n'est dans le sens d'une activité *composée* (σύνθετος) mais rigoureusement *une* (μία). L'épithète θεανδρική ne lèse en rien l'unité d'activité...; elle indique seulement que cette activité d'un genre nouveau, que le Verbe exerce après s'être fait chair, est le résultat de la *composition*. Or, cette dernière écarte la *division* aussi bien qu'elle évite le mélange des choses *composées*. Le patriarche peut ainsi conserver dans le Christ une activité *unique*, malgré la qualification de *théandrique* qu'elle reçoit de l'Aréopagite.' (1909) 319–320.



human component in Christ's single *energeia*, though never regarded this component as a human *energeia*.

Severus also drew a distinction between the single acting Christ, his single activity, and the result(s) of this activity: 'He who acts is one thing, and activity is another, and another that which was enacted, and these things are quite removed from each other.'<sup>68</sup> Activity is not detached from the acting subject; it has no independent existence because it is but a movement, a motion: 'Activity is something in the middle, that is, an active movement, between the one who acted and that which was acted upon.'<sup>69</sup> Severus formulated an 'ontological' status for activity as 'being not a hypostasis.' At the same time, the results of the activity, being actual things, are hypostases: '(Activity) is not a hypostasis, but the things which are enacted, which are brought to completion as a result of this and exist, (are hypostases).'<sup>70</sup> In this, Severus follows ps-Basil's fourth book *Contra Eunomium*,<sup>71</sup> in which the same distinction may be seen.<sup>72</sup> Severus, as indicated earlier, avoided attributing Christ's sole *energeia* either to the Godhead or to his humanity, but to the single Christ. The results of the activity, however, he described as either divine or human:

There is one who acts (ἐνεργήσας), that is the Word of God incarnate; and there is one active movement which is activity (ἐνέργεια), but the things which are done (ἐνεργηθέντα) are diverse, that is, (the things) accomplished by activity... And it is not that, because these things which were done were of different kinds, we say that conceptually there were two natures which were effecting those things, for as we have said, a single God the Word incarnate performed both of them.<sup>73</sup>

In order to illustrate how Christ acted, Severus used the model of man. There are, he maintained, intellectual and corporeal human works that

<sup>68</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 81/Torrance (1988) 152.

<sup>69</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 82/Torrance (1988) 152–153.

<sup>70</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 81/Torrance (1988) 152.

<sup>71</sup> See CPG 2837.

<sup>72</sup> See *contEunom* 689<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 120) 60<sup>33</sup>–61<sup>9</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 165. He repeats the same idea in *contGram*: 'There is only one single activity, only one single operative motion, as there is also only one speaking of the incarnate Logos, be it that the actions and the words have been different.' *contGram* III 38 (CSCO 102) 175<sup>6–7</sup>. On this point by Severus, John Meyendorff has the following to say: 'The agent's unity (Christ's single hypostasis-nature) entails the unity of *energeia*, without making it impossible for the works, corresponding to the natural qualities of the human and divine natures, to be distributed into various categories, divine and human.' (1975) 43.

can be clearly distinguished. Each kind of work corresponds either to body or to soul. However, the activity is still one:

Therefore godless are those, who with regard to Christ teach two natures which act; for it is necessary that each nature has an action which is proper to it and different, that is, an acting movement/motion. If we confess Christ as one from two, and as one person, one hypostasis and one single incarnate nature of the Logos, consequently it will be one who acts and one movement which bears him in action, although the works are different, that is, the completely performed deeds which come from the action. For some fit God, others the human being; but they are performed by one and the same, by God who without alteration has become flesh and a human being. And this is not surprising, (but) similar to the works of a human being, of which some are intellectual, the others visible and corporeal... It is, however, a single human being, composed of a body and a soul, who does this and that, and there is only one single working movement. Hence, when Christ is concerned, we recognize a change of words. Some suit God, others the human being... But on this account we do not say that there they belong to that nature and here to this nature. For they were expressed indistinguishably of the one and the same Christ.<sup>74</sup>

Activity and its results, deeds, do not, therefore, always correspond to each other. The unity of the activity, from which neither purely divine nor purely human *energeiai* can be extracted, becomes dispersed into multiple deeds that could be described as either divine or human.

Another important question, which is closely linked to the issue of *energeia*, is that of Christ's natural property(ies). In developing his concept of the natural properties (mainly in his correspondence with Sergius the Grammarian,)<sup>75</sup> Severus used the word 'property' both in the singular and the plural. In either case, he referred to them as 'natural.' With respect to properties (in plural), he also spoke of the 'properties of the flesh,' 'properties of the humanity,' and 'properties of the divinity of the Word.'<sup>76</sup> With property (in singular) he asserted its oneness, condemning the idea of two properties coexisting in Christ, as well as of two *energeiai*. Here he appears to be making reference to a corresponding teaching of his Chalcedonian opponents:

If someone should wrongfully divide Emmanuel with a duality of natures after the union, there also occurs a division at the same time, along with

<sup>74</sup> *Hom* 109, 758–760.

<sup>75</sup> See Torrance (1988); Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 111–128.

<sup>76</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 77–79/Torrance (1988) 150.

the difference of the natures, and the properties are divided in every respect to suit the (two) natures.<sup>77</sup>

Two natures of Christ would necessarily introduce two properties, since each property (in singular) would correspond to one or the other nature. Elsewhere in the same letter to Sergius, Severus asserts that the property completely fits the nature: 'Those natures attract their own activities and properties which are divided along with the natures completely and in everything.'<sup>78</sup> Yet, property-in-the-singular is not monolithic. It reflects Christ's entire nature, which includes both divinity and humanity.<sup>79</sup> The Godhead neither becomes humanity, nor does humanity become divinity. The single Logos retains both unchangeably as his natural characteristics and natural properties:

We are not allowed to anathematize those who speak of natural properties: the divinity and the humanity that make the single Christ. The flesh does not cease to exist as flesh, even if it becomes God's flesh, and the Word does not abandon his own nature, even if he unites himself hypostatically to the flesh which possesses a rational and intelligent soul. But the difference is also preserved as well as the identity under the form of the natural characteristics of the natures which make up the Emmanuel, since the flesh is not transformed into the Word's nature and the Word is not changed into flesh.<sup>80</sup>

Severus labelled these divine and human features of Christ's single nature 'particularities': The natural property that remains single reveals two 'particularities':

We are obliged to acknowledge as well the particularities of the natures from which Emmanuel is. And we call this a particularity and name it: (this is,) that which (lies) in difference of natural quality, which (definition) I will not cease repeating many times, and not that (which lies) in (independent) parts, and natures in independent existence are implied.<sup>81</sup>

In this manner, Severus found an effective solution to the difficulty he continually faced, namely, how to speak simultaneously about the unity and a certain duality of Christ's nature. This was possible, according to his understanding, because the duality is retained mainly in that which

<sup>77</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 77–78/Torrance (1988) 150.

<sup>78</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 80/Torrance (1988) 151.

<sup>79</sup> Severus remarks: 'Natural quality is the principle of how (a thing) is.' *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 77–78/Torrance (1988) 150.

<sup>80</sup> *adOecum* 2<sup>176–177</sup>/Meyendorff (1975) 40–41.

<sup>81</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 80/Torrance (1988) 152.

proper to the nature. By ascribing particularities to the property, Severus would 'withdraw' them from the single nature and so protect the nature from being fractured by particularities. Moreover, the fact that Christ's single nature-hypostasis is composite could be explained by the dual character of the natural property.<sup>82</sup>

In conclusion, the duality of the property was, for Severus, stronger than the duality either of the nature or of the *energeia*. This means, in turn, that the property did not correspond as closely to the nature, as believed, for example, by the Chalcedonians. Severus allowed for a certain incoherence and 'gap' between the nature and its property. The same 'gap' also existed between the property and the activity, which is more closely related to the nature than to the property. Notwithstanding this inconsistency, the property remains single. In order to prove this, Severus presented an argument that in time would be exploited by the Monenergists, namely, that if one accepts two properties, then one must assume their multiplication, because both the divinity and the humanity of Christ have various properties:

How is it not absurd to speak of two properties or two activities? For there are many properties and not just two, of each nature. For example, of his humanity there is perceptibility, and visibility, and mortality, and being subject to hunger and to thirst and to other things like it. And there are many properties of the divine nature: invisibility, intangibility, being before the ages, being unlimited. The things which are done are similarly many and various, and all these are as many as the human and divine actions that a man can recount.<sup>83</sup>

Severus here used the word 'property' in the plural, making clear distinction between the sole property and the multiple properties of Christ's single nature. He placed the properties (in plural) on the same scale as Christ's deeds and relegated their diversity into two categories: divine and human. Some properties retain their divine character, others their human. This distinction between the properties, however, is conditional. Because of their unity in a single Christ, they can be regarded neither as purely divine nor as purely human. In other words, divine properties could also be understood as human and *vice versa*:

---

<sup>82</sup> See Meyendorff: 'These two categories or qualities, divine and human, within the single nature (or concrete being) are undoubtedly what makes this "composite nature" inevitable' (1975) 41.

<sup>83</sup> *adSerg I* (CSCO 119) 86–87/Torrance (1988) 155.

When a hypostatic union is professed, of which the fulfilment is that from two there is one Christ without confusion, one person, one hypostasis, one nature belonging to the Word incarnate, the Word is known by means of the properties of the flesh, and the properties of the humanity will become the properties of the divinity of the Word; and again the properties of the Word will be acknowledged as the properties of the flesh, and the same one will be seen by means of both (sets of properties), both touchable and not touchable, and visible and not visible, and belonging to time and from before time, and we shall not attribute the properties of each nature, dividing them up.<sup>84</sup>

### 1.3.2. *The Monothelitism of Severus*

Severus paid much less attention to the concept of Christ's will than he did to the *energeia*. Even so, there survive a few general remarks by him on the question of will. Deacon Olympiodore,<sup>85</sup> an Alexandrian exegete ordained by Patriarch John II Nicaïotes (505–516), tells us that Severus taught about the one will of Christ.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, Severus himself allows one to conclude that he preferred to speak of Christ's single will. He linked will to activity, that is to say, an activity receives its impetus from a will (in certain passages, however, he implies the opposite—that an activity is the impetus of a will). In Christ there is no space between willing and acting—he wills and immediately he acts:

He who acts is he who is impelled towards doing something, but the activity (is) like an active movement and impetus of the will which is directed on and indicates doing something, and is set in motion at once. In the case of activity, that which wills (it) remains complete and momentarily impelled to action.<sup>87</sup>

As noted above, Severus explained the process of acting, in which the will is involved, through the use of the Gospel story of the leper (see above, p. 27). As recorded, it appears that there is a 'mediator' between the incarnate God and the *energeia*; this can be identified as the will. The will is single, both because it is attributed to the subject of the activity and because it is linked to the *energeia*, which is single.<sup>88</sup> Severus,

<sup>84</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 79/Torrance (1988) 151.

<sup>85</sup> See Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>4</sup> 105–106.

<sup>86</sup> The testimony is contained in the only surviving fragment from his *contSever*.

<sup>87</sup> *adSerg* I (CSCO 119) 81/Torrance (1988) 152.

<sup>88</sup> Grillmeier: 'The human voice is...the vehicle of the divine flow of will; for without a doubt Severus ascribes the "I will" to the volition of the divinity. The human will of Christ clearly does not need to be active.' (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 164; 'In fact Severus finds

however, would appear to be not as strict about the oneness of the will as he was about the *energeia*. He admitted a stronger duality in Christ's will and accepted the same duality in the unity of body and soul, which he used as an analogy of Christ's unity. In man, Severus recognized two wills: one attributed to the flesh and another to the soul. Their coexistence, however, does not divide the one human nature into two parts:

Do we not see in the human being, as we are, who is one nature and hypostasis from body and soul, how he can now spontaneously demand nourishment . . . , but then also can reflect on that and despise the material food, and in its place surrender himself to heavenly thoughts in desiring likeness to God? Thus there are two wills in the human being; one wills what is of the flesh, the other what is of the soul which is created according to the image of God. Should we for this reason divide the human being and consider it as two natures and *hypostases*? By doing this we would make fools of ourselves.<sup>89</sup>

This analogy can be fully applied to Christ for in him, two wills can be clearly distinguished: one divine and the other human. The former wishes to save people through suffering in the flesh, while the latter accepts this will:

Even less is Christ divided into two natures. He is indeed one from two, from divinity and humanity, one person and *hypostasis*, the one nature of the Logos, become flesh and perfect human being. For this reason he also displays two wills in salvific suffering, the one which requests, the other which is prepared, the one human, the other divine. As he voluntarily took upon himself death in the flesh, which was able to take over suffering and dissolved the domination of death by killing it through immortality—which the resurrection had shown clearly to all—so in the flesh, whose fruit he could take over—it was indeed rationally animated—he voluntarily took upon himself the *passio* of fear and weakness and uttered words of request, in order through the divine courage to destroy the power of that fear and to give courage to the whole of humanity, for he became after the first Adam the second beginning of our race.<sup>90</sup>

---

it difficult to recognize and appreciate the genuine activity of the human willing of Christ.' (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 166.

<sup>89</sup> *contGram* III 33 (CSCO 102) 132<sup>31</sup>–133<sup>7</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 167.

<sup>90</sup> *contGram* III 33 (CSCO 102) 133<sup>7–21</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 167.

Severus continued:

The teacher of divine dogmas<sup>91</sup> has characterized very well the request (of Christ) to avert suffering as 'will'; in this way he shows that it occurs for us against the inclination and will to have fear and trembling in the face of danger, but Christ took this over voluntarily. Thus there was really a will present, no involuntary suffering. He (= Athanasius) immediately showed that he acknowledges the one Christ from two and does not divide up into two wills what belongs to one and the same, namely the incarnate God, by adding this after the passage cited: 'He suffers from weakness, but he lives from the power of God' (2 Cor. 13,4). The power of God is, however, the Son who suffered from weakness, that is from interweaving (συμπλοκή)<sup>92</sup> with the flesh, as a human being he prayed to be freed from suffering; he lives, however, through his (= the Son's) power (PG 26, 1024).

The Word of God was thus united to the flesh, which was endowed with a rational soul and was not divided after the union through the doubling of the natures. For that word 'union' (συμπλοκή)...denotes one being existing from two in unmingledness, a formula which expresses essential union, but is rejected by the Council of Chalcedon. Thus one and the same prayed as a human being to avoid suffering...and as God said: the spirit is willing, and voluntarily proceeded to suffer. Hence let us apportion neither the wills nor the words (*voces*) to two natures and forms.<sup>93</sup>

There is a further reference to the human will in Christ in Severus' commentary on a verse from Isaiah: 'He (= the Emmanuel) will eat butter and honey until the time in which he understands how to reject evil and to choose good' (Isa 7, 15). Severus referred to this verse in *Homily* 83:

With respect to him (= the new Adam) the prophet Isaiah says: 'Before he knows or chooses evil, he will choose good' (7, 15). For before the child recognizes good or evil, he spurns evil in order to choose good. None of us, who is tested as a child, already has knowledge of good and evil. Only with the advance of time, it (= the child) begins to distinguish them. But because the Emmanuel is by nature also God and goodness itself, although he has become a child according to the οἰκονομία, he did not await the time of the distinction; on the contrary. From the time of

<sup>91</sup> Severus referred to ps-Athanasius' *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos*, which in fact was the work of Marcellus of Ancyra (see Tetz, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra.' ZK 75 (1964) 217–270; Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>1</sup> 284–287); see *deIncarnContArian* 1021<sup>b-c</sup>.

<sup>92</sup> The translators of Grillmeier (1975) unsuccessfully translated this word as 'union.'

<sup>93</sup> *contGram* III 33 (CSCO 102) 133<sup>34</sup>–134<sup>21</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 167.

swaddling clothes, before he came to an age of distinguishing between good and evil, on the one side he spurned evil and did not listen to it, and on the other he chose good. These words 'he spurned' and 'he did not listen' and the other 'he chose' show us that the Logos of God has united himself not only to the flesh, but also to the soul, which is endowed with will and understanding, in order to allow our souls, which are inclined towards evil, to lean towards choosing good and turning away from evil. For God as God does not need to choose good; but because for our sakes he assumed flesh and spiritual soul, he took for us this redress.<sup>94</sup>

The role of the human will in both cases (the acceptance of suffering and choosing what is good) is somewhat passive. It accepts and subjects itself to divine will, which, as in the case of the *energeia*, dominates over the human. The two wills are united in one volitional impulse, when Christ voluntarily takes upon himself death or spurns evil and chooses good. This duality by no means destroys the unity that is in Christ.

In conclusion, a certain inconsistency may be observed in Severus' conception of will. On the one hand, the will is one, and overwhelmingly divine. On the other hand, there are two wills, divine and human. Severus unfortunately did not provide any clue to enable us to resolve this contradiction convincingly.

As already indicated, the issue of Christ's will did not greatly attract the attention of Severus; the single *energeia* was more important for him. Severus took the oneness of Christ's *energeia* for granted. He used it as a ready argument in his disputes on Christ's single nature. Nor did his followers exert much effort to prove that the *energeia* of Christ is one. They inherited from their teacher his concept of the single *energeia* without any reservations and used it as a common basis for resolving certain theological questions that emerged from Severus' Christological concepts.

### 1.3.3. *Julian of Halicarnassus*

One such question was raised by Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus (d. after 527).<sup>95</sup> Like Severus, Julian believed in the single dominating divine *energeia*<sup>96</sup> of Christ. He developed the initial Severan concept of

<sup>94</sup> PO 20, 415<sup>15</sup>–416<sup>15</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 168–169.

<sup>95</sup> See Rosenbaum, 'Julianus von Halikarnassus,' *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/Julianus\\_v\\_hal.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/Julianus_v_hal.shtml) (10/06/2002).

<sup>96</sup> See Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 84.



the single *energeia* and single property into an original teaching about Christ's uncorrupt body.<sup>97</sup> The line of Julian's thinking seems to have been as follows: only if Christ's body is uncorrupt, could one speak of the single property of the incarnate Logos. Otherwise, an assumed corruptedness of the body cannot be allied with the uncorruptedness of the Godhead and cannot constitute a truly single property of Christ's nature. Christ's entire uncorruptedness, including that of his body, preserves the true oneness of his property and *energeia*. Whether the property of Christ's nature must be strictly single or should be allowed duality, was the major point of disagreement between Julian and Severus. As noted earlier, Severus admitted a good deal of duality in Christ's property. In particular, he defended the body's corruptibility which, he insisted, could coexist in Christ with the incorruptibility of the Godhead. For Julian, however, this would necessarily lead to the adoption of two natures in Christ:

If anyone divides up the one nature of the human being into what is unbodily and what is in the flesh and says: this (= the flesh) is corruptible according to nature, even if it has not sinned, the soul in contrast escapes the condemnation to death; (whoever calls upon this analogy) in order to represent the Lord as 'naturally corrupted' according to the flesh and as 'incorrupt' according to the spirit (*i.e.* the Godhead), introduces by this means a duality of the Christs, the natures, the properties, and the sons: the one is (son) by nature, the other only in the applied sense.<sup>98</sup>

Julian thus firmly tied the single property to the nature of Christ without admitting any 'gap' between them. He also rejected duality either in the property or in the nature but closely linked with them the single activity and insisted on a strong correspondence between the property and the activity.<sup>99</sup> For Julian, a single *energeia* implied a single property, and *vice*

---

<sup>97</sup> An incentive for his development of this doctrine may have been provided by the following phrase from Severus: 'For in many cases it is apparent that the Logos did not permit the flesh to move according to the law of the nature of flesh (Severus refers to the Christ's walking on the water, events before his crucifixion and after the resurrection)... How does (all this) belong to the flesh if it was not endowed with the power (ἐνέργεια) of the Logos, an entitlement of the Godhead, if it was not to be regarded as one with him, corresponding to the holy word of the holy Cyril? ... This all the more so as this (= flesh) was indeed material and touchable with the hand, thus did not cease to be flesh, whereby it stood above corruptibility.' *Philalethes* (CSCO 134) 267<sup>11-24</sup>/Grillmeier, (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 83; see Grillmeier, (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 82-85; 98-111.

<sup>98</sup> Julian, *Anath* 7, 62; Severus, *advIul* (CSCO 302) 274<sup>13-20</sup>.

<sup>99</sup> See Grillmeier: Julian 'placed the persisting static qualities on the same level as the *one energeia*.' (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 86.

*versa*. In that he considered the single *energeia* of Christ to be divine, he believed the single property to be divine as well. This was another reason for him to insist on the uncorruptedness of the body.

In defending the strong correspondences between the nature, the property, and the *energeia* in Christ, Julian in fact followed Chalcedonian logic. Severus, as we have seen, sometimes ignored this logic and did not always observe strong correspondences between the three categories.<sup>100</sup> Nevertheless, both Severus and the Chalcedonians rejected Julian's view of the uncorruptedness of Christ's body. For them, Julian's concept implied that Christ's suffering and manifestations of humanity were not sufficiently real. Severus, for example, declared him to be a follower of Eutyches and Manes<sup>101</sup> and condemned this kind of Monenergism without reserve:

The phantasiasts, however... (to whom Severus also ascribed Julian) were of the opinion that it is sufficient to say the following: If the Logos of God really transformed the assumed body into his own δόξα and ἐνέργεια and infused into it every which is his, then this (= body) would be elevated above suffering and be immortal from the first moment of the union.<sup>102</sup>

### 1.3.4. *The Agnoetes*

Another controversy that broke out among the Severans was initiated by the Alexandrian deacon Themistius (ca. 536–540).<sup>103</sup> A follower of Severus, he believed in the single *energeia* of Christ, and together with him, he defended the corruptedness of the body over against the notion of Julian. In contrast to Severan mainstream theology, however, Themistius concluded that the corruptedness would imply that in his humanity, Christ's knowledge was incomplete. According to Liberatus, Themistius claimed that 'si corpus Christi corruptibile est, debemus eum dicere et aliqua ignorasse, sicut ait de Lazaro.'<sup>104</sup> When Patriarch

<sup>100</sup> Grillmeier: 'The stronger...the unmingledness of the properties was put in relief, all the more one appeared to approach the two-natures teaching of Chalcedon.' (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 94.

<sup>101</sup> See Severus, *censIul* (CSCO 245) 125<sup>31</sup>–126<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>102</sup> Severus, *apolPhilal* (CSCO 319) 34<sup>12–20</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 85.

<sup>103</sup> See Amann, 'Thémistius,' *DTC* 15, 219–222.

<sup>104</sup> *Breviarium*, 19 (ACO<sub>1</sub> II<sup>5</sup> 134). This information is confirmed by the Syriac sources. Patriarch Theodosius, for example, ascribes to Themistius the following statement: 'In the same way as we say the same person is passible and impassible, that he was hungry

Timothy of Alexandria (517–535) disapproved of his ideas, Themistius refused to accept the Patriarch's judgement. Together with a group of supporters, he separated from the rest of the community and set up his own sect.<sup>105</sup>

The basis of the doctrine developed by Themistius was Severan and Monenergism and most Greek witnesses to his views testify primarily to his Monenergism. These testimonies, however, admittedly come from the later Monenergism-Monothelite controversy and therefore do not necessarily reflect the real theological priorities of Themistius. Nevertheless, it is still clear that for him the question of the *energeia* remained important. In particular he is cited in a fragment from the epistle to Marcellinus the presbyter and Stephan the deacon as saying:

For the activity of Christ which proceeds through all divine and human (things) is not one and another, but one and the same, because it belongs to one and the same (Christ); therefore, Dionysius the Areopagite called it theandric.<sup>106</sup>

In his teaching about the single *energeia*, Themistius followed the lines drawn up by Severus. He especially inherited Severus' reference to the ps-Dionysian concept of 'theandric *energeia*',<sup>107</sup> as is obvious from the above passage. The 'theandric *energeia*' for Themistius was neither purely divine, nor of course purely human. It retains its divine and human characteristics, though always remains one. In this Themistius also referred to Severus:

That the blessed Severus similarly desired to confirm the theandric *energeia* (not only the divine *energeia*) in that he says of Christ that 'the Same does some things divinely and others humanly.'<sup>108</sup>

Though some actions of Christ were performed divinely and some humanly, the activity itself always remained the same and single. This is because Christ as an agent is one:

---

and was not hungry, we speak about other blameless passions.' *adTheodorum* 12. See also Constantine of Laodicea, *adTheodorum* 34–39.

<sup>105</sup> See Liberatus. *Breviarium* 19, ACO<sub>1</sub> II<sup>5</sup> 134<sup>18–22</sup>.

<sup>106</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 144<sup>38–40</sup>.

<sup>107</sup> 'Themistius was defending his use of 'theandric *energeia*' by reference to Severus' statement that Christ does some of His deeds divinely and others of them humanly.' Rorem and Lamoreaux (1998) 12.

<sup>108</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 146<sup>5–7</sup>/Rorem and Lamoreaux (1998) 12.

Although the activity in Christ sometimes was fitting for either divinity or humanity, it remained simply one—because the incarnate Word of God who acted in all (things), was one.<sup>109</sup>

For Themistius, the will of Christ was also one. While some manifestations of his will can be distinguished as divine and human, it is still single, because the subject of willing, Christ, is single. Themistius again uses the argument of Severus: that two wills would necessarily clash with each other.<sup>110</sup> As the *energeia* and will of Christ are single, so knowledge should be single as well.<sup>111</sup> Themistius established a close conformity between these faculties in Christ's nature. Sometimes he even equated *energeia* with knowledge.<sup>112</sup> In so doing he extended the characteristics of the *energeia* to the knowledge. For him, the knowledge of Christ was single and theandric: 'As we have said many times, the activity and knowledge of the Logos is single.'<sup>113</sup>

The idea of theandric knowledge, together with Themistius' teaching about the corruptibility of Christ's body, became the basis for his doctrine of the incomplete and limited knowledge of Christ as man. In the single theandric knowledge of Christ, Themistius distinguished two 'parts': divine and human. The former was complete, whereas the latter was incomplete and limited. It meant that Christ as man did not know everything which was known to him as God. Themistius and the Agnoetes found proof for their views in Holy Scripture. In particular, they referred to three passages. The first, when Christ asked about Lazarus: 'Where have you laid him?' (John 11, 34). The second: 'But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father' (Mark 13, 32; Matt 24, 36). And the third: 'And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature' (Luke 2, 52). Sometimes the Agnoetes also referred to Mark 5, 9: 'And Jesus asked him, "What is your name?" He replied, "My name is Legion; for we are many"' (Mark 11, 13: 'And seeing in the distance a fig tree in leaf, he went to see if he could find anything on it. When he came to it, he found nothing but leaves, for it was not the season for figs'; Luke 8, 45: 'And Jesus

<sup>109</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 328<sup>26-28</sup>.

<sup>110</sup> With regard to Christ's will, Themistius referred to the same passage from ps-Athanasius' *About the Incarnation and against the Arians* (*deIncarnContArian* 1021<sup>b-c</sup>), also quoted by Severus, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 326<sup>31-34</sup>.

<sup>111</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> I 328<sup>11-12</sup>; 328<sup>4-7</sup> (fr. 19); 328<sup>16-17</sup> (fr. 21); 328<sup>37-38</sup> (fr. 25); 330<sup>3-5</sup> (fr. 26).

<sup>112</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> I 330<sup>4-5</sup>.

<sup>113</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 146<sup>16-17</sup>; see also ACO<sub>2</sub> I 328<sup>37-38</sup>.

said, "Who was it that touched me?"; Matt 20, 32: 'And Jesus stopped and called them, saying, "What do you want me to do for you?"; John 18, 4: 'Then Jesus, knowing all that was to befall him, came forward and said to them, "Whom do you seek?"'<sup>114</sup> Anti-Agnoetes considered these passages as manifestations of the *œconomia*. Christ was displaying ignorance only in order to emphasise the reality of his humanity. In fact, however, he knew everything even as a human. Themistius, on the contrary, considered the ignorance of Christ as demonstrated in the passages to be real. He believed it to be one of the blameless passions of Christ and an indication of the true corruptedness of Christ's body.<sup>115</sup> While his concept of ignorance fitted appropriately with the doctrine of the corruptedness, it was hardly amenable to the concept of the single activity, even if the activity were to be considered theandric. This was one of the main points that Themistius' adversaries criticized him for: Themistius was accused of introducing dangerous divisions in Christ.<sup>116</sup>

### 1.3.5. *Criticism of the concept of ignorance*

#### 1.3.5.1. *Theodosius of Alexandria*

The chief opponent of the Agnoetes and one of the most influential of the sixth-century Severan theologians was Theodosius the Patriarch of Alexandria (535–566).<sup>117</sup> His teaching had so great a bearing on the anti-Chalcedonian communities that the Severans of Alexandria were occasionally named after him. Those communities which strove for an Alexandrian union (633), were especially identified as Theodosians. It

<sup>114</sup> See Van Roey and Allen (1994) 9–10.

<sup>115</sup> See Theodosius, *adTheodorum* 12; Constantine of Laodicea, *adTheodorum*, 34–39. The question of whether Christ's ignorance is blameless or blameful was raised by Theodore the monk (see his *Short Refutation* edited and translated from Syriac into Latin by Van Roey and Allen (1994) 78–102). The point that Theodore made was that ignorance, being blameful, must not be ascribed to Christ.

<sup>116</sup> See, for instance, a passage from the *Address to the Emperor Justinian* by Anthimus of Trebizond: 'For to say that the God-Logos, insofar as he is God-Logos, does not know the last day and the (last) hour (cf. Matt 24, 36; Mark 13, 32), is full of Arian, or rather Judaic impiety. (To say that he does not know it) in his humanity makes a division of the one Lord into two persons, two Sons, two Christs, two natures and two hypostases, and into their separate activities and properties and a complete (division)'. Van Roey and Allen (1994) 65<sup>4–10</sup>.

<sup>117</sup> See Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>4</sup> 53 n. 2; CPG 7130–7159.

is important therefore to come to terms with the related teaching of Theodosius.

Theodosius was above all Severan. According to Grillmeier, what Cyril was to Severus, the latter was to Theodosius.<sup>118</sup> But in some measure their positions differed. At different times, Theodosius could either be close to, or far from, Chalcedonian doctrine. To be noted is the fact that Theodosius sometimes used the formula 'one incarnate person (*par̄sopā*) and one hypostasis (*qnomā*) of the God-Logos' in place of Severus' favourite 'one incarnate nature of the God-Logos'.<sup>119</sup> Another expression favoured by Theodosius, which also rang more of Chalcedonianism, was 'one out of the Trinity, the hypostatic Word of God the Father'.<sup>120</sup> At the same time, while the single *energeia* of Christ was for Severus theandric, for Theodosius it was strictly divine. Theodosius had emphasised this point in order to censure Themistius, who had built his doctrine of the ignorance of Christ's humanity on the ps-Dionysian formula. For Theodosius not only the *energeia* of Christ, but also his will was single and divine.<sup>121</sup> In this he was more stringent than Severus and, as a result, stood further from the Chalcedonian faith.

Theodosius distinguished between the blameless passions of Christ and the rest of his activity. He believed that it was possible to say 'ἐν ἅλλῳ καὶ ἅλλῳ' as regards Christ's hunger, thirst, or tiredness, but not in respect of either activity or knowledge.<sup>122</sup> Furthermore, Theodosius characterized the blameless passions as divine (θεοπρεπῆ) by partly associating them with other divine *energeia*.<sup>123</sup> At the same time, however, he held that there was a significant difference between the former and the latter. As such, he avoided calling the passions *energeiai* because they rather signified a lack of activity, which was fulfilled with the divine *energeia*. We may therefore conclude together with Grillmeier that in his picture of Christ Theodosius 'cannot grant to Christ's human, intellectual faculties an active role, but only a passive, purely instrumental one. All *energeia* and *dynamis* in Christ are from the divine side of Jesus and flow from above to down below. In this way the "unmingled and undivided" of Christology in general, even of the non-Chalcedonian

<sup>118</sup> See Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>4</sup> 53.

<sup>119</sup> Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>4</sup> 57. See Theodosius of Alexandria, *adSever* (CSCO 103) 5<sup>14-15</sup>.

<sup>120</sup> *adSever* (CSCO 103) 4<sup>20-21</sup>.

<sup>121</sup> See *adTheodoram*, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 326<sup>24-25</sup>.

<sup>122</sup> *adTheodoram* 55, 476-496.

<sup>123</sup> See *adTheodoram*, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 326<sup>19-20</sup>.

type, is endangered and glossed over. In this picture of Christ, the divine activity is almost as powerful as in Apollinarianism, even if the human soul is always stressed.<sup>124</sup> By insisting that the *energeia* is strictly divine, Theodosius wished to underline the divine character of Christ's knowledge, given that knowledge is one of the activities of rational nature.<sup>125</sup>

Theodosius accepted that, taken separately, human nature is subject to ignorance. Christ had appropriated this ignorance, together with the rest of his humanity.<sup>126</sup> As a result, human ignorance vanished, and animate flesh acquired 'all divine holiness, efficacy and also wisdom and omniscience.' Since then, it became possible to distinguish between the two knowledges only theoretically, exactly as in the case of Christ's nature.<sup>127</sup> As for the passages of Holy Scripture, in which Christ seems to be ignorant about certain things, Theodosius interpreted them as manifestations not of real ignorance, but of the *œconomia* of salvation. In defending this point, he referred to the authority of Cyril:

The 'Father' (Cyril) shows clearly that the Emmanuel did not have ignorance in reality, not even according to his humanity; only through appropriation did he hide himself in accordance with the economy of salvation.<sup>128</sup>

#### 1.3.5.2. *Anthimus of Trebizond*

Another Severan theologian, Anthimus, bishop of Trebizond, was among the first to reject the teachings of deacon Themistius. For under a year he served as Patriarch of Constantinople (June 535–March 536), before being deposed by Justinian.<sup>129</sup> John of Ephesus placed him among the

<sup>124</sup> Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 374.

<sup>125</sup> See *adTheodorum*, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 106<sup>2-5</sup>.

<sup>126</sup> See *adTheodorum* 50, 311–313.

<sup>127</sup> See *adTheodorum* 50–51, 318–323. Grillmeier remarks: 'Theodosius applies to the domain of the *energeia* precisely Cyril's and Severus' linguistic rules with regard to *physis*: as one can speak of two natures before the union in *theoria*, and after the union, however, only of one, so too this holds true with regard to Christ's knowledge. It is only in *theoria* that I may speak simultaneously of Christ's omniscience and ignorance, as long as I consider the natures in themselves.' (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 373.

<sup>128</sup> *adTheodorum* 51, 336–339. Theodosius refers here to the *Thesaurus* (377<sup>53-54</sup>): 'Christ acts in accordance with the economy of salvation, when he says that he does not know the hour, although in reality he does.'

<sup>129</sup> Honigmann (1953) 185–193.

fathers of Monothelitism, alongside Severus, Theodosius, Sergius, and Paul.<sup>130</sup>

Concurring with Theodosius, Anthimus spoke of one hypostasis, one incarnate nature of the God-Logos, one will, one *energeia* and consequently one wisdom and one knowledge in Christ:

If there is only one hypostasis, one nature of the incarnate God-Logos, then without doubt there is also only one will, one activity, one wisdom and one knowledge for both (ἐν θέλημα καὶ μία ἐνέργεια, δηλονότι καὶ μία σοφία καὶ μία γνῶσις τοῦ συναμφοτέρου).<sup>131</sup>

In admitting to a distinction in theory between Christ's divine and human knowledge, Anthimus referred especially to Gregory of Nazianzus' *De Filio*:<sup>132</sup>

See how this wise teacher explained the word of the Gospel, saying: 'if one separates the visible from the intelligible,' and taught us that we can attribute ignorance to him (= Christ) when we make use of a division *in theoria* about the one composite Christ and ask about the content of the substance of his animated flesh.<sup>133</sup>

In reality, however, Christ's knowledge is single and divine, as is the *energeia*:

Because we also know that the property of the divine intellectual activity (νοεῖν θεοπρεποῦς ἐνεργείας) consists in the knowledge of all things, we are taught that there is only one and the same divine activity; how should we also not confess that there is in the one Christ only one and the same knowledge of all things (as we have already said) according to his divinity and according to his humanity?<sup>134</sup>

The words of Grillmeier provide an apt conclusion to this section: 'Anthimus thus presents a picture of Christ conceived totally from above. As the order and sole power to raise the dead proceeds from the Logos, mediated by the simultaneous corporal contact, so too the one knowledge, the divine omniscience, comes from the Logos into Christ's humanity.'<sup>135</sup>

<sup>130</sup> *Vitae* 684, 686.

<sup>131</sup> *adIustin*, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 372<sup>2-5</sup>.

<sup>132</sup> *deFilio* 15<sup>12-14</sup>.

<sup>133</sup> Van Roey and Allen (1994) 65<sup>13-17</sup>.

<sup>134</sup> *adIustin*, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 372<sup>17-21</sup>.

<sup>135</sup> Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 368.



### 1.3.5.3. *Colluthus*

Readily adopted by his followers, the Christological views upheld by Theodosius, led to the emergence of theological replicas. After the death of Theodosius (566), a certain Colluthus<sup>136</sup> wrote an apology in defence of his personal beliefs<sup>137</sup> and in doing so he referred to the authority of Theodosius, emphasising Christ's single and exclusively divine *energeia*:

In this sense, our blessed Pope Theodosius, having implied not the difference in results (τῶν ἀποτελουμένων διαφοράν), but praising the same energetic power (αὐτὴν τὴν ἐνεργητικὴν δύναμιν) of the Saviour, also declared one divine activity in Christ.<sup>138</sup>

Here Colluthus made a distinction between the *energeia* as such (ἐνεργητικὴ δύναμις) and its results (ἀποτελούμενα).<sup>139</sup> The former, he affirmed, is strictly one, whereas in the latter one may observe a certain duality: some deeds may have characteristics of divinity, while others may be attributed to Christ's humanity. In another fragment preserved in the acts of the Lateran council, Colluthus distinguished between the activity and its results, as between ἐνέργεια and ἐνεργήματα.<sup>140</sup> He also spoke of one will in Christ, which, however, sometimes moved divinely and sometimes humanly. Colluthus took the single will as unequivocal and used it as proof of Christ's single knowledge:

There is one will of Christ, although it moves sometimes divinely and sometimes humanly. In the same way and not otherwise, Christ had one knowledge.<sup>141</sup>

### 1.3.5.4. *Constantine of Laodicea*

Another follower of Theodosius, bishop Constantine of Laodicea,<sup>142</sup> employed the same arguments as Theodosius in an address to the Empress Theodora.<sup>143</sup> On one occasion, he repeated Theodosius' point that only in regard to Christ's passions can we say ἐν ἄλλῳ καὶ ἄλλῳ, not, however, with respect to the one activity or one knowledge, which

<sup>136</sup> See Beck (1959) 395.

<sup>137</sup> CPG 7298.

<sup>138</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 330<sup>21-23</sup>.

<sup>139</sup> See also ACO<sub>2</sub> I 332<sup>3-5</sup>.

<sup>140</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 330<sup>32</sup>.

<sup>141</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 330<sup>27-28</sup>.

<sup>142</sup> See Honigmann (1951) 36-38.

<sup>143</sup> *adTheodoram* 68.

remain strictly single.<sup>144</sup> He also confirmed that only a theoretical distinction between Christ's two kinds of knowledge is acceptable. In saying this, he followed Anthimus and referred to the *De Filio* by Gregory of Nazianzus.<sup>145</sup>

In conclusion, it is now clear that the Severan adversaries of Themistius accused the latter of deviating from the doctrine of their common teacher. They constructed their arguments on the basis of the concept of the single divine *energeia*. If the *energeia* (together with the will) is single and divine, knowledge, which is a kind of *energeia*, is also single and divine. Human nature as such is indeed subject to ignorance. However, after the hypostatic union the omniscience of the Godhead was spread through the entire composite nature of Christ. Henceforth only a theoretical distinction between the two knowledges is possible. The Scriptural passages which the Agnoetes referred to (John 11, 34; Mark 13, 32; Matt 24, 36; Luke 2, 52; Mark 5, 9; Mark 11, 13; Luke 8, 45; Matt 20, 32; John 18, 4), were explained as indications not of real, but of 'economic' ignorance. They do not truly imply that Christ was ignorant of what he was asking, he simply wanted to emphasise his real humanity.

Nonetheless, the notion of the one divine *energeia* of Christ developed by Themistius' opponents, was not itself entirely Severan. Severus, as was shown earlier, considered the single activity within the context of the ps-Dionysian formula of the 'theandric *energeia*.' In this sense, Themistius who also referred to this formula and who considered the single *energeia* to be human-divine, was more Severan than his opponents.

### 1.3.6. *Sergius the Grammarian*

Sergius the Grammarian,<sup>146</sup> an anti-Chalcedonian theologian, also questioned some of Severus' Christological ideas as well as developed his own concept of Christ's single *energeia*. Like Julian of Halicarnassus and deacon Themistius, Sergius disagreed with Severus on the issue of Christ's natural property. Again following Julian, he insisted that

<sup>144</sup> See *adTheodorum* 71<sup>34-39</sup>.

<sup>145</sup> See *adTheodorum* 70<sup>25-26</sup>; *deFilio* 15<sup>12-14</sup>.

<sup>146</sup> The origins and biography of Sergius remain unknown. It is only possible to guess that he was a philosopher and a private scholar who stepped in to the field of theology. Grillmeier refers to him as 'the amateur theologian.' (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 111. See Lebon (1951) 429 no. 14, 445, 474-476, 495, 520f., 537f., 548-554; Frend (1972) 206 n. 2, 209; Torrance (1988) 6-7; Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 111-126.

the property is strictly single, without duality. In his eyes, to speak of two properties would entail two natures: 'Every property belongs to an underlying nature, and if we speak of two properties, we are obliged also to speak of two natures.'<sup>147</sup> For Sergius, it was impossible to speak of a duality in the nature, because the very essence (οὐσία) of Christ is one. The concept of the single essence in Christ was a focal point of Sergius' Christology.<sup>148</sup> He equated the notions of nature (φύσις) and essence (οὐσία) and rejected any duality in either:

The words φύσις and οὐσία mean the same as far as we are concerned, the one being derived from πεφυκέναι and the other from εἶναι and you, O Theologian, agree with me (on this). For you have said somewhere in (your) letter, 'Where composition and natural coming-together of *ousiai* or of natures is constituted.' Therefore, if we teach 'from two natures (φύσεις), one nature (φύσις) of the Word incarnate,' how do we sin against the mystery, if, by means of words with the same meaning, we fulfil the same doctrine, (in saying) that from two *ousiai* there is one *ousia* of the Word incarnate? But this 'incarnate' I have omitted, in as much as it is frequently declared, but I do not dissolve the composition because of this... I urge you, O Father, to endure for a little my presumption with regard to the precision of the philosophers; even if they are outside our fold, we shall greatly clarify the explanation. Among these philosophers, Aristotle, who is called νοῦς, said these words somewhere...: 'But *ousia* is, if one will speak with an example, such as man, horse.'<sup>149</sup> But it is not the case that he does not acknowledge the composition of the living creature because of this. For everything which is simple is understood, rather than falling under the senses. Therefore how do I defraud the truth, when I call the incarnate Word '*ousia*,' and understand this (*ousia*) (to be) incarnate?<sup>150</sup>

The single nature-essence of Christ implies a strictly single property and a strictly single *energeia*.<sup>151</sup> The single *energeia* of Christ is new and cannot be identified with either the purely divine or the purely human activity, as Sergius writes in his *Apologia*:

You see how some natures receive their (properties) and activities not cut apart or separately recognized, but the divinity and humanity of the Word who has incarnated appear together. Let them show me what was done after the Incarnation (which) was purely human. And I will not say a tear, for that came divinely, for he was immediately summoning

<sup>147</sup> *adSerg* (CSCO 119) 71–72/Torrance (1988) 38.

<sup>148</sup> See Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 111–126.

<sup>149</sup> Aristotle, *Cat* 4, 1b.27: CSCO 120, 115 n. 4.

<sup>150</sup> *adSever* III (CSCO 120) 103<sup>12–17</sup>/Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 117.

<sup>151</sup> See Torrance (1988) 38.

Lazarus whom he pitied, and, though he was putrefying, the dead man became alive and made haste to run. They speak of sweat and perplexity in relation to the passion? But these things also (happened) divinely, and surpass our reasoning, so that by means of human passions he might lead men (to) impassibility. But what will they say about (his) death? Will he await this utterly human thing, which takes possession of the body? We are persuaded: thus God is he who preserved even the properties of the divinity, and suffered humanly. For because of this he also became a complete human being that he might bear our weakness, and giving (his) back on our behalf to scourging, he conferred honour upon the wound which the ancient (serpent) set against our soul.<sup>152</sup>

Sergius was a Monenergist of the Severan style. In its developed form, however, his Monenergism was stricter and more consistent than that of Severus. Sergius, like Julian, defended an absolute correspondence between the categories of nature, property, and activity. In this sense, he was closer to the Orthodox than was Severus.<sup>153</sup>

### 1.3.7. *Conclusions*

In conclusion, it must be said that the ultimate aim of Severus and each of his disciples was to protect the unity that is in Christ. Severus was forced to defend this not only in the traditional terms of nature-hypostasis, but also in the terms of *energeia*, will, and property. He fervently defended the unity of Christ's *energeia*, but was more relaxed about the will and even more about the natural property, admitting in them same kind of duality. Yet, he recognized a certain duality even in the single *energeia* and therefore styled it theandric. Severus' arguments implied that there was a certain human 'component' in this *energeia* and clearly distinguished divine and human consequences of Christ's single activity (deeds, works).<sup>154</sup> He also made a distinction between property (in singular) and properties (in plural), considering the latter to be both human and divine. On account of this, he eschewed the necessity to attribute a human-divine duality in Christ to his nature, but ascribed it to the property of the nature.

<sup>152</sup> *adSerg* (CSCO 120) 140<sup>25</sup>–141<sup>5</sup>/Torrance (1988) 232–233.

<sup>153</sup> As Torrance correctly remarks, 'One can see the presupposition (of Sergius) that a property implies a nature, and that two properties, even if undivided, imply two natures, in the Dyophysite sense of two natures with their own activities' (1988) 39.

<sup>154</sup> This allowed Andreas Theodorou to draw an incorrect conclusion that 'Severus did not proclaim Monenergism and Monothelitism.' (1957) 19 n. 3.

The weak link in Severus' Christology was the absence of firm ties and the lack of correspondence among the categories of nature, property, and *energeia*. This resulted in arguments among his disciples and led to division in the camp of the anti-Chalcedonians. Thereafter the Julianists and Agnoetes separated themselves from the rest of the Severans. Disciples of Severus, such as Julian of Halicarnassus and Sergius the Grammarian attempted to strengthen the connections between the aforementioned categories. This, however, did not help them to avoid all the problems. For example, by relegating the *energeia* and the property to the single nature, they were obliged to eliminate any duality in all of these categories, something that Severus wanted to preserve, at least with respect to the property. This led them to embrace a kind of Monenergism of a stricter type than that originally promulgated by their teacher. The Monenergism of the Agnoetes, however, was more flexible than that of Severus. Yet, the Agnoetes became marginalized within the anti-Chalcedonian camp; they also provoked the wider circles of Severans to adopt a stronger Monenergist language.

#### 1.4. *Theopaschism*

'Theopaschism,' as debated both in the West and East of the Roman Empire during the first half of the sixth century, was a matter of ecumenical discussion between those who supported and those who opposed Chalcedon. In the debate, discussion focused on Christ's Passion, which in time would be regarded as a kind of *energeia*. It may be argued, therefore, that theopaschism represented an early attempt to raise the question of *energeia* as a self-sufficient theological problem and to use it as a meeting point for the Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian traditions. It is well worth noting that no theologian in the sixth century would in any way accept that the Godhead in Christ suffered. The term 'theopaschism,' therefore, is technical and denotes various theological interpretations of the theopaschite formula: *unus ex Trinitate passus* (and/or *mortuus, crucifixus*).

The earliest debate on the theopaschite formula was initiated by certain Scythian monks: Maxentius, Achillius, John, Leontius, and Mauritius,<sup>155</sup> who came to Constantinople in 518 with a mission, as

---

<sup>155</sup> See Altaner (1947) 145–65; (1953) 568–81; Glorie (CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>). These were monks from the region between the mouth of Danube and the Black Sea.

Grillmeier suggests, 'to protect the Council of Chalcedon, probably in the face of Severan opponents, against the reproach of Nestorianism by producing a greater synthesis between the Cyril of the *mia-physis* formula and the unification Christology of Proclus.'<sup>156</sup> They believed that the theopaschite formula *Christus unus ex Trinitate incarnatus et passus* would serve this intention since it emphasised the unity of Christ in stronger terms than the Chalcedonian definitions.<sup>157</sup> In Constantinople, the monks received protection from a relative of Leontius, the general Vitalian, one of the most influential politicians of his time. His patronage permitted them to address the highest political and ecclesiastical circles of the capital in order to pursue their aims. They presented to the Patriarch and to the Pope's legates, who had come to Constantinople in order to eliminate the Acacian schism, a *libellus* with an exposition of their beliefs. Their views, however, were rejected and they were advised, apparently by Vitalian, to go to Rome and take their case to the Pope, which they did. In Rome, however, they failed to win the Pope's favour, so they appealed to the senate and the people of city. A strictly pro-Chalcedonian senator, Faustus, in response to the appeal of the monks, appointed the presbyter Trifolius to examine their teachings. The result of his investigation<sup>158</sup> was unsympathetic to the Scythians: their theopaschism was ranked together with the teachings of Arius and Apollinarius. Trifolius reported that the Scythian formula was absent from the acts of the four ecumenical councils, and, what is more, it implied that Christ suffered according to his divinity, whereas his flesh remained untouched by the *passio*. Neither the negative decision nor the generally unfavourable position of Rome, however, stopped the monks. They approached the African bishops who had been exiled by the Vandals to Sardinia, writing a letter to them<sup>159</sup> which was delivered by the deacon John. The statement of belief contained in the letter was a revision of the *libellus fidei* presented by the monks to the Pope's legates

<sup>156</sup> Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 321.

<sup>157</sup> Because of this, they were accused of considering the Chalcedon as an insufficient rejection of Nestorianism. Thus, the deacon Dioscorus in his *Report* to Pope Hormisdas (*CorpAvel* ep. 224 n. 7, 686) accused the Scythians: 'May your Beatitude (= Hormisdas) know that these Scythians say that all who accept the Synod of Chalcedon are Nestorians, and say "the Synod is not sufficient against Nestorius", and one ought to accept the Synod as they themselves have expounded (it).'

<sup>158</sup> Trifolius, *adFaust* 137–139; Schwartz (1934) 115–117.

<sup>159</sup> *adEpisc* (CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>) 157–172; English translation with introduction by McGuckin (1984) 239–255.

in Constantinople in 519. Fulgentius of Ruspe, on behalf of the exiled African bishops, approved the Scythian formula, with the alteration of *unus de Trinitate crucifixus est* into *una de Trinitate persona crucifixa est*.<sup>160</sup> On a larger scale, however, the efforts of the Scythians to gain the confidence of the West failed. Returning to Constantinople, they continued to Scythia.

The doctrinal innovations of the Scythian monks and their attempts to win the favour of Rome are not as important to this story as the practical application of the Scythian theopaschite formula that was made by the Emperor Justinian. Upon their arrival in Constantinople the monks brought their proposal to court and Church authorities. To begin with Justinian was sceptical. Reporting on the mission of the papal legates who came to Constantinople to terminate the Acacian schism, Justinian also wrote to Pope Hormisdas about the Scythian monks' intention to visit Rome.<sup>161</sup> Notably he advised the Pope to receive them, listen to them, and then send them far away. With their empty chatter, so he wrote, the Scythian monks introduce novelties which can be found neither in the acts of the four ecumenical councils nor in the letters of Pope Leo. The monks therefore should be punished and dismissed. These 'restless people,' he continued, should not be allowed to disturb the unity and peace which has been recently achieved with so much difficulty, following the Acacian schism. This letter was despatched on 29 June 519.

A few days later, however, Justinian speedily sent a second letter<sup>162</sup> with entirely different recommendations. This time he asked the Pope to comply with the request of the 'pious monks' as quickly as possible and then send them back to Constantinople! He wrote that a positive response from the Pope would be crucial for the unity of the Church. Justinian wanted the Pope to receive the monks before his letter of 29 June reached him in Rome. He feared that his initial suggestions might impel Hormisdas to react negatively against the monks. In his eagerness to obtain the Pope's approval, he despatched yet another letter on 15 October 519. In it, he again asked the Pope to respond to the questions of the monks as soon as possible and to accept the theopaschite

<sup>160</sup> See PL 62, 82<sup>b</sup>; 65, 110<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>161</sup> Justinian, *adHormisd* (*CorpAvel* ep. 187, 644–645; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) n. 3, 8).

<sup>162</sup> Justinian, *adHormisd* (*CorpAvel* ep. 191, 648–649; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) no. 4, 9).

formula.<sup>163</sup> Shortly thereafter in a report issued on 19, January 520, he once again broached the topic. This letter has not survived, but we can conclude from the reply of the Pope that Justinian again implored him to give approval to the theopaschite formula.<sup>164</sup> On 9 July 520, Justinian once again endorsed the theopaschite formula. In order to dispel fear in Rome that the formula *unus ex Trinitate passus/crucifixus* implied the suffering of the Godhead in Christ, Justinian interpreted *unus* as *persona*, adding that Christ suffered in the flesh.<sup>165</sup> On 9 September 520, he sent yet a further letter to Hormisdas<sup>166</sup> in which he requested a reply that would leave no doubts about the formula. To secure its 'Orthodox' interpretation, Justinian once again inserted into it the concept of *persona*.<sup>167</sup> Despite all efforts, the response of Rome to his letters did not satisfy Justinian. The Pope evaded granting approval to the theopaschite formula.

This story contains a conundrum. What made Justinian change his mind so suddenly (only a few days after his letter on 29 June!) about the Scythian monks? Why was he so insistent in his request for papal approval of the theopaschite formula? The answer lies in Justinian's continuing struggle to re-establish ecclesiastical unity with the anti-Chalcedonians.<sup>168</sup> To this end, he tried to find common points of rapprochement and theological formulas that could be used as bases for the re-unification of the imperial Church. In doing so, he attempted to avoid the errors of his predecessors, Zeno and Anastasius by not prohibiting discussion on controversial issues, neither did he question the decisions of Chalcedon. At the same time, it was obvious to him, as the history of his predecessors has shown, that it was extremely difficult to reach any theological consensus either on the 'one nature' or the 'two nature' formulae. Justinian was obliged to look for other expressions which would neither contradict Chalcedon nor be entirely unacceptable to the Severans. The phrase suggested by the Scythian monks met all conditions. Justinian did not immediately comprehend

<sup>163</sup> Justinian, *adHormisd* (*CorpAvel* ep. 188, 645–646; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) no. 5, 10).

<sup>164</sup> See *CorpAvel* ep. 206; CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup> XXXIV n. 68.

<sup>165</sup> See Justinian, *adHormisd* (*CorpAvel* ep. 196, 656).

<sup>166</sup> Justinian, *adHormisd* (*CorpAvel* ep. 235, 715; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) no. 8, 14).

<sup>167</sup> Justinian, *adHormisd* (*CorpAvel* ep. 235, 715<sup>22–25</sup>; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) no. 8, 14<sup>14–16</sup>).

<sup>168</sup> See Schwartz (1935); Gerostergios (1974).



the potential theological force of the theopaschite formula, so initially he rejected it. But as soon as he realized that the Scythian wording might help him reconcile the Chalcedonians and their adversaries without arousing confrontation, immediately and insistently he asked Rome for approval.

Indeed, both Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians regarded the theopaschite formula, even before its presentation in Constantinople by the Scythian monks as an expression of their faith, though their respective interpretations of the phraseology may have differed. Orthodox in the Near East were not reluctant to acknowledge the formula as an expression of Chalcedonian Christology. In 520, for example, Orthodox monks and clergy from Jerusalem, Antioch and Syria *Secunda* sent a confession of faith to the Emperor Justin in which the expression *unus ex sancta et unius essentiae Trinitate* was suggested as an interpretation of Chalcedonian Christology.<sup>169</sup> The major Orthodox authority to whom the Chalcedonian theopaschites referred was Patriarch Proclus of Constantinople (434–446).<sup>170</sup> He had used the formula *unus ex Trinitate incarnatus* (not *passus* or *crucifixus*!) in his *Tome to the Armenians*<sup>171</sup> and in the epistle to the Western bishops.<sup>172</sup> The same formula occurred also in the *Second tome to the Armenians*.<sup>173</sup> The expression *unus ex Trinitate passus/crucifixus* with the words *passus* or *crucifixus* cannot be found in the genuine works of Proclus which have survived. There were, however, several other authors who testified to the fact that Proclus used this phrase. For example, John Maxentius in his *libellus of faith*<sup>174</sup> cites three passages from Proclus' work 'To the Armenians,' in which the expressions *unus ex Trinitate est, qui crucifixus est*,<sup>175</sup> then *unus est de Trinitate, qui passus est*,<sup>176</sup> and finally *unus ergo de Trinitate est crucifixus*,<sup>177</sup> occur. The same wording is ascribed to Proclus also by Innocent

<sup>169</sup> See *CorpAvel* ep. 232<sup>a</sup> 705<sup>6</sup>–706<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>170</sup> See Richard (1942) 303–331; Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 317–318. On Proclus see Lumpe in *BBkl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/p/proklos\\_p\\_v\\_k.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/p/proklos_p_v_k.shtml) (12/06/2003).

<sup>171</sup> *adArmen*: 'Τὸν ἕνα Τριάδος, σεσαρκῶσθαι.' ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 192<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>172</sup> *epUnifomis*: 'Unum ex Trinitate... Deum Verbum factum hominem.' ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 66<sup>16–17</sup>.

<sup>173</sup> *Tomus secundus ad Armenios* ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 72<sup>38–39</sup>. Eduard Schwartz believes that this tome is not authentic. (1914), 43–44.

<sup>174</sup> *LibFid* X<sup>17–19</sup>.

<sup>175</sup> *Maxentii* 16<sup>215</sup>.

<sup>176</sup> *Maxentii* 17<sup>239</sup>.

<sup>177</sup> *Maxentii* 17<sup>245</sup>.

of Marona, who refers to the Patriarch's third *Book of Faith*.<sup>178</sup> Severus of Antioch<sup>179</sup> in the East and Facundus of Hermiane<sup>180</sup> in the West ascribed to Proclus the admission of *unum ex Trinitate carne crucifixum* which occurs in his fourth epistle to John of Antioch.<sup>181</sup> Richard, however, thinks that Proclus never used the theopaschite formula and believes that the above-mentioned testimonies to be insufficient to support such a suggestion.<sup>182</sup> Whatever may be the truth of the matter, the Orthodox communities in the Near East regarded the expression as a legacy of Proclus. Confirmed by his authority, the formula was, as Viktor Schurr remarks, spread 'as the core-word and password of Orthodoxy'.<sup>183</sup>

Anti-Chalcedonians also regarded the theopaschite formula as an expression of their faith. By the time of Justinian, they already had an established tradition of exploiting the formula to the point where they developed their own version of theopaschism based on it. Hence, Peter the Iberian (453–488) was taught about it in a vision;<sup>184</sup> Emperor Zeno in the *Henotikon* (§ 7) used a similar expression: 'One of the Trinity... became incarnate';<sup>185</sup> Emperor Anastasius also confessed that 'one of the persons (hypostases) of the Trinity, God the Word... became incarnate... was crucified'.<sup>186</sup> The great teachers of the anti-Chalcedonian tradition, Severus of Antioch and Philoxenus of Mabbough, also approved of it.<sup>187</sup>

The type of theopaschism accepted by Justinian was not identical with that first proposed and then promoted by the Scythian monks in the West. The monks insisted that *unus ex Trinitate* must not be changed into *una ex Trinitate persona*. Their leader, Maxentius, in his *Dialogue against Nestorians* ascribed to Nestorians the belief in 'one person of

<sup>178</sup> See *De his qui unum ex Trinitate Iesum Christum dubitant confiteri* (CPG 6847), ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 73<sup>1–11</sup>, 16.

<sup>179</sup> *contGram* III (CSCO 102) 247.

<sup>180</sup> *proDefens* I 1<sup>9</sup> (CCh.SL 90<sup>a</sup>) 56<sup>1</sup>–6<sup>66</sup>.

<sup>181</sup> CPG 5901. This fragment was included in the *Doctrina Patrum* (*DoctPatr* 48) under the name of Cyril of Alexandria; other manuscripts ascribe the fragment to Basil and to Pamphilus of Abydos.

<sup>182</sup> See (1942) 323–31; also Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>2</sup> 318 n. 9.

<sup>183</sup> Schurr (1935) 149. On 'theopaschism' in general see Chadwick (1981).

<sup>184</sup> Cf. John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* (from 515) ch. 37 (PO 8, 86–87).

<sup>185</sup> See Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>1</sup> 253.

<sup>186</sup> *confFid* (CSCO 88) 30<sup>16–27</sup>.

<sup>187</sup> *contGram* III, 29; see John of Beth-Aphthonia, *VitSeveri* 236–237. At the request of Severus, an imperial delegation was sent to Patriarch Macedonius with an inquiry about his position concerning the formula *unus de Trinitate incarnatus*. Whereas Macedonius rejected the formula, Severus considered it to be a criterion of the true faith.

Christ from the Trinity' instead of 'one from the Trinity'.<sup>188</sup> This issue became their point of disagreement with the deacon Dioscorus whom the Scythians accused of heresy:

Here it is the right place for us to show how and why the heretics, of whom Dioscorus is one, proclaim Christ as one person of the Trinity, but do not condescend to confess Christ as one from the Trinity. They assert that Christ has the prosopon of the God-Logos, but is not himself the God-Logos... In this wily way they indeed admit that Christ is a person of the Trinity; however, in no way do they want to confess him as one of the Trinity.<sup>189</sup>

In this way, the Scythians shifted the focus from the *crucifixus est* to the *unus ex Trinitate*. Justinian, on the contrary, persistently focused on the *crucifixus/passus*. He readily permitted the substitution of *unus ex Trinitate* with *una persona*, in order to reassure Rome that nothing from the ancient Theopaschism was implied.<sup>190</sup> Unfortunately for him, even in the modified form, the Scythian formula was not approved by Hormisdas. This, however, did not stop Justinian from further promoting the formula. He returned to it after he became the sole ruler of the Empire in 527 at which time the theopaschite confession formed part of a text composed probably in 527 and included in the *Codex Iustiniani*.<sup>191</sup> Justinian strongly promoted the formula in the dialogue with the anti-Chalcedonians. According to Innocent of Marona, during the theological debates held in 532, the Severans accused their opponents of denying 'that God suffered in the flesh or that he (= Christ) was one of the Trinity and that the miracles and the suffering did not belong to the one and the same person'.<sup>192</sup> Justinian used this accusation as an opportunity to promote the theopaschite formula. At a special audience granted to the participants of the dialogue, Justinian asked Patriarch Epiphanius of Constantinople (520–535) and Archbishop Hypatius of Ephesus (531–c. 538), whether they believed that both the suffering and the miracles belong to the same Christ, who is God and who suffered in the flesh, one of the Trinity. Justinian received affirmative answers

<sup>188</sup> 'Non, unum ex Trinitate, sed, unam personam Christum ex Trinitate, melius arbitror confiteri.' *contNestor* (CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>) 105<sup>1002–1003</sup>.

<sup>189</sup> *Respons* (CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>) 134<sup>348</sup>–135<sup>368</sup>.

<sup>190</sup> See above the passages from his epistles to Hormisdas sent on 9 July and 9 September 520.

<sup>191</sup> *CodexIustin* (Krüger (1954) 6–7.

<sup>192</sup> ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> n. 82, 183.

to all his questions.<sup>193</sup> On 15 March 533, the Emperor issued an edict addressed to the citizens of Constantinople, Trebizond, Jerusalem, and Alexandria.<sup>194</sup> In it was the expression 'one of the Trinity, the God-Logos, became flesh'.<sup>195</sup> 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God and our God, who became flesh and a human being and was fixed to the cross, is one of the consubstantial Trinity.'<sup>196</sup> At that very time a new Pope was elected: John II (533–535). Once again Justinian attempted to win the support of the Roman see. On 6 June 533, he sent a letter to the Pope<sup>197</sup> asking him to recognize the theopaschite teaching. The Pope eventually complied with his request,<sup>198</sup> after having received additional clarifications on some points in the formula which to him sounded dubious.<sup>199</sup> Papal approval protected Justinian from accusations directed at him by the strict Chalcedonians and allowed him to make further approaches to the Severans. He commissioned a special hymn that included the theopaschite expression to be sung in the churches of Constantinople. This hymn became an integral part of both eastern and western liturgical traditions:

Only-begotten Son and Word of God, who, being immortal, accepted for our salvation to take flesh from the holy Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary, and without change became man; you were crucified, Christ God, by death trampling on death, being one of the Holy Trinity, glorified with the Father and the Holy Spirit: save us!

Finally, Justinian convinced the fifth ecumenical council (553) to approve the formula. Its tenth anathema condemned those who did not accept it: 'If anyone does not confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified in the flesh, is true God and Lord of glory and one of the holy Trinity, let him be anathema.'<sup>200</sup> It is clear, therefore, that Justinian went far to regain the Severans. Their response, however, was

<sup>193</sup> See ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> ns. 83–86, 183.

<sup>194</sup> See *CodexIustin* (Krüger (1954) 7<sup>a</sup>–8<sup>a</sup>; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) 32–35).

<sup>195</sup> See *CodexIustin* (Krüger (1954) 7<sup>b</sup>; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1929) 35<sup>5–6</sup>).

<sup>196</sup> See *CodexIustin* (Krüger (1954) 8<sup>a</sup>; Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) 35<sup>14–15</sup>).

<sup>197</sup> See *CodexIustin* (Krüger (1954) 11<sup>b</sup>; *CorpAvel* ep. 84; see also ep. 91).

<sup>198</sup> See *adSenat* III 20<sup>d</sup>; 21<sup>d</sup>; 22<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>199</sup> See Justinian's letter on 6 June (PL 66, 15<sup>bc</sup>) and John's letter to the senators of Constantinople (PL 66, 20<sup>cd</sup>).

<sup>200</sup> Act 8, can. 10 (ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>1</sup> 218, 242).

a poor return for the immense efforts of the Emperor. Their confidence in his promotion of the theopaschite formula did not increase, for even the most moderate in the Severan party refused to accept it as a point of rapprochement with the Orthodox. Justinian's theopaschite project unfortunately had failed.<sup>201</sup>

In advancing the theopaschite formula, Justinian added a new theme to the theological dialogue with the anti-Chalcedonians. This was the issue of the activities or *energeiai* of Christ, though in a very elementary form. Indeed, the Passion of Christ that was central to the theopaschite discussions involved the issue of the *energeia*, since they were regarded as a kind of natural activity. The formula had connections with the concepts of *energeia* as adopted by both theological parties. Although accepted by each of them, the phrase gave them space for their own interpretation of *energeia*. Ultimately, it fitted perfectly with the anti-Chalcedonian notion of the single *energeia*:

*one subject of suffering*  
 ↓↓  
*one subject of activities*  
 ↓↓  
*one activity*

The Severans, for their part, accentuated the first element of the formula: *unus ex Trinitate*. In this way, they emphasised the single subject of the passion and, more generally, the unity of Christ. The Chalcedonians, however, insofar as Justinian represented them in Rome, stressed the second element of the formula: *passus est*. In this way, they demonstrated the distinct human capacity of Christ to suffer and through that a distinct human nature. It may be an exaggeration to suggest that the theopaschite formula, in its Chalcedonian interpretation, implied two distinct activities in Christ. At the same time, it did not contradict the concept of two *energeiai*. For instance, we may be quite sure that Justinian accepted Christ's two *energeiai* since, in his epistle to Patriarch Zoilus of Alexandria (541–551), he confirmed his adherence to the Tome of Leo and to Dyenergism.<sup>202</sup> Nevertheless, at that stage the category of *energeia* in its fullest sense had not yet become a subject of theological enquiry. Only a particular aspect of the *energeia*, the Passions, had been placed on the agenda of the dialogue. It was, nevertheless, a first step

<sup>201</sup> See Gerostergios (1974) 250.

<sup>202</sup> See Amelotti and Migliardi Zingale (1977) 58<sup>6–16</sup>.

to a more complete discussion of the issue of Christ's *energeia* and will that was launched in the seventh century.

### 1.5. *The eve of the Monothelite controversy*

The anti-Chalcedonians, whose Christological credo had been shaped mainly through the Severan interpretation of Cyril's theological language, inherited from Severus belief in Christ's single *energeia*. This belief became a feature of self-identity for the anti-Chalcedonian theologians and wider Christian communities, especially in Egypt. We have already examined the views of Patriarch Theodosius and some of his followers, who adopted strong Monenergist language as a result of their polemics against the Agnoetes. Many of Theodosius' successors also professed emphatically the single *energeia* of Christ. One of them, Theodore, elected anti-Chalcedonian Patriarch of Alexandria in 575 nine years after Theodosius' death,<sup>203</sup> reproduced in a letter to Patriarch of Antioch Paul (*adPaul*) certain issues of Severan-Theodosian theology and, confessing the single *energeia* of Christ, in particular anathematized the Tome of Leo.<sup>204</sup> Another Severan Patriarch of Alexandria, Damian (578–605),<sup>205</sup> in his letter to Jacob the Baradeus (*adBarad*) also proclaimed Christ's 'one *energeia*:'

We proclaim not two Christs nor two sons nor two natures nor two activities, but one single Son and one single nature of the incarnate Word, one single hypostasis, one single person, and one single activity.<sup>206</sup>

An interesting angle on the single *energeia* was developed by Patriarch Benjamin of Alexandria (626–665).<sup>207</sup> On the one hand, he recognized human actions in Christ: 'I believe that everything that human beings do, my Saviour himself did, except only sin.'<sup>208</sup> Benjamin admitted that Christ experienced real hunger, thirst, and joy.<sup>209</sup> On the other hand, he

<sup>203</sup> See Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>4</sup> 71.

<sup>204</sup> ACO, I 386<sup>3-9</sup>.

<sup>205</sup> See Ebied (1977); Maspero (1923); Jugie (1935) 456, 592 ff.

<sup>206</sup> *adBarad* II 327<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>207</sup> See Pinggéra, 'Benjamin I,' *BBkl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/b/benjamin\\_i\\_p\\_v\\_k.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/b/benjamin_i_p_v_k.shtml) (03/12/2002).

<sup>208</sup> Müller (1968) 118.

<sup>209</sup> See Müller (1968) 118–120.

saw these actions as a single *energeia*. In his sixteenth paschal letter<sup>210</sup> (end 643–beginning 644), he admitted one nature, one hypostasis, and one *energeia* for Christ. In order to prove this statement, he mentioned four paradoxes which occurred at the marriage in Cana. He, who invited everyone to his true marriage, was himself invited; he, who created men according to his image, sat at table with men; he, who created wine, drank of it himself; he, who created bread, ate of it himself.<sup>211</sup> Thus, Benjamin stressed the unity of Christ as subject of all activities, and at the same time clearly recognized the human-divine diversity of the activities. In his sixteenth paschal letter, he used an ‘astonishingly un-Monophysite’<sup>212</sup> image. According to Benjamin, the way Christ’s flesh suffered while his Godhead did not, can be illustrated by the image of iron and fire. When a hammer strikes an iron, the stroke does not affect the fire. In employing this illustration, Benjamin was accused of admitting to a compromise with the Chalcedonians.<sup>213</sup> Finally, he accepted some particular Chalcedonian views.<sup>214</sup> His Monenergist language was not as strict as that of Theodosius.

In conclusion, by the time of the Alexandrian union, Monenergism had become a cornerstone of the Severan faith. Though Severan, it adopted an even stronger single-*energeia* language because of the internal controversies within the Severan communities. This language did not favour such terms as ‘theandric’ in its application to the *energeia*, but stressed the divine character of the single activity of Christ. Such Monenergism was preached to and widely accepted by the Theodosians—the anti-Chalcedonian community of Egypt. The Theodosians also believed in Christ’s single will and single knowledge, which were divine, in a similar way to the *energeia*. As a kind of Monenergism it was faced by the Chalcedonians who, at the beginning of the seventh century, undertook an attempt at reconciliation with the Severan communities on the basis of the single-*energeia* formula. This undertaking caused broad theological controversy which spread throughout the Empire and in due course became a cardinal theological theme during the seventh century.

<sup>210</sup> See Müller (1968) 302–351. According to Georg Graf, the fragments of the letter are contained in two Coptic *florilegia*: *Priceless Pearl* and *Confession of the Father* (Graf (1937), 68 n. 30; 394 n. 208).

<sup>211</sup> See Müller (1968) 86–88.

<sup>212</sup> Grillmeier (1995) II<sup>4</sup> 85.

<sup>213</sup> Müller (1968) 346.

<sup>214</sup> Müller (1968) 346–348.





## CHAPTER TWO

### HISTORY

#### 2.1. *Historical premises*

At his ascent to the imperial throne in 610, Heraclius was confronted by a complex tissue of internal and external crises—the consequences of a poor economy, popular discontent following the unhappy years of Phokas' reign, civil war, and the Persian invasion under king Khusrau II Parviz in 609.<sup>1</sup> The Persians achieved significant successes in their campaign against the Romans and in a short time they constituted a serious threat to Byzantium. Between 609–612 they broke Byzantine defences in the Caucasus, captured Byzantine Armenia, and pushed on into Cappadocia. They also advanced on the Mesopotamian front where they took Tella, Amida, Edessa, Ra's al-'Ayn, and eventually moved into the Anatolian plateau. Shortly thereafter a new outbreak of Persian attacks followed which significantly worsened the situation. During 613–614, they invaded Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, capturing important cities such as Antioch, Damascus, and Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> It was Jerusalem that probably suffered most; certainly it was the greatest loss to the Romans. The Persians laid waste to it and removed relics that were of special value to the Romans, among them the Holy Cross, which they held in Persia. Throughout 615–616, the Persians penetrated deep into Asia Minor until they reached the walls of Constantinople, and by 619 they also captured Alexandria following victories in Pelusium, Nikiu, and Babylon (Old Cairo). Decades earlier, the Persians had already undertaken raids into the depths of Byzantium. Their most notable foray occurred in 540, when they arrived as temporary intruders who came to loot and to retire. Now, however, they realized that this was an opportunity to conquer Byzantine territories and to retain them for

---

<sup>1</sup> In describing events in civil and, above all, military history, I have followed the chronology of Kaegi (2002).

<sup>2</sup> Nicephorus, perhaps exaggeratedly, describes the Persian army as having 'devastated the entire oriental part of the empire.' (1990) 6, 44–45.

an extended period.<sup>3</sup> As Theophanes reports, the Persian king hoped 'to seize the Roman Empire completely.'<sup>4</sup> Other enemies of Byzantium immediately took advantage of Heraclius' defeats by opening new fronts against him, among them were the Avars who, accompanied by the Slavs, invaded Illyricum. John of Nikiu describes the devastation of this territory and how a significant part of its populace was enslaved. Only Thessalonica remained untouched.<sup>5</sup> In 615 the Visigothic king Sisebut also annexed several important Roman cities in Hispania, such as Malacca and Assido.<sup>6</sup> Byzantium had not faced such serious threats for a long time and it seemed that the very integrity of the Empire was in jeopardy.

Persian progress on the eastern front was facilitated by the anti-Chalcedonian masses as the people tended to prefer Persian to Byzantine supremacy.<sup>7</sup> Khusrāu had shown favour to anti-Chalcedonian majority communities in those regions within his dominion. Heraclius, who personally commanded troops in the East, had frequently experienced the unreliability of the local anti-Chalcedonian population. During the Persian campaigns he presumably came to realise how urgent it was to reconcile Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians. At the first opportunity, having recaptured the occupied eastern territories in 624–628, Heraclius set about to do this with determination. Aside from the urgent political need, he was apparently moved to accomplish this mission because of the increased religious enthusiasm that had accompanied his victories in the anti-Persian campaign of 624–628.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, he was inspired by a series of events which he considered to be signs of divine benevolence towards him and his undertakings during this campaign. Among them was the miraculous salvation of Constantinople during the joint Avaro-Persian siege of 626, when approximately 12,000 defenders of the city<sup>9</sup> resisted around 80,000 Avars<sup>10</sup> together with an undefined

---

<sup>3</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 74.

<sup>4</sup> (de Boor, 1883 (1963)) 300, 301.

<sup>5</sup> Charles (1916) 109.18, pp. 175–176.

<sup>6</sup> See Fredegarius, *Chron* 4.33.

<sup>7</sup> The non-Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius the Camel-Driver (595–631), reported the following on the Persian occupation of the Byzantine territories: 'The world rejoiced in peace and love,' because the 'Chalcedonian night' had passed away. Severus of Asmounein, *Hist* 481.

<sup>8</sup> On the religious dimension of the Persian campaign see Meyendorff (1988) 333–335.

<sup>9</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 134.

<sup>10</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 135–136.

number of Persian soldiers commanded by general Shahrbarāz. Shortly thereafter a series of shattering victories over the Persian army ensued, followed by the consequent reconquest of the occupied Byzantine territories. The Christian populations were liberated and a great number of relics were recovered, including the Holy Sponge, the Holy Lance (returned 629) and the Holy Cross (returned 630). Heraclius triumphed as the great liberator of Christians and Christian relics and as a mediator of divine Providence.<sup>11</sup> It is no wonder, therefore, that with these honours he turned to solving the old and painful problem of division among the Christians, given of course that this was also an urgent task for the political consolidation of the Empire.

## 2.2. *Setting up the new doctrine*

The plan to reconcile the supporters and the adversaries of Chalcedon on the basis of the formula *two natures—one activity (energeia)*, was inspired and designed by Emperor Heraclius and Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople who came to power—political and ecclesiastical respectively—almost simultaneously in 610. Sergius ascended the Patriarchal throne a little earlier, on 18 April, while Emperor Phokas was still in power.<sup>12</sup> On the 5 October, Sergius crowned the successor, Heraclius, with whom he shared political and ecclesiastical views and with whom he would collaborate over the next thirty years. Their deaths were also nearly simultaneous, with a difference of just over two years.<sup>13</sup> The coexistence and collaboration of both powers, political and ecclesiastical, during these three decades were without turmoil, approaching closely

---

<sup>11</sup> Among numerous panegyric *topoi* that were composed to mark Heraclius' victories, notable is an eloquent comparison by Theophanes (apparently borrowed from George of Pisidia), in which the six years of Heraclius' campaign are equated with the six days of Creation: 'The emperor in six years fought and conquered Persia and, in the seventh year, he returned to Constantinople, having achieved all of that in the mystical sense. In effect, God fashioned all of creation in six days and he named the seventh day that of rest. So the emperor also accomplished numerous works during six years, then, in the seventh, having returned to the City in the midst of joy and peace, he rested.' Theophanes (de Boor, 1883 (1963)) 327–328.

<sup>12</sup> See Uthemann in *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios\\_i.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios_i.shtml) (29/05/2003); van Dieten (1972) 1–56; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 258–260.

<sup>13</sup> Sergius died on 9 December 638, and Heraclius on 11 February 641.

the Byzantine ideal of 'symphony'.<sup>14</sup> Sergius and Heraclius were allies who enjoyed mutual trust and had significant influence over each other. For example, in 614/615, when the Emperor faced one of the most difficult moments of his reign, following Khusrau's capture of huge eastern areas of the Empire and forcing a humiliating peace, Heraclius, before commencing negotiations with the Persians, consulted Patriarch Sergius.<sup>15</sup> When, because of permanent defeats suffered by the Roman army Heraclius decided to move the capital from Constantinople to Carthage, the Patriarch convinced him not to. When required, Sergius endowed Heraclius' military campaigns with ecclesiastical treasures and permitted the Emperor remove those articles of worship containing precious metals to smelt them into coins.<sup>16</sup> It was an unprecedented step; normally gold and silver liturgical vessels were only sold to redeem Christian prisoners, not for military campaigns.<sup>17</sup> During the fighting when the Emperor was far from the capital for extended periods, the Patriarch would share responsibility for the political affairs of the Empire together with the patrician Bonos. Indeed, the contribution of Sergius in the war effort against the Avars, Slavs, Bulgars, and Persians in 626 was altogether vital for the victorious outcome. Nevertheless, this almost idyllic conformity of the two powers had its downside. For example, without any noticeable hesitation Sergius blessed the incestuous marriage of Heraclius to his own niece Martina (622/623).<sup>18</sup> Also, a much greater concession to imperial power was made by the Patriarch in efforts towards union with the Severans on the basis of the single *energeia* (and later, will) formula.

Heraclius and Sergius were from similar backgrounds. According to Anastasius of Sinai, Sergius' origins were Syriac and Jacobite: 'He was born in Syria, an offspring of Jacobite parents.'<sup>19</sup> That he was Syrian is quite possible, although his Jacobite background is somewhat dubious and may be a slander.<sup>20</sup> If Syrian, he may well have been sensitive to the

---

<sup>14</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 6, 60; also Uthemann, *BBKl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios\\_i.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios_i.shtml) (29/05/2003): 'Zwischen Sergios und dem neuen Kaiser (= Heraclius) entwickelte sich schnell ein in der Politik ungewöhnliches Vertrauensverhältnis.'

<sup>15</sup> See *Chronicon Paschale* (Dindorf (1832) 707); van Dieten (1972) 7; Kaegi (2002) 84.

<sup>16</sup> See Theophanes (de Boor, 1883 (1963)) 302–303.

<sup>17</sup> See Herrin (1987) 193.

<sup>18</sup> See van Dieten (1972) 5–6.

<sup>19</sup> *Opera* 2 III 1<sup>45–46</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> See Uthemann, *BBKl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios\\_i.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios_i.shtml) (29/05/2003).

task of reconciling the two opposing Christian groups and informed about theological tendencies and beliefs in the non-Chalcedonian camp. Moreover, he would have been fully aware of the importance for the Severans of the single *energeia* issue. Heraclius' background would also have provided him with the opportunity to have experienced the anti-Chalcedonian fluctuations in the East of the Empire. Being of Armenian origin<sup>21</sup> he spent some of his early years in the East, especially in his homeland together with his father, Heraclius the Elder. From 585 his father had served as a general in the East and in 595 was appointed supreme regional commander of Armenia (*magister militum per Armeniam*).<sup>22</sup> By 602, Heraclius the Elder was assigned as exarch in North Africa, with his residence in Carthage. He was followed by his son, who spent around ten years in Carthage (aged 25 to 35 approximately).<sup>23</sup> As Emperor, and as result of his Persian and other campaigns, Heraclius travelled considerably in the East where he spent a great amount of his time. As W. Kaegi remarks, 'Heraclius had acquired a richer perspective on his contemporary world than any emperor since Theodosius I.'<sup>24</sup> As a result, he became very familiar with the regions where Chalcedon was largely rejected, and acquired an awareness of the local situation at first hand. In addition to this knowledge and experience Heraclius possessed a heightened sensibility to the anti-Chalcedonian population. He was generally in touch with religious matters and appeared to be a pious Emperor.<sup>25</sup>

One of the important motives for the Monenergist undertaking was political expediency.<sup>26</sup> It remains unclear whether it was Heraclius or

---

<sup>21</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 21. Most contemporary historians agree that Heraclius was of Armenian background: Theophylact Simocatta, *Hist* 3.1.1; 2.3.2; 2.5.10; 2.10.6; 3.6.2; John of Nikiu, *Chron* 109.27; Theophanes, *Chronographia* A. M. 6078, 6100, 6101, 6102. Two sources refer to him as Heraclius Cappadocian: the earlier, that of John of Nikiu, refers to Cappadocia (*Chron* 106.2, 109.27); and much later, in the 12th century, Constantine Manasses proclaims that 'his fatherland was the thrice-blessed land of the Cappadocians, his race of distinguished men, and with an abundance of hair.' *BrevChron* 1.3664–5 (Lampides (1996) 197). As Kaegi remarks, 'that is not irreconcilable with being Armenian.' Heraclius' mother, Epiphania, for example, may have been of Cappadocian descent. Also the term 'Cappadocian' may be applied to all who lived up to the Euphrates (2002) 21.

<sup>22</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 21–22.

<sup>23</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 26.

<sup>24</sup> Kaegi (2002) 210.

<sup>25</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 59.

<sup>26</sup> This expediency, in my opinion, was correctly emphasised by Wolfram Brandes in his article (2003).

Sergius that had initiated the plan. Nevertheless, given the extraordinarily difficult political situation by virtue of the Persian invasions, one may surmise that Heraclius asked Sergius to find paths of reconciliation for the Christian communities that did not accept Chalcedon. It is scarcely conceivable that Heraclius himself elaborated the single-*energeia* formula. Whereas on the one hand he was reported to be a very learned person, on the other, as W. Kaegi remarks, ‘there is no information on what kind of education he received as a child or during his teenage years, including when, where, and how he became literate.’<sup>27</sup> Though pious, he was not theologically or philosophically trained. That Heraclius was not the author of the new formula is evident from the fact that, in discussing Christological issues (in particular the *energeiai* in Christ) with either Chalcedonians or non-Chalcedonians (Paul the One-Eyed, Cyrus of Phasis, Syrian and Armenian ‘Miaphysites’), the Emperor always deferred to Sergius. Heraclius himself admitted that the *Ecthesis*, a crucially important Monothelite document, though formally issued by him, was in fact composed by the Patriarch.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, the theological elaboration of the Monenergist formula was unequivocally undertaken by Sergius.<sup>29</sup> It is obvious, nevertheless, that Sergius was not the sole author of the formula. In the Chalcedonian camp, his main colleague was Theodore, bishop of Pharan;<sup>30</sup> their exchange of letters has been preserved. Maximus informs us that Sergius wrote to Theodore<sup>31</sup> asking him to present his opinion on the single *energeia* and will in Christ. He attached to the letter a *libellus*, allegedly sent by Patriarch Menas of Constantinople (536–552) to Pope Vigilius (537–555), which

<sup>27</sup> Kaegi (2002) 22.

<sup>28</sup> He wrote the following in a letter to Pope John IV: ‘The *Ecthesis* is not mine, and I have not recommended its promulgation, but the Patriarch Sergius drew it up five years ago, and on my return from the East petitioned me to publish it with my subscription.’ Mansi 11, 9/ Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 61. Nevertheless, in writing this, Heraclius could simply be trying to avoid responsibility for Monothelitism and to transfer it onto Sergius.

<sup>29</sup> See Meyendorff (1988) 338.

<sup>30</sup> Lived in the first half of the 7th c. There is still disagreement over whether he is identical with Theodore of Raithu. See Winkelmann (2001) pp. 271–272; *BBKI* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor\\_v\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor_v_p.shtml) (13/10/2002). According to Beck, Theodore of Pharan was, if not the initiator, then the most important representative of Monenergism (1959) 430. The following writings of Theodore are reported: a) *Sermon to Sergius of Arsenoë* (frag. in ACO<sub>2</sub> I 120<sup>9–39</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 602<sup>4</sup>–604<sup>3</sup>; CPG 7601; Winkelmann 8); b) *Sermon about interpretations of Father’s testimonies* (frag. ACO<sub>2</sub> I 122<sup>3</sup>–124<sup>7</sup> = ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 604<sup>5</sup>–606<sup>14</sup>; CPG 7602; Winkelmann 8<sup>a</sup>). See also Nikas (Dissertation) 87–100.

<sup>31</sup> See Maximus, *Disputatio* 332<sup>bc</sup>; Winkelmann 10.

became one of the major testimonies referred to by the Monenergists.<sup>32</sup> Theodore reportedly approved of the phrase.<sup>33</sup> As well as representing the Chalcedonian camp, Sergius also consulted the Council's adversaries, in particular Bishop Sergius Macaronas of Arsenoë (in Egypt), and George Arsas.<sup>34</sup> Maximus reports that Sergius asked George to provide him with a *florilegium* in favour of Monenergism (χρήσεις...περὶ μιᾶς ἐνεργείας). From George the letter fell into the hands of the Melkite Patriarch of Alexandria John the Almsgiver (late 610/611–619): 'Blessed John, the Pope of Alexandria, seized this letter with his hand from Arsas, and wished, because of it (= the letter), to interdict him.'<sup>35</sup> Having read Sergius' epistle to George, John was outraged by it and decided to issue an interdiction. The question is, to whom? The phrase itself is ambiguous. Its last word, αὐτοῦ, could be applied either to George or to Sergius. As Vasilii Bolotov suggests, it is more likely that Maximus meant Sergius because George was not Chalcedonian and hence already condemned.<sup>36</sup> This is a plausible suggestion. Patriarch John, however, had no time to fulfil his intention because of the Persian invasion and his subsequent death. Sergius may have contacted other theologians and hierarchs from both camps, but there is no evidence for this. Aside from referring to the opinions of contemporary theologians and ecclesiastical figures, Sergius

<sup>32</sup> Two Syriac fragments of the *libellus* survive in the Cod. Brit. Mus. Add. 14535, foll. 3<sup>b</sup> and 9<sup>b</sup>, edited by Sebastian Brock *After Chalcedon* (1985) 37ff. The fragments in particular say: 'Of the holy Menas, patriarch of Constantinople; from the libellon which he proffered to Vigilius pope of Rome in the palace in the presence of Justinian the emperor: Because some people mistakenly say that in our Lord Jesus Christ the will of his divinity is different from that of his humanity, thereby demonstrating that Christ is in opposition to himself, dividing (him) up into God the Word separately and the man separately, we fittingly, being advocates for the truth, are demonstrating by means of testimonies of the holy fathers how, just as Christ is one, God and Man, one and the same, so too his will is one...'; 'Of the holy Menas, patriarch of Constantinople, from the libellon which he gave to Vigilius patriarch of Rome. After providing the testimonies of the fathers he said as follows: Menas: See now, by means of the teaching of the holy fathers we have shown how the catholic church of God correctly and in piety preaches one will and one operation full of salvation, just as our Lord Jesus Christ is one.' Brock *After Chalcedon* (1985) 37–38. A short fragment is contained in the *Chronicle* of John of Nikiu (Charles (1916) 149). The authenticity of this document was thoroughly investigated and eventually rejected at the sixth ecumenical council; see CPG 6934; Winkelmann 1.

<sup>33</sup> On the letter of Theodore to Sergius, see Maximus *Disputatio* 332<sup>c</sup>; Winkelmann 11.

<sup>34</sup> See Maximus, *Disputatio* 333<sup>a</sup>; Winkelmann 9. See Winkelmann, *Der m.-m. Streit* p. 206.

<sup>35</sup> Maximus, *Disputatio* 333<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> Bolotov (1994) 448.

and Heraclius could also rely on the experience of Justinian who was evidently the first to employ *energeia*, though in the preliminary form of the *passio*, to bridge the gap with the non-Chalcedonians. Theopaschism was included in the Monenergist documents, such as, for instance, the Pact of the Alexandrian union.<sup>37</sup>

Monenergism was not designed to be a new, self-sufficient doctrine, but rather a broader interpretation of the Orthodox faith intended to bring about a reconciliation between the dissident groups: in other words an ecclesiastical οἰκονομία. An interpretation of the objective of the undertaking can be seen in Sergius' letter to Pope Honorius:

... Many other times our holy Fathers appear and use, following the God-pleasing *oekonomia*... in order to obtain the salvation of many souls.<sup>38</sup>

Subsequently, this initial *raison d'être*, which permitted κατ' οἰκονομίαν, became a precise doctrine (ἀκρίβεια), which prohibited ascribing to Christ two *energeiai* or wills.

In the initial period, during which the Monenergist project was initiated and formed, Sergius was the chief protagonist while Heraclius appears to have remained behind the scenes. The Emperor made an appearance only when the innovation was to be implemented. Indeed, the new doctrine was still being shaped when the earliest attempts at its enforcement were instigated. Up until 633 it appears that Heraclius carried out negotiations with the non-Chalcedonians, urging them into union on the basis of the Monenergist prescription. Heraclius' first recorded act in this direction transpired during his short stopover in Theodosiopolis (Erzurum), Armenia. There he entered into dispute with a non-Chalcedonian theologian, Paul the One-Eyed (Μονόφθαλμος), who had arrived from Cyprus.<sup>39</sup> This Paul, well instructed in theological matters,<sup>40</sup> was one of the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian community on the island.<sup>41</sup> One of the matters raised during their discussion was that of Christ's *energeiai*. On the basis of this exchange, Heraclius sent

<sup>37</sup> See Meyendorff (1988) 347.

<sup>38</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 538<sup>17-19</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> See the letter of Cyrus of Phasis to Sergius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 588<sup>20-21</sup>), the reply of Sergius to Cyrus (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 528<sup>4-7</sup>), and the letter of Patriarch Sergius to Pope Honorius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 534), *Synodicon Vetus* 128; Winkelmann 12. See Winkelmann (2001) p. 248.

<sup>40</sup> See Bolotov (1994) 451.

<sup>41</sup> See van Dielen: 'Daß Paulos monophysitische Gemeinden von Zypern vertrat, kann man aber mit ziemlicher Sicherheit daraus erschließen, daß die erfolglose Diskussion Herakleios zu einem Dekret an den Erzbischof der Insel veranlaßte.' (1972) 28, 93.



Sergius a letter asking him to provide theological arguments in favour of Monenergism. By way of response, Sergius sent a letter with the *libellus* of Menas and the opinion of Theodore of Pharan concerning the single *energeia*.<sup>42</sup> Once Paul had familiarized himself with the documents, he entered into a further discussion (or discussions) with the Emperor and eventually rejected the Monenergist compromise. As a result he was condemned by Heraclius, who, on this occasion issued a special imperial decree (κέλευσις)<sup>43</sup> which was sent to Archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus.<sup>44</sup> In this decree, Paul was condemned for his insistence on the single nature of Christ. The matter of Christ's *energeia* was also broached. The document intentionally forbade all discussions on the two *energeiai* of Christ.<sup>45</sup>

It was at this stage that the Church of Cyprus became involved in discussions on Monenergism. According to the Syriac *Vita* of Maximus, Arcadius complied with the decree and supported the Monenergist project. The *Vita* discloses that, in 633 or 634, having been persuaded to do so by Sophronius,<sup>46</sup> Arcadius convoked in Cyprus a synod

<sup>42</sup> See Maximus, *Disputatio* 332<sup>c</sup>; Winkelmann 13.

<sup>43</sup> See the letter of Cyrus of Phasis to Sergius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 588<sup>19-21</sup>), the reply of Sergius to Cyrus (ACO<sub>2</sub> II, 2, 528, 4-7), and the letter of Patriarch Sergius to Pope Honorius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 534), *Synodicon Vetus* 128; Winkelmann 14.

<sup>44</sup> Archbishop of Cyprus from about 625 to 641/642; see Winkelmann (2001) pp. 196-198.

<sup>45</sup> As Sergius reports in his letter to Cyrus, the decree 'prohibited talk about two *energeiai* of Christ our God.' ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 528<sup>7</sup>. Cyrus, in his letter to Sergius, mentions a certain reference (ἀναφορά) of the Patriarch, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 590<sup>6</sup>. According to Grumel, this is a replica of the Emperor's κέλευσις against Paul the One-Eyed (*Reg* 283; Winkelmann 15). Grumel dates the document to 623.

<sup>46</sup> The Syriac *Vita* of Maximus reports on intensive correspondence between Sophronius and Arcadius:

- a) Letter of Sophronius to Arcadius (Cod. Brit. Mus. Or. 8606, fol. 127<sup>a</sup>-140<sup>b</sup>, Albert and Schönborn (1978); see Brock *AB* (1973) 322, 345; CPG 7636; Winkelmann 29). Brock asserts that the text 'clearly antedates the main period of the monoenergeist controversy.'
- b) Letter of Arcadius to Sophronius: 'Arkadios the archbishop of Cyprus showed you contempt.' Brock *AB* (1973) 315 n. 7; Winkelmann 30. Brock suggests that the letter might be an answer to the previous epistle.
- c) Letter of Sophronius to Arcadius (see Brock *AB* (1973) 315f; Winkelmann 31). Sophronius invites Arcadius to 'send to the holy Kyros of Alexandria and to Honorios patriarch of Rome and to Sergios patriarch of Constantinople, (saying) that there should be a synod and gathering of bishops wherever they liked, and they should make trial of these things (= Trishagion), saying, It is not pleasing to the Lord that we should consume the revenues of the sheep and of the church, while there is an upheaval of dissension in our midst; why should we come to destruction on behalf of the flock which the head shepherd has entrusted to us?' The letter was written

comprising forty-six delegates, including Cyrus, Gaius, the deacon of Pope Honorius, Archdeacon Peter, George, the author of the *Syriac Vita*, eight bishops from Sophronius' jurisdiction, and Anastasius, the Maximus' disciple.<sup>47</sup> The council reportedly backed Monenergism and condemned the stand of Sophronius and Maximus. Its decisions were summarized in a corresponding letter sent to Heraclius.<sup>48</sup> That Arcadius was on the side of Heraclius, at least at the beginning of the controversy, can also be deduced by implication from the fact that Heraclius during or immediately after his visit to Jerusalem in 630, donated a considerable amount of money for the construction of an aqueduct in Cyprus (the island constantly suffered from drought, as it does even today).<sup>49</sup> Perhaps this money was granted to express the gratitude of the Emperor and to encourage the Cypriots in their support of Monenergism.<sup>50</sup> It would appear to be no coincidence that Maximus addressed his dogmatic treatises in favour of Dyenergism-Dyothelitism to the Cypriot deacon Marinus. Perhaps the persuasiveness of Sophronius, or other factors unknown to us, convinced Arcadius to change his mind. His successor Sergius<sup>51</sup> claimed in his letter to Pope Theodore that Arcadius was with the Dyothelite party.<sup>52</sup>

During the 627 anti-Persian campaign, Heraclius, leading his troops, passed through Lazica where, at the port of Phasis, he conducted a theological discourse with the local bishop, Cyrus.<sup>53</sup> Among other topics, the Emperor spoke of his meeting with Paul the One-Eyed in Armenia

---

between the summer/autumn of 631 and 634. Arcadius sent the requested letters, as the same *Syriac Vita* reports: 'When the holy Arkadios received the letter from Sophronios' notary and from the deacon John, who was going round the churches of Mount Sinai, and when he had read it, he did not delay from carrying this out, and he wrote off sending (letters) to the above mentioned patriarchs.' See Brock *AB* (1973) 316; Winkelmann 32.

<sup>47</sup> See Brock *AB* (1973) 316<sup>10-14</sup>; Winkelmann 33. According to Brock, 'the precise date of this gathering is not clear.' However, he suggests that 'the synod in Cyprus took place c. 634, around the time that Sophronios came to the patriarchal throne.'

<sup>48</sup> Brock *AB* (1973) 'An Early Syriac Life of Maximus' 316; see also Winkelmann 34.

<sup>49</sup> A relevant inscription, which probably dates back to 631, has survived in Salamis/Constantia: 'These seven arches have been made with the help of God and also thanks to the generosity of Flavius Heraclius, our master crowned by God, from the Hippodrome, the sixth month, indiction four.' Sodini (1998) 624-625 n. 1.

<sup>50</sup> See Sodini (1998) 208.

<sup>51</sup> See *PmbZ* 6532; Winkelmann (2001) p. 261.

<sup>52</sup> See *ACO*<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 62<sup>30</sup>; *CPG* 7628; Winkelmann 83.

<sup>53</sup> See Winkelmann 18; on Cyrus see *PmbZ* 4213; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 227-228.

and about the doctrine of the single *energeia*. Cyrus was puzzled by the doctrine and sent a letter to Patriarch Sergius asking him for clarification on the issue.<sup>54</sup> Cyrus appears in his letter to be doubtful; for behind his rhetorical figures of speech lies confusion. It would appear that he, as a committed Chalcedonian, believed implicitly in Christ's two *energeiai* and therefore was unprepared for such a challenge. Sergius replied<sup>55</sup> by confirming to Cyrus that there is indeed a single activity in Christ, and in an attempt to disperse his doubts, Sergius added that none of the ecumenical or other Orthodox councils had raised the issue of the *energeiai*. Among testimonies from the Fathers, he cites the writings of Cyril and the *libellus* of Menas.<sup>56</sup> *Synodicon Vetus* reports that before despatching his reply, Sergius convoked a synod *endemousa* (that is, consisting of the bishops who at that moment resided in Constantinople) which confirmed his position.<sup>57</sup>

Active involvement in his military campaigns forbade Heraclius to promote Monenergism on a larger scale. When the eastern front had become more or less stable, he spent a short time in Constantinople, and then again returned to the East. His main destination now was Jerusalem and his declared purpose was to receive the Holy Cross, which had been offered to him by the new Persian king and Heraclius' own protégé, the former general Shahrbarāz. Apart from this official reason, Heraclius also sought to promote union in the East among the dissident Christian groups.<sup>58</sup>

Heraclius wished to approach not only the Severans, but also the 'Nestorians.' In dealing with either party he used the same tactic, namely, reaching an acceptable doctrinal compromise, and then sharing communion with the group's leader. Such moves were undertaken with the 'Nestorians.' On 9 June, the Persian king Shahrbarāz was slain; his place was taken by the daughter of Khusrau, Boran II, who requested the Nestorian Catholicos Ishoyahb II (628–643)<sup>59</sup> to take a message to Heraclius which preposed a renewal of the truce with the Romans.

<sup>54</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 588<sup>7</sup>–592<sup>4</sup>; see CPG 7610; Winkelmann 19.

<sup>55</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 528–530; see CPG 7604; Winkelmann 20.

<sup>56</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 528<sup>15–19</sup>.

<sup>57</sup> See *Synodicon Vetus* n. 128; Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 15–18; Winkelmann 21<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>58</sup> As Kaegi remarks, 'Heraclius utilized this time to try to consolidate his empire by reasserting imperial authority in lost provinces and in attempting to find ways to end religious dissidence.' (2002) 210.

<sup>59</sup> See McCullough (1982) 162–164; Tenberg, 'Isho'jahn I' *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/i/Isho\\_II.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/i/Isho_II.shtml) (10/06/2002).

It is likely that Ishoyahb and Heraclius met at Aleppo in the summer of 630<sup>60</sup> where they had discussed both political and doctrinal issues. Once the Catholicos set out his beliefs, Heraclius asked him to celebrate the Liturgy and to give him communion. In exchange Ishoyahb demanded the removal of the name of Cyril of Alexandria from the Orthodox diptychs, after which he professed his faith in written form and gave Heraclius communion. In his negotiations with the Catholicos, Heraclius apparently made use of the Monenergist formula. As indicated above, Antiochian theology, in the form presented by Theodore of Mopsuestia, presupposed a union or rather a manifestation of the two particular natures of Christ as a single *energeia*. Hence the idea of two natures and one *energeia* as articulated by Heraclius was familiar to the Nestorians. If indeed the Monenergist formula was used by Heraclius in his conversations with the Antiochians, it would therefore have been quite acceptable to them.<sup>61</sup> Ultimately, nothing of significance resulted from this act of union. The initiative of the Catholicos, upon his return home, was severely criticized by his community and failed to lead to any reconciliation with the Imperial Church.<sup>62</sup>

The major target for the Emperor's unionist attempts, however, was the Severans. On his return from Jerusalem in the spring of 631, Heraclius remained for a time at Hierapolis (Mabbough, Mambij) where he met with the non-Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius the Camel-Driver<sup>63</sup> and twelve of his bishops.<sup>64</sup> They reportedly discussed Christological issues for twelve days before reaching a compromise. The theological basis of the discussion is reflected in a letter addressed by Heraclius to Athanasius.<sup>65</sup> It amounts to an acceptance of the two

<sup>60</sup> See Flusin (1992) 321; Kaegi (2002) 212–213.

<sup>61</sup> See Meyendorff (1988) 338. As Pelikan remarks, 'Ironically, Monoenergism, the notion of one action in Christ, was able to claim the support of both Christological extremes, the Nestorian and the Monophysite: the former taught that the two hypostases in Christ concurred in a single action, while the latter taught that there was "a single, individual action of one hypostasis"' (1974) vol. 2, 64.

<sup>62</sup> See McCullough (1982) 162–163.

<sup>63</sup> Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch from 593/4 to 630/631. He was respected by both Jacobite and Chalcedonian communities. In 609–610, with the assistance of the Byzantine state, he managed to unify Syrian and Egyptian Jacobites and he also took care to strengthen links between the Byzantine and Persian Jacobites. See *TRE* 16 (1987) 476–478, in which there is also an extensive bibliography (481–485). On Athanasius see Winkelmann (2001) p. 198.

<sup>64</sup> See van Dieten (1972) 219–232; Winkelmann 24<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>65</sup> See Winkelmann 24.

natures which, however, have but one operation.<sup>66</sup> Owing to the abrupt death of Athanasius in July 631, the alleged decisions were never formally implemented,<sup>67</sup> although some communities, including monastic ones, condoned the Emperor's faith. Those who refused freely to accept Chalcedon were forced into the union by violence. On this the anti-Chalcedonian author Bar Hebraeus reports:

When the Emperor went to Mabbough (Hierapolis), he was approached by Patriarch Mar Athanasius and twelve bishops, from whom he asked a declaration of faith which they gave to him. After having read it, the Emperor spoke to them with praise. But he pressed them hard to accept the Council of Chalcedon. Since they would not consent, Heraclius was irritated and sent out a decree to the whole Empire: 'Anyone who will not adhere (to the Council), will have his nose and ears cut off and his house pillaged.' And so, many converted. The monks of Bêt(h) Maron, of Mabbough and of Emesa showed their wickedness and pillaged a number of churches and monasteries. Our people complained to Heraclius, who did not answer them.<sup>68</sup>

The communities that either intentionally or under duress accepted Monenergism-Monothelitism retained the doctrine even after it was rejected in Byzantium. They later became known as Maronites.<sup>69</sup>

Heraclius achieved a somewhat greater success in Armenia. He managed to convince the Armenian Catholicos Ezr to accept the compromise Christological formula containing the Monenergist insertion and to share Holy Communion with him. Supposedly, Ezr yielded to pressure after having received in exchange one third of the town of Kolb and revenues from its salt mines. Heraclius also threatened to set up a parallel hierarchy were Ezr to reject the compromise.<sup>70</sup> A union based on the Monenergist formula was accepted and signed at the 631–633 synod of Theodosiopolis which Heraclius himself attended.<sup>71</sup> But the Armenian hierarchs adopted Chalcedon somewhat evasively. Ordinary believers from the Armenian community were even less compliant with the faith of the Emperor.<sup>72</sup> Ezr's successor Nerses III the

<sup>66</sup> See Michael the Syrian, *Chron* II 402f.

<sup>67</sup> See McCoull (1998) 69–79.

<sup>68</sup> *Chron* I 271–274.

<sup>69</sup> On Maronism see a chapter below.

<sup>70</sup> See Yovhannes Drasxanakert'ci, *History of Armenia* 18.6–14 (Maksoudian (1987) 98–99); *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* (Garitte (1952) 310); Sebeos, *Hist* 91–92.

<sup>71</sup> See Bolotov (1994) 453, and especially a note by his editor Alexandr Brilliantov (n. 2, p. 453); Winkelmann 25. The council was mentioned by bishop Sebeos, *Hist* 91f.

<sup>72</sup> See, for instance, Petrosian (1987) 66.

Builder retained Chalcedonianism until the council of Dvin rejected it in 648–649 together with the subjection of Armenia to Byzantium.<sup>73</sup> Once Emperor Constans II restored Roman dominion over Armenia, however, the issue of Church union was also revitalized. Constans came to Dvin in 654 and shared communion with the Catholicos Nerses, who again complied with Chalcedon. Finally, the Arab conquest of Armenia reversed the position, and the union was abandoned for ever.

Heraclius' efforts at restoring ecclesiastical unity were also recorded in Georgia. The eleventh-century Georgian historian, Sumbat Davididze, relates in his *Life and Time of the Georgian Bagratids*<sup>74</sup> that the Emperor

despatched priests to Tp'ilisi and Mc'xet'a and Ujarma so that all Christians would be united in the Church, and all the magi and fire-worshippers who would not receive baptism were exterminated.<sup>75</sup>

The doctrinal concessions made by Heraclius in Mesopotamia and Armenia were comparable with those made subsequently in Egypt. One may ask why these concessions were not questioned by Chalcedonian hierarchs and theologians (setting aside the alleged protest of John the Almsgiver in Alexandria), as it would happen later on in Alexandria. Possibly because in Hierapolis and Theodosiopolis it was the Emperor who acted directly, while in Alexandria imperial policy was imple-

---

<sup>73</sup> See the testimonies of *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* (Garitte (1952) 46); Sebeos, *Hist* 113–142; see also Winkelmann 131<sup>a</sup>. Sebeos, who opposed Nerses, noted: 'He (= Nerses) firmly agreed with the council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. But he revealed his impious thoughts to no one until he reached the episcopate in that land, from which he was called to the throne of the Catholicosate. He was a man virtuous in conduct, fasting, and prayer. But he kept the bitter poison hidden in his heart, and he planned to convert Armenia to the council of Chalcedon. Yet he did not dare to reveal his intention until king Constans came and stayed in the residence of the Catholicos, and the council of Chalcedon was proclaimed in the church of St Gregory on a Sunday. The liturgy was celebrated in Greek by a Roman priest; and the king, Catholicos, and all the bishops took communion, some willingly, some unwillingly. In this way the Catholicos perverted the true faith of St Gregory which all the Catholicoi had preserved on a solid foundation in the holy church from St Gregory down to today. He muddied the pure and clean and crystalline waters of the springs—which the Catholicos from early on had intended, but had not been able to reveal until that day. Then, when he found an opportunity, he carried out his desire. He betrayed one by one the bishops, and demoralized them through fear, so that from terror of death they all carried out the orders to communicate; especially because the blessed ones who were more firmly based, had died.'

<sup>74</sup> Published by Semen Kaukhchishvili in the first volume of the *History of Georgia*, Tbilisi, 1955.

<sup>75</sup> Kaegi (2002) 220; Davitis'dze (1979) 30.

mented by the ecclesiastical hierarch, Cyrus. In the former case, the involvement of the Church was minimal, with only Sergius distantly supporting the Emperor's efforts. Few would dare to blame so pious an Emperor as Heraclius for his efforts, especially after the glorious victories over the Persians and his direct involvement in the return of so many important relics.

### 2.3. *Union at Alexandria*

Although the earlier attempts at reconciliation in Asia did not bear the desired fruit, Heraclius did not give up. In 631, Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, was not only elected to the Patriarchal throne of Alexandria, but was also invested with secular authority as prefect of Egypt. One of his chief tasks was to achieve reconciliation with the Severan groups in Egypt on the basis of the Monenergist formula. The local Severan community met Cyrus with hostility. Its Patriarch, Benjamin, fled from Alexandria to Upper Egypt, where he remained in hiding for ten years. Nevertheless, during the two years that Cyrus spent in Alexandria before 633, he managed to set up more or less regular contacts with leaders of non-Chalcedonian communities<sup>76</sup> convincing some of them to accept the Chalcedonian faith with the added Monenergist formula. Formal union based on a written confession,<sup>77</sup> apparently composed by Cyrus himself, was proclaimed on 3 June 633 in the Cæsareum, the cathedral of Alexandria. Thereafter, Chalcedonians and Severans shared Holy Communion. Cyrus immediately reported this success to Constantinople:

All the clergy of the Theodosian party of this city, together with all the civil and military persons of distinction, and many thousands of the people, on the 3 June, took part with us, in the Holy Catholic Church, in the pure and holy mysteries.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> According to the information given by Sergius in his letter to Honorius, the proclamation of the union was preceded by extensive discussions, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 536<sup>21-23</sup>.

<sup>77</sup> The text can be found in the protocol of the 8th session of the sixth ecumenical council (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 596-600). The 7th chapter of the Pact, which contains the Monenergist confession, is included in the protocol of the Lateran council (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 134<sup>10-29</sup>); see CPG 7013; Winkelmann 27.

<sup>78</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 592<sup>7</sup>-594<sup>15</sup>/Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 18; see CPG 7611; Winkelmann 28. In reply, Sergius sent to Cyrus an approval letter (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 134<sup>31</sup>-138<sup>37</sup>; see CPG 7605; Winkelmann 70).

The act of union was apparently confirmed by a local synod of the Alexandrian Church, as reported in *Synodicon Vetus* (no. 130). Theological teachings and ecclesiastical arrangements were enforced by persecutions that Cyrus, as prefect of Egypt, imposed on those local Severans who rejected the union. Two examples are documented. Under Cyrus' government the brother of Patriarch Benjamin, Menas, was tortured and executed.<sup>79</sup> The Romans moreover, continued to exterminate the Severans even when in 641 they themselves were being besieged by the Arabs in Babylon (Old Cairo). Cyrus' persecutions against the Severans were reportedly very harsh. In the historical memory of the Copts, Cyrus is counted as 'one of the worst oppressors of the Copts;' he 'inaugurated one of the fiercest persecutions of the Copts in history.'<sup>80</sup> In Coptic sources, only violence and blood remain associated with the memory of Cyrus, not his theological endeavours.

It is difficult to ascertain exactly how many Severans actually converted to the Chalcedonian faith. Presumably most of the Alexandrian urban clergy and some bishops must have yielded to Cyrus. However, even if a significant number of Severans did join the Catholic Church, that number soon fell dramatically.<sup>81</sup> When the Arabs invaded Egypt in 639, the local population, if it did not help them openly, at least refrained from any resistance and avoided supporting the Romans.<sup>82</sup> It is noteworthy that in Egypt, unlike Syria (the Maronites), no Monothelite communities have survived, which suggests that opposition to Monenergist Chalcedonianism was stronger there than in the East. Thus, Cyrus' attempts at reconciliation on the basis of the Monenergist formula failed. The crowds who reportedly joined Orthodoxy in 633 withdrew and failed to come to the aid of the Empire in 639 when it

<sup>79</sup> See Severus, bishop of Ushmunain, *Hist* 489–492.

<sup>80</sup> Atiya. 'Cyrus Al-Muqawqas.' *Coptic Encyclopedia* v. 3.

<sup>81</sup> According to the *History of the Patriarchs*, Patriarch Benjamin urged Copts to renounce Chalcedonianism: 'He induced them to return to the right faith by his gentleness, exhorting them with courtesy and consolation.' Severus, the bishop of Ushmunain, *Hist* 497.

<sup>82</sup> An account on the response of the Severans to the Arab invaders can be found in the chronicle of Michael the Syrian: 'The God of vengeance... raised up from the south the children of Ishmael to deliver us from the hands of the Romans... It was no light benefit for us to be freed from the cruelty of the Romans, their wickedness, anger and ardent cruelty towards us, and to find ourselves in peace (*Chron* II 412). See also Kaegi (1992) 213–218. However, the collaboration of the Severans should not be exaggerated; they supported the Arabs rather passively. See Moorhead (1981) 580–591.



was in dire need of such assistance. The Arab 'Abd al-Hakam has left an interesting report on the Arab assault on Egypt:

The Muqawqis (= 'the Caucasian' that is Cyrus) who was the foremost among the Byzantines until he wrote to the king of Byzantines, informing him what he did. And 'Amr (= commander of Arab troops) accepted that and he agreed and allowed them to leave. And he wrote a document about it. And Muqawqis wrote to the king of the Byzantines informing him about the reason for the affair in all detail. The king of the Byzantines wrote to him, denouncing his opinion as shameful, called him impotent, and replied to him about his actions. He said in his document: 'Indeed 12,000 Arabs reached you while there are innumerable Copts beyond counting in Egypt and the Copts loathe the killing and like to contribute jizya (= head tax) to the Arabs and they prefer them to us. You have in Egypt Byzantines of Alexandria who together with auxiliary troops number more than 100,000 and the strength of the Arabs.'<sup>83</sup>

Indeed, in the face of inevitable defeat by the Arabs, Cyrus chose to pay a considerable tribute to their commander 'Amr bin al-'Ās, a decision which displeased Heraclius enormously and which deprived Cyrus of the Emperor's trust. Of interest in 'Abd al-Hakam's report, which sets it apart from other, similar accounts, is the detail that Heraclius blamed Cyrus for the Copts' collaboration with the Arabs. True or not, Heraclius was clearly irritated by Cyrus' failure to reconcile the Copts with the Romans. Moreover, the money that Cyrus paid to the Arabs also failed to be of effect for very long. On 28 November 641, Egypt fell into their hands.

Unionist attempts in Alexandria, unlike similar actions in Asia, faced opposition from the Chalcedonians who disagreed with the notion of a single *energeia*. Prior to the implementation of the text of agreement with the Severans, Cyrus had consulted Sophronius, a widely respected abbot and refugee who had escaped from the Persian occupation of Palestine.<sup>84</sup> Sophronius opposed the single *energeia* and attempted to persuade Cyrus not to implement it in the union with the Severans. Maximus in particular reports that:

Sophronius therefore, the great and divine, arriving then at Alexandria, immediately on the first reading (for Cyrus had given him those nine

<sup>83</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ miṣr wa akhbāruhā* (Torrey, 1922) 71/Kaegi (2002) 286–287.

<sup>84</sup> See Winkelmann 26. On Sophronius see Schönborn (1972); Winkelmann (2001) pp. 261–262.

impious chapters for revision) dolefully, plaintively cried out, shedding fountains of tears, fervidly begging, beseeching, expostulating with him, prone at his feet, that he pronounce none of these things from the pulpit against the Catholic Church of God.<sup>85</sup>

Cyrus, however, did not yield to the persuasiveness of Sophronius and proceeded to implement the formula, an action that obliged Sophronius to appeal to the Patriarch of Constantinople in person. He arrived at the capital for an audience with Sergius,<sup>86</sup> who quickly anticipated the potential danger of divisions within the Chalcedonian camp as a result of Monenergist insinuations. In the absence of the Emperor, who was in the East, Sergius on his own authority issued a *Psephos* (Ψήφος), which prohibited use of the language of one or two *energeiai* but instead promoted a single subject of activities in Christ.<sup>87</sup> Apparently, the document was officially confirmed by the *endemousa* synod.<sup>88</sup> In effect, by issuing the *Psephos*, Sergius suspended further endorsement of the unionist project. Why Sergius did this remains a puzzle. That the Patriarch could suspend the venture on his own authority, without preliminary consultation with the Emperor, presumably means that he and Heraclius, anticipating possible negative consequences, had already arranged contingency measures were the project to fail. Whether or not this was true and whether or not exit strategies had been drawn up, Sergius' immediate reaction terminated any further realisation of the project, and confirmed its genesis not as a dogmatic issue, but rather as a matter of ecclesiastical *oeconomia*.

Following Sophronius' objection to the formula, Sergius had two choices: either he could disregard the protests and continue implementing Monenergism, or he could suspend the unionist attempts in order to prevent further dissent within the Church. For reasons unknown to us, he chose the latter course. He may have come to realise that the previous attempts at reconciliation on the basis of the Monenergist formula had not brought significant results. He might also have recalled the unhappy consequences of other unionist attempts, such as those by the Emperor Zeno and Patriarch Peter Mongus who unsuccessfully promoted the *Henotikon* (482). In order to persuade the strict Chalcedonian estab-

<sup>85</sup> From the letter to Peter Illustris, PG 91, 143<sup>cd</sup>.

<sup>86</sup> See Winkelmann 26<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>87</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 542<sup>2-7</sup>.

<sup>88</sup> The very title of the document—ψήφος (from ψηφίζω—vote)—indicates that it was voted by a council.

ishments to accept the new formula, Sergius refrained from abusing the Emperor's authority. A major impetus that might also have affected Sergius' response could well have been the threat of an imminent Arab invasion.<sup>89</sup> In this case, he would have deemed it a priority to preserve the existing unity of the Church. Understandably, therefore, Sergius may have preferred the internal unity of the Chalcedonian majority to the ephemeral task of reaching unity with the Severans. At the same time, the degree to which Monenergism was suspended should not be exaggerated. It was not abandoned altogether but rather conserved in order perhaps to preserve its fruit in the East and in Egypt. Sergius' decision was approved by Heraclius, who sent from the East a *keleusis*, which confirmed the *Psephos*.<sup>90</sup>

At the end of 633 or the beginning of 634 Sophronius was elected Patriarch of Jerusalem.<sup>91</sup> According to custom, he issued an enthronement letter which had the character of an encyclical addressed to all the Patriarchs<sup>92</sup> and he used this opportunity to promote his Dyenergist views. In this letter he virtually admitted belief in the two *energeiai*, omitting however to employ the number 'two' when referring to them. Formally, therefore, he complied with the *Psephos* but simultaneously promoted the Dyenergist doctrine. Addressed primarily to Honorius and Sergius,<sup>93</sup> the epistle was, according to the *Synodicon Vetus*, confirmed by the synod of bishops in Jerusalem.<sup>94</sup> In addition, as Photius reported, the epistle was supplied with a *florilegium* that favoured two *energeiai*.<sup>95</sup>

Foreseeing that Sophronius would not stop protesting, Sergius became concerned that Rome receive 'correct' information about what had happened in Alexandria. It was possible that Sophronius might send the Pope a report which would favour neither Sergius nor Cyrus. Upon

<sup>89</sup> As Kaegi remarks, Heraclius realized the severity of the Muslim threat as early as 632 or 633 (Kaegi (2002) 230).

<sup>90</sup> Sergius sent the Emperor a letter mentioned in his epistle to Honorius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 546<sup>8-9</sup>; see Winkelmann 39). The Emperor's decree (κέλευσις) is noted in: ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 546<sup>17</sup>; Theophanes (de Boor, 1883 (1963)) 330; George Cedrenus (Spanos, 1838) I 737<sup>3</sup>; John Zonaras, *Epitomae historiarum* (Buettner-Wobst, 1897) III<sup>14</sup> 17; see Winkelmann 37.

<sup>91</sup> See Schönborn (1972) 85.

<sup>92</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 410<sup>13</sup>–494<sup>9</sup> = PG 87, 3148–3200; see CPG 7635; Riedinger (1982) 143–154; Winkelmann 45.

<sup>93</sup> See Schönborn (1972) 100. Photius read a letter addressed to the Pope (*Bibliotheca* 64<sup>13</sup>–65<sup>35</sup>).

<sup>94</sup> *Synodicon Vetus* 131, 110.

<sup>95</sup> *Bibliotheca* 65<sup>36</sup>–67<sup>7</sup>.

receiving the notification that Sophronius had been elected Patriarch of Jerusalem, Sergius decided to send to Rome his own account of the events; after all he knew that by custom the newly elected Patriarch would circulate his official enthronement letter with its profession of Orthodoxy. Sergius must have seen this as an eminent opportunity for Sophronius to criticize Monenergism.<sup>96</sup> Hence, soon after Sophronius' election, Sergius hastened to send a letter to Pope Honorius<sup>97</sup> in which he related the history of the unionist attempts undertaken by Heraclius. He emphasised that it was the Emperor himself who had initiated the unions and also he referred to their theological base. Here Sergius had to be very cautious. Touching on the issue of the single *energeia*, he stressed the distinction of the two natures, *communicatio idiomatum*, and Leo's Tome. Honorius in his reply<sup>98</sup> approved the position of the Patriarch and went even further in admitting a single will in Christ: 'Whence we recognize a single will of the Lord Jesus Christ, because our nature is truly assumed by the Divinity.'<sup>99</sup> Thus, Monothelitism, which existed in embryo in the earlier Monenergist documents, was for the first time proclaimed emphatically in the epistle of Honorius to Sergius. Unintentionally, the Pope triggered off a new phase in the controversy, now Monenergism was left aside and Monothelitism acquired.<sup>100</sup> History does not know a conjunctive mood. Therefore, we will never know whether Monothelitism would ever have emerged if Honorius had not explicitly professed it in his letter.

<sup>96</sup> Sergius' motivation was suggested by Vasilii Bolotov (1994) 462–463.

<sup>97</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 534<sup>4</sup>–546<sup>25</sup>; see CPG 7606; Winkelmann 43. The years of Honorius' pontificate (27 October 625–12 October 638) were happy ones for the Roman Church. He successfully settled the problems with the Lombards, Rome's political rivals in Ravenna, built many churches in Rome, promoted mission in Britain, etc. See Thanner (1989); Winkelmann (2001) p. 213; Tilly, 'Honorius I' *BBKl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/h/honorius\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/h/honorius_i_p.shtml) (10/06/2002).

<sup>98</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 548<sup>3</sup>–558<sup>8</sup>; PL 80, 470–474; Kreuzer (1975) 32–47; see CPG 9375; CPL 1726; Winkelmann 44. There was yet another letter of Honorius to Sergius. Part of it was included in the protocol of the 680/1 council (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 621<sup>20</sup>–625<sup>19</sup>; PL 80, 474–476; Kreuzer (1975) 48–53; see CPG 9377; Winkelmann 47.) In this letter, Honorius informs Sergius that he has sent exhortative communications to Cyrus and Sophronius.

<sup>99</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 551<sup>14–16</sup>.

<sup>100</sup> See Meyendorff (1988) 353–354; Uthemann, *BBKl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios\\_i.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios_i.shtml) (29/05/2003).

#### 2.4. *The Ecthesis*

Heraclius' preoccupation with ecclesiastical reconciliation was relatively short lived. It lasted from 628 to 633, a period of peace between two campaigns against the Persians and the Arabs. In 634 Muslim Arabs invaded the Byzantine Empire and initiated their swift advances into its heartland. The Romans, defeated at Yarmūk in 636, were forced to abandon Syria, which was filled with Arab troops. The latter hastened further into Upper Mesopotamia and annexed Byzantium's huge territories, including the Holy Land. Towards the end of 639 Arabs invaded Egypt and by 641 had captured it. These events turned the attention of the Emperor and the Patriarch away from the cause of Church unity in the Empire. Nevertheless, in the last years of his life Heraclius came back to his Monenergist project and attempted to revitalize it. In 638, he issued the *Ecthesis*,<sup>101</sup> a document released by the Emperor's chancellery and posted in the narthex of Hagia Sophia. Processing all the hallmarks of obligatory law, its main point was to prohibit completely any debate on the numbers of *energeiai* in Christ.<sup>102</sup> Instead of a single *energeia*, however, Christ's single will was openly professed.<sup>103</sup>

As a state document dealing with ecclesiastical affairs, the *Ecthesis* had to be confirmed by an ecclesiastical authority. In the last months before his death (December 638), Sergius convoked a synod to validate the document.<sup>104</sup> The next Patriarch, Pyrrhus (20 December 638–29 June 641; 9 January–1 June 654),<sup>105</sup> repeated this ecclesiastical ratification of the *Ecthesis* at a synod which he convoked soon after his enthronement.<sup>106</sup> Pyrrhus also released an encyclical letter<sup>107</sup> on the rulings of the synod.

<sup>101</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 156<sup>20</sup>–162<sup>13</sup>; see CPG 7607; Winkelmann 50; Bolotov (1994) 475–476.

<sup>102</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 160<sup>4–13</sup>.

<sup>103</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 160<sup>14–19, 22–24, 25–29</sup>.

<sup>104</sup> A fragment of the decree issued by the council was included in the protocols of the Lateran council (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 164<sup>22</sup>–166<sup>35</sup>). Grumel dates the council to November 638 (1972). See Winkelmann 51; Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 65.

<sup>105</sup> See van Dieten (1972) 57–75, 104–105; *PmbZ* 6386; Winkelmann *Der m.-m. Streit* 257–258; article of E. Reichert in *BBKl* <http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/p/pyrrhos.shtml> (29/05/2003).

<sup>106</sup> Fragments of its acts survive among the documents of the Lateran: ACO<sub>2</sub> I 168<sup>3</sup>–170<sup>7</sup>. Grumel dates the synodal decree to the end 638–beginning 639; see CPG 7615; Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 65; Grumel (1972) 294; van Dieten (1972) 59–61; Winkelmann, 55.

<sup>107</sup> While its text does not survive, it was mentioned in a letter of Pope John IV to the Emperor Constans (PL 80, 603<sup>ab</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 168<sup>13</sup>); see Grumel (1972) 295; van Dieten

According to Pheidas, this document was supported by all five Patriarchs at the time, namely, Honorius of Rome, Sergius of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria,<sup>108</sup> Macedonius of Antioch,<sup>109</sup> and Sergius of Jerusalem.<sup>110</sup> Undoubtedly they convened local synods in order to affirm this imperial document,<sup>111</sup> which in fact was an attempt to implement the authority of the concordance between the five Patriarchs (*pentarchy*). This, however, put in danger the authority of an ecumenical council and in the case of the *Ekthesis*, the *pentarchy* was called to substitute for an ecumenical council.<sup>112</sup>

Why did the Emperor decide to promote Monothelitism? Since, it is widely accepted that the *Ekthesis* was a response to Sophronius' encyclical letter,<sup>113</sup> why was it not issued in 634, but five years later? Was it that Heraclius wanted once more to attract the Monophysites?<sup>114</sup> Did he expect the new formula to be implemented at some future date, given that the Romans had by that time not lost hope of recapturing the occupied territories? Could it also have been that he wanted to sum up and reconfirm the achievements of his ecclesiastical policy before leaving the political scene?<sup>115</sup> Or, again, now that he was nearing the end of his life had he really come to believe that Monenergism-Monothelitism was the true Orthodoxy that had to be confessed unanimously throughout the Empire? Perhaps by issuing the *Ekthesis* he was leaving to his successor his legacy in ecclesiastical matters. In my opinion none of these suggestions is entirely convincing. Heraclius' motives remain obscure

---

(1972) 61; Winkelmann 56. As Grumel suggests, this letter, circulated—he believes—in 639, is probably identical to the δογματικός τόμος mentioned by Pope Agatho (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 108<sup>8,12</sup> = PL 87, 1203<sup>c</sup>).

<sup>108</sup> Sergius sent Cyrus a letter with the *Ekthesis* attached. The letter does not survive, though is mentioned in the reply of Cyrus to Sergius (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 172<sup>12</sup>; Winkelmann 52). According to Grumel, Sergius' letter—one of his last—was sent in November 638. In his reply to Sergius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 172; see CPG 7612; Winkelmann 53), Cyrus enthusiastically approved of the *Ekthesis*.

<sup>109</sup> Patriarch from 639 to after 649; see *PmbZ* 4678; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) p. 235.

<sup>110</sup> See *PmbZ* 6575; Winkelmann (2001) p. 260.

<sup>111</sup> See Pheidas (1995) 738–739.

<sup>112</sup> See Pheidas (1995) 750.

<sup>113</sup> See, for instance, Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 61.

<sup>114</sup> See Haldon (1990) 301.

<sup>115</sup> As Kaegi remarks, 'there were various motives for the publication of the *Ekthesis*. Heraclius hoped to settle remaining issues before his death, including the thorny problem of the imperial succession, theological disputes, and the Patriarchate. He probably also wished to show that he and his government could still do something. He may have timed its issuance for the centenary of Severos of Antioch's death in 638.' (2002) 269.

and they are probably one of the chief enigmas in the history of the controversy. What can be said with some measure of certainty is that he had compelling reasons to issue this kind of document.

Patriarch Sergius, the faithful companion of Heraclius for almost thirty years, died on 9 December 638. The Emperor, also elderly, wanted to see a similar Patriarch on the Constantinopolitan throne. Pyrrhus appeared to be the ideal person to replace Sergius. He continued to implement the cause of Monothelitism and was also sufficiently amenable, as can be seen in his vulnerability during the dispute with Maximus. In due course Pyrrhus became one of only a few persons in whom the old Emperor confided.<sup>116</sup> It is significant that Heraclius, realising that death was fast approaching, entrusted to Pyrrhus a significant sum of money to support the unpopular empress Martina, 'so she would not be lacking funds if she were driven out of the palace by her stepson, the Emperor Constantine.'<sup>117</sup> Pyrrhus, however, did not fulfil Heraclius' wishes. Following the latter's death, he yielded to pressure from the Emperor's treasurer Philagrius, and surrendered the sum to him. Philagrius, in turn, used the money to fight against Martina and her sons. In these events, the conformism and maleability of Pyrrhus became once more apparent.

Before and during his patriarchate, Pyrrhus produced several theological treatises in support of Monenergism-Monothelitism, among which the sources mention the following:

- a) *Encyclical letter*.<sup>118</sup>
- b) *Tomus dogmaticus*, of which only a fragment survived.<sup>119</sup> Here Pyrrhus admitted that the famous phrase from ps-Dionysius' epistle to Gaius was deliberately changed from 'a new theandric *energeia*' to 'one new theandric *energeia*.' He affirmed that this did not affect the sense of the phrase.
- c) *Epistle to Pope John IV*. Fragments from it were quoted at the 680/1 council.<sup>120</sup>

<sup>116</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 275.

<sup>117</sup> Nicephorus, *Short History* 29, 79.

<sup>118</sup> Testified in Mansi 10, 683<sup>ab</sup> = PL 80, 603<sup>ab</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 168<sup>13-34</sup>; see Winkelmann 56.

<sup>119</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 152<sup>27-39</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 606<sup>19-6085</sup>; see Winkelmann 57.

<sup>120</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 626<sup>4-9</sup>; see CPG 7616; Grumel (1972) 296. According to Grumel, it was sent in 641.

- d) Six books, mentioned at the thirteenth session of the 680/1 council.<sup>121</sup> In them Pyrrhus, apart from other general theological topics, referred specifically to Christ's *energeiai* and wills. Some of the texts were written in Pyrrhus' own hand.

After Heraclius' death on 11 February 641, two hostile factions instigated a struggle for the succession. Initially Heraclius' second wife, Martina, and her son Heracleonas, gained the upper hand, but shortly they were overcome by the faction supporting Heraclius' successors from his first wife, Eudocia. Heraclius' eleven-year-old grandson, Constans II (641–668),<sup>122</sup> finally became Emperor and, as a result, Pyrrhus, who had sided with the party of Martina, was deposed. He was replaced by Paul II (1 October 641–27 December 653).<sup>123</sup>

### 2.5. *Maximus and the West: strategic alliance*

Following his deposition, Pyrrhus went to Carthage where he expected to gain the support of the exarch Gregory, an opponent of Constantinople.<sup>124</sup> Gregory had made Dyothelitism not only a part of his political agenda but also a motto for resistance to Constans II.<sup>125</sup> In this context, he gladly harboured Dyothelite refugees from the East and supported initiatives for the refutation of the imperial doctrine of Monothelitism. In Carthage Pyrrhus met Maximus, whom he had by then known for some years. As far back as late 633 or early 634, Pyrrhus, then abbot at the monastery of Chrysopolis, asked Maximus to express his opinion concerning the *Psephos*.<sup>126</sup> In reply,<sup>127</sup> Maximus endorsed the document as suspending any further advance of Monenergism. He praised Patriarch Sergius as a new Moses for issuing the *Psephos*, and complimented Pyrrhus.<sup>128</sup>

<sup>121</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 586<sup>8–11</sup>. According to Winkelmann (n. 58), the books were written between 638 and 641.

<sup>122</sup> See *PmbZ* 3691; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 221–224.

<sup>123</sup> See van Dieten (1972) 76–103; *PmbZ* 5763; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 247–248.

<sup>124</sup> See Winkelmann (2001) p. 208.

<sup>125</sup> See Cameron (1978) 29–62, esp. 38–51.

<sup>126</sup> See Sherwood 42; Winkelmann 41. According to Sherwood, 'with this he (= Maximus) must have received a copy of Sergius' *sentence* (*Psephos*).'

<sup>127</sup> *Ep* 19 PG 91, 589–597; see Sherwood 42; Winkelmann 42. Sherwood dates the epistle end 633, early 634.

<sup>128</sup> *Ep* 19 PG 91, 592<sup>c</sup>.



Twelve years later, Maximus would express his regret for what he had written in that letter.<sup>129</sup> Although in the early stages of his theological activity Maximus obeyed the *Psephos* and avoided any open confrontation with Monenergism, he occasionally mentioned the issue of Christ's *energeia* and will. In an early reply to Abbot Pyrrhus, he emphasised the two wills. Of relevance to the *energeiai* and wills debate were the early works of Maximus, such as *Definitions of unions*,<sup>130</sup> *Answer to the arguments of the Monenergists*,<sup>131</sup> *Letter to George, very revered priest and superior who asked by letter about the mystery that is in Christ*,<sup>132</sup> *Various definitions*<sup>133</sup> etc.<sup>134</sup>

Maximus launched criticism against Monenergism and Monothelitism probably around 640.<sup>135</sup> Of importance among his openly anti-Monenergist and anti-Monothelite writings before 645 were the *Letter to bishop Nicandrus*,<sup>136</sup> *Dogmatic tomes to the priest Marinus*,<sup>137</sup> *Letter*

<sup>129</sup> See *OpuscThPol* 9, 129<sup>c</sup>–132<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>130</sup> *OpuscThPol* 18, 213–216; see Sherwood 22; CPG 7697; Winkelmann 17. The third type of union considered by Maximus, the habitual one, refers to the notion of will. This definition, according to Sherwood, 'would seem to place the whole group in the early period of ep. 2 and *Ambigua* II,' i.e. before 626.

<sup>131</sup> *OpuscThPol* 5, 64; see Sherwood 40; CPG 7697<sup>5</sup>; Winkelmann 35. According to Sherwood, the treatise was written 'by 633... Clearly this belongs to the Monoenergistic stage of debate; probably also before the *Psephos* (634) as there is no hesitation in speaking of 1 and 2 operations.'

<sup>132</sup> *OpuscThPol* 4, 56–61; see Sherwood 48; Winkelmann 48. According to Sherwood, it was published between 634 and 640. Here Maximus touches on the question of conflicting wills in Christ (60<sup>a</sup>). As Larchet remarks, 'C'est dans cet opuscule en tout cas que l'on trouve la première position de Maxime contre le monothélisme.' (1998) 27.

<sup>133</sup> *OpuscThPol* 14; see Sherwood 50; CPG 7697<sup>14</sup>; Winkelmann 61. This is a collection of various definitions relevant to Triadological and Christological terminology. Definitions of *energeia* and 'will' were placed at the end (PG 91, 152<sup>b</sup>–153<sup>b</sup>; Epiphanovitch (1917) 68–70; *DoctPatrum* 256<sup>1–6</sup>). As Sherwood suggests, 'it may be that the definitions of *energeia* and will were added to a series already formed for Monophysite controversy.' He further affirms that it was highly improbable these definitions were composed after the *Ecthesis* became known to Maximus.

<sup>134</sup> Sherwood indicates some other treatises in which the distinction of gnostic and natural wills was made: *OpuscThPol* 2 and 3 of the year 645 (PG 91, 44<sup>cd</sup> and 48<sup>d</sup>), *OpuscThPol* 7 of the year 642 (PG 91, 81<sup>d</sup>), *OpuscThPol* 20 composed by 640 (PG 91, 233<sup>c</sup>), and *OpuscThPol* 16 written before 643 (PG 91, 185<sup>d</sup>, 188<sup>b</sup>, 192<sup>bc</sup>).

<sup>135</sup> See Louth (1996) 48.

<sup>136</sup> *OpuscThPol* 8, 89–112; see Sherwood 61; Winkelmann 63. According to Sherwood, its date 'must be about 640.'

<sup>137</sup> *OpuscThPol* 7, 69–89; see Sherwood 73; CPG 7697<sup>7</sup>; Winkelmann 59 and *OpuscThPol* 20, 228–245; see Sherwood 49; CPG 7697<sup>20</sup>; Winkelmann 60.

to abbot Thalassius,<sup>138</sup> *That it is impossible to say one will of Christ*,<sup>139</sup> *Ten chapters on the two wills of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ*,<sup>140</sup> *A comment on the passage of Matthew: Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me (Matt 26, 39)*,<sup>141</sup> *From the things asked by the monk Theodore*,<sup>142</sup> *letter to John the Chamberlain*,<sup>143</sup> *On the two wills of the One Christ our God*,<sup>144</sup> *Solution of the Theodore's questions*,<sup>145</sup> *letter to Peter the Illustis*,<sup>146</sup> *Definitions of the will*,<sup>147</sup> *Definitions of the energeia*<sup>148</sup> etc.

Hence by the time Pyrrhus arrived at Carthage to meet Maximus, the latter had developed active theoretical opposition to Monothelitism and Monenergism: clashes between them were inevitable. In 645, they held a formal theological debate under the auspices of the exarch Gregory.<sup>149</sup>

<sup>138</sup> Only a fragment survives: Mansi 10, 677–678, which was translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (PL 129, 583<sup>d</sup>–586<sup>b</sup>); see CPG 7702; Sherwood 60; Winkelmann 62. Sherwood dates the letter 640, after Maximus received a copy of the *Ecthesis*.

<sup>139</sup> *OpuscThPol* 24, 268; see Sherwood 62; Winkelmann 64. This letter is addressed to an uncertain person who shared Monothelite views.

<sup>140</sup> *OpuscThPol* 25, 269–273; see Sherwood 63; Winkelmann 65. Addressed to a Dyothelite and composed ca 640. Maximus defines various terms relevant to will.

<sup>141</sup> *OpuscThPol* 6, 65–69; see Sherwood 64; Winkelmann 66. The text, according to Sherwood, ‘would date... at least from the first period of open opposition, 640–2.’

<sup>142</sup> *OpuscThPol* 26, 276–280; Epiphaniou (1917) 67; *DoctPatrum* 261<sup>28</sup>–262<sup>10</sup>; see Sherwood 65; Winkelmann 67. The text contains definitions of *nature*, *ousia*, *individual*, *hypostasis* followed by a brief *florilegium* of twelve texts, among which two belong to Maximus.

<sup>143</sup> *Ep.* 12, PG 91, 460–509; see Sherwood 66; Diehl (1959) 543–547; van Dieten (1972) 68; Winkelmann 71; sent in November–December 641. It provides almost no information on the theological aspects of the controversy, but speaks mostly about its historical background.

<sup>144</sup> *OpuscThPol* 16, 184–212; see CPG 7697<sup>16</sup>; Sherwood 74; Winkelmann 84. Sherwood suggests that it was composed ‘when first the controversy became openly Monothelite. Some time therefore after 643 seems indicated.’ This is the most extensive treatise by Maximus on the *energeiai* and wills in Christ.

<sup>145</sup> *OpuscThPol* 19, 217–228; see CPG 7697<sup>19</sup>; Sherwood 75; Winkelmann 86. According to Beck, the text was composed after Paul was elected Patriarch (641–653) (1959) 433; Sherwood: ‘642 or after.’ This is an answer to two theological questions posed by the deacon Theodore.

<sup>146</sup> The fragments, copied by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, had as their main point of interest the views of Maximus on the Roman see (*OpuscThPol* 12, 141–146; PL 129, 573–576; see CPG 7697; Sherwood 76; Winkelmann 88). According to Sherwood, ‘the letter must be dated not only after Pyrrhus’ deposition (Sept. 29, 641) but after Pope John’s death (Oct. 11, 642) ...—in 643 or 644.’

<sup>147</sup> Epiphaniou (1917) 72–75; see CPG 7707<sup>24</sup>; Winkelmann 90.

<sup>148</sup> Epiphaniou (1917) 76; see CPG 7707<sup>25</sup>; Winkelmann 91.

<sup>149</sup> *Disputatio* PG 91, 288–353/Doucet (1972); see CPG 7698; Sherwood 78; van Dieten (1972) 84; Winkelmann 92; Bolotov (1994) 479–482.

Pyrrhus, defeated, departed to Rome with the intention of accepting Dyothelite Orthodoxy from the Pope. However, as subsequent events would show, he was moved to Orthodoxy more by the desire to gain the political support of Gregory and the West in order to regain the patriarchal throne.<sup>150</sup> When he learnt in 647 that Gregory had been murdered (eliminating, therefore, the possibility of utilising his political support) he went to Ravenna and made his peace with the Monothelites. As a result, he was excommunicated by Pope Theodore who pointedly signed the decree with a pen dipped in a Eucharistic chalice.

Meanwhile, Maximus continued his activities against Monothelitism by writing and organizing resistance in North Africa and Italy. During this period he composed the following texts relevant to the controversy: *Letter to the Cypriot Presbyter Marinus*,<sup>151</sup> *To Marinus the very pious priest*,<sup>152</sup> *Chapters from the treatise about energeiai and wills*,<sup>153</sup> *Chapters about the properties of the two natures of Christ*,<sup>154</sup> *Thirteen chapters on the wills*,<sup>155</sup> *Ten chapters on the wills and energeiai*,<sup>156</sup> and *To the Christ-loving Fathers, superiors, monks, dwelling here in Sicily and the Orthodox people*.<sup>157</sup> This output soon saw results, and a series

<sup>150</sup> See Bolotov (1994) 479.

<sup>151</sup> *OpuscThPol* 10, 133–137; Latin excerpts from the letter were copied by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (PL 129, 577–578); see CPG 7697<sup>10</sup>; Sherwood 79; Winkelmann 93. It was composed, according to Sherwood, in 645–646: ‘The time of the debate with Pyrrhus, or the month before departure for Rome, seem most probable.’

<sup>152</sup> *OpuscThPol* 1–3, 9–37, 40–45, 45–56; see CPG 7697<sup>1–3</sup>; Sherwood 80–82; Winkelmann 94. A collection of excerpts from a number of letters written by Maximus to Marinus which, according to Sherwood, were written in 645–646.

<sup>153</sup> Chapters 8, 50, 51 from the *OpuscThPol* 3: Epiphaniovitch (1917) 72–75; PG 91, 40–56; see CPG 9697<sup>2–3</sup>; Sherwood 81–82; Winkelmann 84<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>154</sup> Winkelmann gives this common title to the three chapters published by Epiphaniovitch (1917) 62. These chapters were taken from Cod. Mosq. gr. 247 and have the following titles: 1. *Of the same, of the properties of the two natures of Christ*, ch. 58 (*OpuscThPol* 3<sup>a</sup>); 2. *Of the same, from that on the wills and self-determinations of Christ*, ch. 59 (*OpuscThPol* 3<sup>b</sup>); 3. *Of the same, from ch. 92* (*OpuscThPol* 3<sup>c</sup>). On the text see CPG 7707<sup>17</sup>; Sherwood 83–85; Winkelmann 95. Epiphaniovitch suggested that the chapters were an elaboration of Maximus’ texts composed by John the Damascene. Sherwood, however, disagreed with this suggestion: ‘The authorship of these three pieces can...be finally determined only by a careful study of the relations of Maximus and the Damascene. A *prima facie* supposition, however, would seem to favor Maximus.’ Sherwood 54. The collection should be dated, according to Sherwood, to 645–646.

<sup>155</sup> Epiphaniovitch (1917) 64; see CPG 7707<sup>18</sup>; Winkelmann 96.

<sup>156</sup> Epiphaniovitch (1917) 66; see CPG 7707<sup>19</sup>; Winkelmann 97.

<sup>157</sup> *OpuscThPol* 9, 112–132; see CPG 7697<sup>9</sup>; Sherwood 86; Winkelmann 102. This is an apology by Maximus, addressed to the people of Sicily, against the accusation that he professes three wills and three *energeiai* in Christ. Before submitting this apology,

of local councils against Monothelitism was held in Western Europe<sup>158</sup> and North Africa.<sup>159</sup>

After the death of Honorius, Severinus succeeded to the Roman see.<sup>160</sup> Although his pontificate only lasted around two months, he was able to oppose the *Ecthesis*. His successor, John IV (24 December 640–12 October 642),<sup>161</sup> convened a synod which condemned Monenergism–Monothelitism and anathematized Sergius, Cyrus, and Pyrrhus.<sup>162</sup> A conciliar definition was sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople and to the Emperor. In his reply to John,<sup>163</sup> Heraclius, among other things, shifted responsibility for the *Ecthesis* onto Sergius. Following the death of Heraclius on 11 February 641 Heraclius Constantine also known as Constantine III, Heraclius' son from his first wife Eudocia, became the new Emperor (11 February 641–24 May 641). The West expected that the new Emperor would change his policy on Monothelitism. These expectations were expressed in a letter by Pope John to Heraclius Constantine,<sup>164</sup> in which the Pontiff tried to justify Honorius. He also condemned the efforts of Pyrrhus towards promotion of the heresy. Heraclius Constantine, however, soon died, having been poisoned by his stepmother Martina, or so it was believed. The new Emperor, proclaimed Constans II, addressed two letters to Pope John that survive

---

Maximus defended his faith orally. The text was written in Sicily 'from 646 or after; and doubtless before the Lateran council.' (Sherwood 86.)

<sup>158</sup> Councils at Orlean (Hefele(1895) vol. 5, 69–70) and Rome (Hefele(1895) vol. 5, 92–93).

<sup>159</sup> Councils at Numidia, Mauritania, Byzacene, and probably Carthage (see Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 89–93). These councils issued the following documents which were read out at the council of Lateran: 1. *Synodal epistle of the Church of Byzacium to Emperor Constans II* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 74–76; see CPG 9394; CPL 976; Winkelmann 99); 2. *Letter of Victor, the bishop of Cartage, to Pope Theodore* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 98–102; PL 80, 637–644; PL 87, 85–92; see CPG 9396; CPL 874; van Dieten (1972) 86; Winkelmann 100); 3. *Letter of bishops of the Archdiocese of Proconsularia to Patriarch Paul* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 81–95; CPG 9395; CPL 877; Winkelmann 101); 4. *Synodal epistle of three African bishops* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 67–71); see CPG 9393; CPL 875; Winkelmann 98.

<sup>160</sup> See Pulsfort in the *BBKI* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/severinus\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/severinus_p.shtml) (29/05/2003).

<sup>161</sup> See *PmbZ* 2689; Winkelmann (2001) p. 220; an article by Schulz, *BBKI* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/johannes\\_IV.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/johannes_IV.shtml) (10/06/2002).

<sup>162</sup> *Libellus Synodicus* (Mansi 10, 607–610); Theophanes (de Boor, 1883 (1963)) 331; see Hefele(1895) vol. 5, 67; Winkelmann 67<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>163</sup> A fragment is published in CCh.SG 39, p. 4l = PG 90, 125<sup>ab</sup> = PL 129, 615<sup>d</sup>. The letter was sent at the beginning of 641 but before the 11 February, when Heraclius died; see CPG 9382; Winkelmann 68.

<sup>164</sup> Mansi 10, 682–686 = PL 129, 561–566; see CPG 9383; Winkelmann 69.

in Arabic translation.<sup>165</sup> Here Constans II expressed his intention to be reconciled with Rome and to abandon whatever innovation had been adopted during the years that had passed. He fulfilled his promise, but only in part and not until six years later, by issuing the *Typos*. At the same time Paul, a committed Monothelite, replaced Pyrrhus as Patriarch of Constantinople. Paul's Monothelitism is obvious from his epistles<sup>166</sup> and from the collection of his writings examined at the 680/1 council.<sup>167</sup>

Meanwhile, in November 642, a new Pontiff was elected: Theodore, a Greek refugee from Palestine<sup>168</sup> whose contribution to the rejection of Monothelitism was very substantial. On the one hand, he attempted to convince the East to abandon the doctrine<sup>169</sup> and on the other hand, he began to prepare for a major council at which he wanted Monothelitism to be condemned outright. To this end he collaborated closely with Maximus, who arrived in Rome in 646. There Maximus, probably with the assistance of the Pope, embarked upon *florilegia* in favour of the Dyothelite doctrine.<sup>170</sup> As Jean Pierres has shown, 27 of the 161

<sup>165</sup> 1) CSCO 50, p. 335; Latin translation PG 111, 1111<sup>ab</sup>. 2) Cod. Vat. syr. 130, fol. 80b; CPG 9385; van Dieten (1972) 79; Winkelmann 75.

<sup>166</sup> See his synodical letter to Pope Theodore mentioned by Pope Martin at the council of Lateran (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 18<sup>8-12</sup>); see Grumel (1972) 299; Winkelmann 76. According to Martin, Paul not only agreed with the Monothelite policy of his predecessors, but also eagerly supported it and probably added some fresh arguments in defence of it. There is yet another letter by Paul to Pope Theodore (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 196–204; PG 87, 91–99; see CPG 7620; Grumel (1972) 300; van Dieten (1972) 90; Winkelmann 104). It was sent in reply to the request of the *apocrisarii* of Pope Theodore. Paul here once again appears to be a consistent Monothelite. According to Grumel, the letter was sent in 646 or 647, while in the CPG May 645 is suggested.

<sup>167</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 586<sup>12-17</sup>; see Winkelmann 73.

<sup>168</sup> 24 May 642–14 May 649; see *PmbZ* 7769; Winkelmann (2001) p. 274; Kreuzer, 'Theodor I', *BBKI* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor_i_p.shtml) (13/10/2002).

<sup>169</sup> Theodore despatched a series of epistles to the Emperor, the Patriarch and the eastern bishops persuading them to abandon Monothelitism: a) *Letter to Constans II*, which survives in two Arabic translations (see CPL 1731; CPG 9386; van Dieten (1972) 80–82; Winkelmann 77). This was sent at the end of 642 or beginning of 643 (CPG 9386). b) *Letter to Patriarch Paul* (Mansi 10, 702–705 = PL 87, 75–80 = PL 129, 577–582; see CPL 1732; CPG 9387; van Dieten (1972) 80–82; Winkelmann 79). Here Theodore condemns Pyrrhus's policy and appeals to Paul urging him to abandon it. According to Caspar, the letter was sent before the 29 May 643 (Caspar (1930) II 544). c) *Propositio* (Mansi 10, 705 = PL 87, 80–82 = PL 129, 581; see CPL 1732; CPG 9388; Winkelmann 80). d) *Letter to bishops who consecrated Paul of Constantinople* (Mansi 10, 706–708 = PL 87, 81f = PL 129, 581–584; see CPL 1732; CPG 9389; van Dieten (1972) 80–82; Winkelmann 81). Here the Pope again condemns Pyrrhus. According to Caspar, the letter was sent before 29 May 643 (Caspar (1930) II 544). See also the notification of another letter by Theodore to Patriarch Paul (*Liber Pontificalis* I 333; Winkelmann 107).

<sup>170</sup> On the Pope's involvement, see Caspar (1932) 75–137.

testimonies presented to the Lateran council were penned by Maximus who also designed the theological outlines and even the drafts of the speeches for the prospective participants at the anticipated council. As indicated below, many of the arguments and theological points expressed by the different speakers at the Lateran council repeat the theses in Maximus' writings. Moreover, as Riedinger has shown, the initial text of the council's acts, in Greek, was probably written by Maximus.<sup>171</sup>

## 2.6. *The Typos*

Because of the active resistance of the West, which eventually led to a break in communion between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, Constans II was threatened by the loss of ties with this region, as well as the loss of the eastern provinces and Egypt to the Arabs. He was, therefore, forced to revise and soften his policy over the Christological issues. As a result, the *Ecthesis* was removed from the narthex of Hagia Sophia, and in 648 a new regulating document—the *Typos*—was released.<sup>172</sup>

According to western sources and to information from Stephan of Dora, Constans had been persuaded to issue the *Typos* by Patriarch Paul. As with the *Ecthesis*, it prohibited any use of controversial formulas. Now, together with the *energeiai*, expressions about Christ's one or two wills were prohibited:

We declare to our Orthodox subjects that, from the present moment, they no longer have permission in any way to contend and to quarrel with one another over one will and one energy, or two energies and two wills.<sup>173</sup>

The *Typos* permitted only those phrases approved by Church tradition:

We should follow only the Holy Scriptures and the five deliverances of the five holy Œcumenical Synods and the simple utterances and confessions of the approved Fathers.<sup>174</sup>

Thus, as Bolotov has remarked, the difference between the *Typos* and the *Ecthesis* consisted solely in the fact that the former 'had the char-

<sup>171</sup> See Riedinger (1976) 17–38.

<sup>172</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 208–211; see CPG 7621; van Dieten (1972) 92–95; Winkelmann 106.

<sup>173</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 208<sup>19–23</sup>/Hefele(1895) vol. 5, 95–96.

<sup>174</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 208<sup>27–28</sup>/Hefele(1895) vol. 5, 96.

acter of an edict, while the latter was a dogmatic treatise.<sup>175</sup> The *Typos* promoted neither theological formulas nor arguments.

Meanwhile Constans, having withdrawn his active support for Monothelitism, did not abandon it altogether but continued to make use of it, as for example in his reported attempts to reconcile the Armenian Church. In 648 or 649, he issued an order that the Armenian Church must accept the Chalcedonian dogma—an order which the Armenians eventually rejected at the synod of Dvin (649). Moreover, they also concluded a treaty with the Arabs that Armenia should secede from Byzantium and come under Arab authority.

### 2.7. The Lateran council

After the death of Theodore, Pope Martin was elected as his successor (649).<sup>176</sup> From the very beginning of his pontificate, Martin appeared to oppose Monothelitism more so than his predecessors. As such, he assumed the pontificate without the Emperor or the exarch in Ravenna confirming his election. In October 649, shortly after the beginning of his pontificate, he convened a council in the Lateran basilica of Rome. This was the council that had been prepared by Pope Theodore who died before it could be held. One hundred and five bishops, mostly from Italy and Africa, took part. The East was represented by the Palestinian bishop Stephan of Dora,<sup>177</sup> whom Sophronius of Jerusalem had earlier appointed as his *apocrisarius* to Rome. In addition, 'many pious abbots and monks, from among the Greeks' were present.<sup>178</sup>

The synod followed the theological outlines drawn up by Maximus and possibly some other Greek monks. Although it appears to be true,

<sup>175</sup> Bolotov (1994) 482–483.

<sup>176</sup> See Martino I Papa (1992); *PmbZ* 4851; *PBE*; Kreuzer, 'Martin I'; *BBkl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/m/martin\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/m/martin_i_p.shtml) (10/06/2002); Winkelmann (2001) pp. 236–237.

<sup>177</sup> See *PmbZ* 6906; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 267–268; Uthemann, 'Stephan von Dor,' *BBkl* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephan\\_v\\_dor.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephan_v_dor.shtml) (27/09/2002). Stephan addressed a letter to the council (*ACO*<sub>2</sub> I 38–46), in which he condemned Monothelitism and provided important information about the ecclesiastical situation in Palestine. According to van Dieten, the letter was sent not long before the death of Pope Theodore (14.05.649); van Dieten (1972) 96; see Caspar (1930) II 553; Winkelmann, 82.

<sup>178</sup> See the testimony in *ACO*<sub>2</sub> I 208<sup>27–28</sup>; Sansterre (1982) 9–30, 117–119. They submitted their own *libellus* (*ACO*<sub>2</sub> I 48–54; see Caspar (1930) II 556; van Dieten (1972) 92; Winkelmann 108).

as Riedinger suggested,<sup>179</sup> that originally the acts of the council were composed in Greek and then translated into Latin, he has gone too far in affirming that the council as such was a fiction.<sup>180</sup> If this were so, neither Martin nor Maximus would have been condemned and exiled. Moreover, a fabricated council would certainly have been uncovered by the Monothelites and used as a very persuasive argument against the ‘forgeries’ of the Dyothelites. More possible is the view that the bishops were helped and given well-elaborated arguments in the form of drafts composed earlier by Maximus in Greek and then translated into Latin.<sup>181</sup> However understood, the fact is that in defiance of the *Typos*, the council explicitly confirmed the doctrine of the two *energeiai* and wills in Christ, condemned the *Ecthesis* and the *Typos*, and anathematized Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople. Upon completion of the council’s work, copies of its acts and a concluding encyclical letter were dispatched to the Emperor, the eastern Patriarchs, and other bishops and monastic communities in the West, East, and North Africa.<sup>182</sup> Shortly after the

<sup>179</sup> Bibliography on the acts see in Winkelmann 110.

<sup>180</sup> Riedinger, ‘Die Lateransynode von 649 und Maximus der Bekenner.’ In Heinzer and Schönborn (1982) 111.

<sup>181</sup> See Herrin (1987) 253. This theory refutes Riedinger’s objection that western participants at the council could not deliver their speeches because they simply did not speak Greek (Riedinger in Heinzer and Schönborn (1982) 118).

<sup>182</sup> See the epistles of Pope Martin: a) *encyclical* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 404–421; see CPG 9403; CPL 1733; Winkelmann 111); b) *to the bishop of Traiectum (Maastricht) Amandus* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 422–424; see CPL 1733; CPG 9404; Winkelmann 112); c) *to Emperor Constans II* (Mansi 10, 789–798 = PL 87, 137–146; see CPL 1733; CPG 9405; van Dieten (1972) 99; Winkelmann 114); d) *to the Church of Carthage* (Mansi 10, 797–804 = PL 87, 145–146; see CPL 1733; CPG 9405; van Dieten (1972) 99; Winkelmann 114); e) *to John of Philadelphia* (Mansi 10, 805–814 = PL 87, 153–164; see CPL 1733; CPG 9407; van Dieten (1972) 99; Winkelmann 116); f) *to Theodore of Esbus in Arabia* (Mansi 10, 815 = PL 87, 163–166; see CPL 1733; CPG 9408; Winkelmann 117); g) *to Anthony of Bacatha* (Mansi 10, 817 = PL 87, 165–168; see CPL 1733; CPG 9409; Winkelmann 118); h) *to George the Archimandrite of the monastery of St Theodosius* (Mansi 10, 819f = PL 87, 167; see CPL 1733; CPG 9410; Winkelmann, 119); i) *to Pantaleon* (Mansi 10, 819–824 = PL 87, 169–174; see CPL 1733; CPG 9411; Winkelmann 120); j) *to Peter the Illustris* (Mansi 10, 825–826 = PL 87, 173–176; see CPL 1733; CPG 9412; Winkelmann, 121); k) *to the Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch* (Mansi 10, 827–832 = PL 87, 175–180; see CPL 1733; CPG 9415; van Dieten (1972) 99; Winkelmann 122); l) *to Paul of Thessalonica* (Mansi 10, 833–844 = PL 87, 181–192; see CPL 1733; CPG 9414; Winkelmann 123); m) *to the Church of Thessalonica* (Mansi 10, 843–850 = PL 87, 191–198; see CPL 1733; CPG 9415; Winkelmann 124).



council Maximus wrote a letter<sup>183</sup> in which he seems to have counted the Lateran convocation among the ecumenical councils.<sup>184</sup>

In ecclesiastical terms, this was a triumph for Dyothelitism. In political terms, however, it was a rebellion which had to be punished accordingly.<sup>185</sup> The exarch Olympius, who resided in Ravenna, went to Rome in order to arrest Martin for treason. The resistance of the populace, however, and Olympius' own reluctance prevented Martin from being arrested at this time. In the following year a newly appointed exarch, Theodore Kalliopas, successfully accomplished this task: Martin was arrested and brought to Constantinople for trial. The court charged him with treason, and as a result had him deposed, defrocked, and exiled to Chersonese in the Crimea, where he died on 16 September 655.

Maximus himself was also heavily punished. Arrested in Rome and brought to Constantinople for trial, he was initially accused of treason and of supporting the rebellion plotted by the exarch Gregory in Carthage. Such accusations probably comforted the Byzantine authorities, since in the person of Maximus they could also find a scapegoat for the defeat of the Byzantine army in Egypt.<sup>186</sup> Apart from the accusation of treason, Maximus was also indicted for denying the Emperor's right to enter the realm of ecclesiastical authority and define Church doctrine. Eventually he was sent to Byzia in Thrace until 656 when he was recalled to Constantinople for trial then accused, tortured, had his right hand and tongue severed, and exiled to Lazica where he died on 13 August 662. In the same year Patriarch Peter (8 June 654–*ca.* 12 October 666)<sup>187</sup> convened a council in Constantinople, which anathematized Maximus, Martin and Sophronius,<sup>188</sup> and issued a *Psephos* outlining the results of the council.<sup>189</sup>

<sup>183</sup> Only a fragment of the letter survives: *OpuscThPol* 11, 137–140; see CPG 7697<sup>11</sup>; Sherwood 88; Winkelmann 113.

<sup>184</sup> He speaks about six ecumenical councils. Combefis suggested that the sixth one is the Lateran. This interpretation was accepted by some scholars (Grumel, Sherwood, Winkelmann).

<sup>185</sup> On the juridical aspect of the process against Martin and Maximus see the comprehensive study by W. Brandes *Fontes Minores* (1998).

<sup>186</sup> See Kaegi (2002) 295; (1992) 217–218.

<sup>187</sup> See van Dieten (1972) 106–116; *PmbZ* 5941; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 249–250.

<sup>188</sup> See the summary in Mansi 11, 73–76. See also the notification in the confession of Patriarch Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 230); van Dieten (1972) 114; Winkelmann 148<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>189</sup> Testified in PG 90, 169<sup>d</sup>–172<sup>b</sup> = PL 129, 655<sup>d</sup>; see Grumel (1972) 306; van Dieten (1972) 114; Winkelmann 149.

Meanwhile, in Rome, following Martin's deposition, a new Pope, Eugenius I (10 August 654–2 June 657) was elected.<sup>190</sup> Eugenius, in an act of apparent accommodation towards Constantinople, was ready to comply with the *Typos*. Resistance from the populace and the clergy of Rome, however, prevented him from reaching a compromise with Monothelitism. He and his successor Vitalian (30 July 657–27 January 672)<sup>191</sup> restored communion with the Monothelite Patriarch Peter.

### 2.8. *The 680/1 council*

After Constans II's murder on 15 September 668, the throne passed to Constantine IV (668–685).<sup>192</sup> A difficult military situation together with the permanent Arab threat, both inherited from Constans, prevented him from any preoccupation with ecclesiastical affairs. By 670 Arabs had captured Cyprus, Rhodes, Kos, and Cyzicus. Two years later Smyrna also fell. Their ultimate goal, Constantinople, was eventually blockaded by the Arabs for five successive summers. The Byzantines however managed to contain the invaders and even to defeat them in several important battles. In 678 Constantine IV finally forced them to sign a truce for thirty years, thereby creating a breathing space for him to turn to internal affairs, including his ecclesiastical responsibilities. The chief intention behind his religious policy was to allow the Church herself to come to a decision concerning doctrine. The best method for this would be an ecumenical council. As Pheidias remarks, throughout the entire fifty years of the controversy the erroneous tactic of substituting an ecumenical council by the authority of the patriarchal *pentarchy* was applied. Constantine's decision changed this by restoring the authority of the ecumenical council.<sup>193</sup> However, it was not an easy task to implement any resolution under the prevailing conditions of the Arab occupation of the eastern territories and Egypt. Because Churches in these regions were unable to send representatives to Constantinople, a move was taken to convoke a 'conference' of bishops. The Emperor addressed Pope

<sup>190</sup> See Winkelmann (2001) pp. 202–203; Bautz, 'Eugen I,' *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/e/eugen\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/e/eugen_i_p.shtml) (10/06/2002).

<sup>191</sup> See *PmbZ* 8582; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 278–279.

<sup>192</sup> See *PmbZ* 3702; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 225–227.

<sup>193</sup> Pheidias (1995) 570–571.

Donus (2 November 676–11 April 678)<sup>194</sup> in a letter (*sacra*) inviting him to send his representatives to the ‘conference.’<sup>195</sup> By the time the letter reached Rome, however, Donus had died (11 April 679), but the newly elected Pope Agatho (27 June 678–10 January 681)<sup>196</sup> enthusiastically supported the Emperor’s initiative. Deciding first to enlist the support of the Church in the West, Agatho initiated local councils in different occidental provinces, such as Milan and Hatfield in Britain. In addition, a local synod of 125 bishops of the Roman Church was convoked,<sup>197</sup> whose decisions were set out in two ‘suggestions’ (ἀναφοραί) addressed to Constantine. One was sent by the Pope himself<sup>198</sup> and the other by the council.<sup>199</sup> Both were read at the fourth session of the 680/1 council and subsequently were entered into its *Horos*.

Meanwhile the political situation in the East had changed. Since Churches under Arab occupation could now send their representatives to the council, the newly elected Patriarch of Constantinople George I (December 679–February 686)<sup>200</sup> persuaded the Emperor to convert the proposed ‘conference’ into a fully-fledged ecumenical council. This assembly, which in time would be numbered as the sixth ecumenical council, commenced its work on 7 November 680 and lasted until 16 September 681, with eighteen working sessions.<sup>201</sup> The Monothelite party was headed by Patriarch Macarius of Antioch<sup>202</sup> and his disciple

<sup>194</sup> See Winkelmann (2001) p. 201; Bautz, ‘Donus,’ *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/d/donus\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/d/donus_p.shtml) (10/06/2002).

<sup>195</sup> Mansi 11, 196–201 = PL 87, 1147–1154; see CPG 9416; van Dieten (1972) 127; Winkelmann 156.

<sup>196</sup> See *PmbZ* 129, *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 186–187; Bautz, ‘Agatho,’ *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/agatho\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/agatho_p.shtml) (09/06/2002).

<sup>197</sup> See Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 140–142.

<sup>198</sup> Mansi 11, 234–286 = PL 87, 1161–1214; see CPG 9417; CPL 1737; van Dieten (1972) 132–134; Winkelmann 157.

<sup>199</sup> Mansi 11, 286–315 = PL 87, 1215–1248; see CPG 9418; CPL 1737; Winkelmann 158.

<sup>200</sup> See Winkelmann (2001) p. 204.

<sup>201</sup> Bibliography see in Winkelmann 161.

<sup>202</sup> Little is known about Macarius. He inherited the see of Antioch from another Monothelite Patriarch, Macedonius, in November or December 669 and was eventually condemned at the council of 680/1. See *PmbZ* 4670; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 231–234. Some of his writings survive in fragments: *Λόγος προσφωνητικός* addressed to Constans II (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 508<sup>15–19</sup>; see CPG<sub>suppl</sub> 7626<sup>2</sup>; Winkelmann 128); *letter to the African monk and presbyter Luke* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 610<sup>3–4</sup>; see CPG<sub>suppl</sub> 7626<sup>3</sup>; Winkelmann 129); *a third sermon* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 508<sup>3–7</sup>; see CPG<sub>suppl</sub> 7626<sup>1</sup>; Winkelmann 130); *Libellus to Constans II* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 500<sup>13–15</sup>, 504<sup>3</sup>; see Winkelmann 130<sup>a</sup>). On the theology of Macarius see dissertation by Rissberger (1940).

Stephan.<sup>203</sup> Although Stephan was officially the disciple of Macarius, it was more a case of Macarius succumbing to Stephan's influence.<sup>204</sup>

In its first three sessions, the council examined the acts of the third, fourth, and fifth ecumenical councils respectively. In revising the acts of the fifth ecumenical council, the authenticity of the *libellus* attributed to Patriarch Menas was thoroughly investigated, together with two letters ascribed to Pope Vigilius and allegedly addressed to Empress Theodora and Emperor Justinian. The documents were found to be inauthentic. In general, the council was overly occupied with examining the authenticity of various texts. Because of this Adolf von Harnack called it 'the Council of antiquaries and palaeographers',<sup>205</sup> while John Meyendorff remarked that, 'unlike the early councils which tended to debate theological issues for their own sake, the assembly of 680–1 focused on the issue of Tradition. The only question discussed was whether the earlier conciliar decrees and the writings of the Fathers could be used to justify the doctrine of "one *energeia*" and "one will" in Christ.'<sup>206</sup> At the fourth session the two 'suggestions' (ἀναφοραί) issued by Pope Agatho and the local council of Rome were considered. From the fifth and up to the tenth sessions two sets of *florilegia*, the first in favour of the single *energeia* and will, and the second in favour of Christ's two activities and two wills, were scrutinized with the object of establishing the authenticity of the former set.<sup>207</sup> At the eighth session Bishop Theodore of Melitene read out a document (χαρτίον), which contained the main points of the

<sup>203</sup> See *PmbZ* 6920; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 263–267.

<sup>204</sup> For example, in a letter addressed by the council to Constantine, Stephan is characterized as an instructor of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 816<sup>3–4</sup>); see also the letter of Pope Leo to the council (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 878<sup>9</sup>).

<sup>205</sup> Harnack (1961) vol. 4, 261.

<sup>206</sup> Meyendorff (1988) 371.

<sup>207</sup> The following *florilegia* were either reported or examined during the controversy:

I. Dyothelite *florilegia*:

- a) *Florilegium* compiled by Sophronius. See the report of Stephan of Dora (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 40<sup>20</sup>). According to the testimony, it consisted of two books and contained 600 quotes.
- b) *Florilegium* mentioned in the *OpuscThPol* 26 (PG 91, 276–280; see Winkelmann 68). It contained definitions by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Alexander of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, Athanasius of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Diadochus, Anastasius of Antioch, and Nemesius of Emesa on the notions of nature, essence, individuum, and hypostasis.
- c) *Florilegium* concerning the *energeiai* and wills in Christ (Maximus, *OpuscThPol* 27, 280–285; see CPG 7697<sup>27</sup>; Sherwood 77; Winkelmann 89). It is commonly accepted that this *florilegium* was composed by Maximus. According to Sherwood, it might have been composed between 640 and 646.

*Typos*, in particular that neither one nor two wills should be attributed to Christ. Among those who allegedly shared these positions Theodore named Peter of Nicomedia, Solomon of Cleneus, Anthony of Hypæpa, monk Stephan, and five clerics of the Patriarchate. All of them, except Stephan, rejected this charge and presented statements which were considered at the tenth session. Macarius was also called to profess his faith at the eighth session. In response, he presented two statements—the one oral, the other written which are possibly the richest sources for the *credo* of later Monothelitism. At the ninth and tenth sessions, passages of approved Fathers and proven heretics were read and analyzed. At the eleventh session, the synodical letter of Patriarch Sophronius was read out, and at this and the next session, the writings and compilations of

- 
- d) *Spiritual and dogmatic tome addressed to Stephan the most holy bishop of Dora* (*OpuscThPol* 15, 153–184; see CPG 7697<sup>15</sup>; Sherwood 87; Winkelmann 105<sup>a</sup>). This *florilegium* is the most extensive from among those composed by Maximus. The objective here was to show that the *Ecthesis* was contrary to Church tradition and in agreement with the recognized heretics. Sherwood attributes the text to 646–647.
  - e) *Florilegium* by Maximus and his school (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 425–436; Cod. Vatic. gr. 1455, fol. 165<sup>r</sup>–176<sup>r</sup>; see Winkelmann 112<sup>a</sup>).
  - f) *Testimonia Patrum* by Maximus and his school (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 258<sup>l</sup>–314<sup>13</sup>; see CPG 9402<sup>2</sup>; Winkelmann 112<sup>b</sup>).
  - g) *Florilegium* by Maximus and his school (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 84<sup>l</sup>–90<sup>26</sup>; see Winkelmann 112<sup>c</sup>).
  - h) *Florilegium of heretics* by Maximus and his school (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 320<sup>21</sup>–334<sup>35</sup>; see Winkelmann 112<sup>d</sup>).
  - i) *DoctPatrum*.
  - j) *Christological florilegium* in support of Dyothelitism (ed. Diekamp (1938); see Winkelmann 131).
  - k) *Florilegium* by Pope Agatho (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 85<sup>l</sup>–95<sup>27</sup>; see CPG 9423; Winkelmann 157<sup>a</sup>).
  - l) *Dyenergist-Dyothelite florilegium* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 288<sup>l</sup>–308<sup>16</sup>; see CPG<sub>suppl</sub> 9429<sup>1</sup>; Winkelmann 161<sup>a</sup>).
  - m) *Florilegium* from the Cod. Ochrid. Musée nat. 86 (see Winkelmann 174).
- II. Monothelite *florilegia*:
- a) *Florilegium* composed by George Arsas at the request of Patriarch Sergius (see Winkelmann 9<sup>a</sup>).
  - b) *Catens* composed by Macarius of Antioch (see ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 232<sup>24</sup>–260<sup>13</sup>; 268<sup>22</sup>–274<sup>8</sup>; Winkelmann 127).
  - c) *Monothelite florilegium* by Macarius (see ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 168<sup>4–14</sup>; Winkelmann 127<sup>a</sup>).
  - d) *Monothelite florilegium* by Macarius (see ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 176<sup>13–26</sup>; see Winkelmann 127<sup>b</sup>).
  - e) *Florilegium* by the Patriarch Peter (see CCh.SG 39, 101; Winkelmann 145<sup>a</sup>).
  - f) *Monothelite florilegium* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 370<sup>l</sup>–390<sup>4</sup>; CPG<sub>suppl</sub> 9429<sup>2</sup>; Winkelmann 161<sup>b</sup>).
  - g) *An untitled florilegium* in Syriac (Cod. Brit. Mus. Add. 14535, foll. 1<sup>r</sup>–20<sup>r</sup>; see Brock *After Chalcedon* (1985); Winkelmann 170<sup>b</sup>).

Macarius were brought before the council for examination. This resulted in the condemnation of Macarius and the election of a new Patriarch of Antioch, Theophanes. At the thirteenth session, the council studied documents presented from the library of the Patriarchate and written by Theodore of Pharan, Pope Honorius, the Patriarchs of Constantinople Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, Thomas, John, and Constantine. In addition, a study was made of the Pact of the Alexandrian union. At the fourteenth session, the council participants occupied themselves in investigating how the *libellus* ascribed to Patriarch Menas and two letters ascribed to Pope Vigilius were interpolated into the acts of the fifth ecumenical council. They concluded that a forgery had been committed by Paul, Macarius, and Stephan. At the fifteenth session, the council dealt with the case of a fanatic, who was also a monk, Polychronius,<sup>208</sup> who produced a book endorsing Monothelitism, which he claimed God had revealed to him. He asked the council that the book be placed on a dead body, which he believed would be resurrected. A corpse was brought to the public baths of Zeuxippus. Polychronius placed his book on it and ‘whispered’ for ‘many hours,’ as the Acts report. After failing before the eyes of all to produce a miracle, Polychronius was given the chance to change his mind about Monothelitism, but he refused to do so and was later anathematized. At the sixteenth session, another Monothelite credo was scrutinized—that of the priest Constantine from Apamea whose popularist beliefs extolled Monothelitism. Notably, he claimed that Christ had two natures and two *energeiai*, and, simultaneously, a single will that belonged to the ‘person of Christ.’ The human nature of Christ, according to Constantine, also had its own will, but it was stripped away together with ‘flesh and blood’ when Christ was resurrected. Failing to explain his beliefs in sufficient detail, Constantine was condemned by the council. By the end of the session, all teachings on the single *energeia* and will of Christ were denounced and the following were anathematized:<sup>209</sup> Pope Honorius of Rome, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Cyrus the Patriarch of Alexandria, bishop Theodore of Pharan, Macarius the deposed Patriarch of Antioch, Stephan, Polychronius, and a certain Apergius of Perge.<sup>210</sup> Patriarch George’s

<sup>208</sup> See *PmbZ* 6318; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 255–257.

<sup>209</sup> *ACO*<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 580.

<sup>210</sup> This person is apparently identical with Metropolitan Constantine of Perge who in 653 participated in the discussions with Maximus. See Brandes *JÖB* (1998) 35–40; *PmbZ* 3706; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) p. 227.

proposal that the Patriarchs of Constantinople not be denounced, only their teachings, failed to be ratified. Wolfram Brandes has suggested that the papal legates pronounced charges of Monothelitism in order to promote the supermacy of Rome over Constantinople. At the council, they insisted that those Constantinopolitan Patriarchs found guilty of holding Monothelite views be condemned in person. In return, however, they were obliged to endorse the condemnation of Honorius.<sup>211</sup> The final definition (*Horos*) was adopted during the last two sessions. Following the council, the customary series of formal documents was released. They included the Emperor's *Edict*,<sup>212</sup> which was posted in the narthex of Hagia Sophia.

### 2.9. *Attempts at a renewal of Monothelitism*

Macarius, Stephan, and Polychronius, who were judged and subsequently condemned at the council, asked the Emperor to allow them to go to Rome to be sentenced by the Pope.<sup>213</sup> According to Pheidas, this should not be considered as an appeal to the See of Rome because the decision of an ecumenical council could not be revised by any authority and such a practice was in any event, prohibited by the legislation of that time.<sup>214</sup> It seems that the Emperor offered them one more chance to change their minds about Monothelitism. They, however, remained resolute and as a result were enclosed in one of the monasteries of Rome.

Dyenergism-Dyothelitism was finally pronounced as the official doctrine to be accepted throughout the Empire. In February 687 all the chief provincial governors were assembled in Constantinople by Emperor Justinian II (685–695, 705–711)<sup>215</sup> where they listened to the acts of the 680/1 council, signed them, and promised to promote the decisions in

<sup>211</sup> Brandes (2003), 107, 111.

<sup>212</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 832–856; see CPG 9438; Winkelmann 165. See also the epistle of Constantine to Pope Leo II (Mansi 11, 713–717; see CPG 9439; Winkelmann 166); *Sacra* of Constantine to the Roman council (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 856–867 = PL 96, 399–412; see CPG 9440; Winkelmann 167); the epistle of the council to Pope Agatho (Mansi 11, 683–696 = PL 87, 1247–1260; see van Dieten (1972) 142; Winkelmann 164).

<sup>213</sup> In the *sacra* of Constantine to Pope Leo II (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 896<sup>31</sup>).

<sup>214</sup> Pheidas (1995) 758.

<sup>215</sup> See *PmbZ* 3556; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 218–220.

their regions. Prior to this, a similar procedure was conducted with the palace officials, soldiers, and imperial guards.<sup>216</sup>

The issue of Monothelitism, however, did not disappear entirely after the 680/1 council. When in 711 Philippicus became Emperor,<sup>217</sup> he aspired to imitate Heraclius and in so doing restored Monothelitism as an official doctrine of the Empire. Philippicus' Armenian background may also have affected this decision.<sup>218</sup> He first informed the Pope about his intention by issuing a *sacra*<sup>219</sup> and in 712, he convened a council in Constantinople, which condemned the 680/1 council and reconfirmed Monothelitism.<sup>220</sup> Based on the results of the council, a *Tomus dogmaticus* by Patriarch John VI (December 712–July 715)<sup>221</sup> was issued, of which only a few references survive.<sup>222</sup> In the attempt to erase the memory of the council, Philippicus commanded that its depiction in the imperial palace be destroyed together with the commemorative inscription on the palace's Million gates. In place of the latter, he mounted his own portrait and an image of Patriarch Sergius.<sup>223</sup>

The restoration of Monothelitism resulted in energetic resistance from the West. Pope Constantine (25 March 708–9 April 715)<sup>224</sup> returned Philippicus' portrait which the Emperor had sent to Rome, and rejected his Monothelite profession of faith. Philippicus' name was also excluded from the commemorations. In addition, the Pope decreed that representations of the six ecumenical councils be painted in St Peter's cathedral. On 3 June 713, Philippicus was deposed by the army and blinded; he was succeeded by Anastasius II. One of the new Emperor's first acts

<sup>216</sup> See the letter of Emperor Justinian to Pope John V (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 886–887 = PL 96, 425–428; see CPG 9442; van Dieten (1972) 146–148; Winkelmann 169), in which he states that he ordered the acts of the council to be kept in the archives and to be read to the higher ranks of the civil and ecclesiastical hierarchy. The epistle was sent on 17 February 687.

<sup>217</sup> See *PmbZ* 6150; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 253–255.

<sup>218</sup> See Haldon (1990) 78–79.

<sup>219</sup> See Winkelmann 176. Sent soon after December 11, 711.

<sup>220</sup> See Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 257–259; Winkelmann 177.

<sup>221</sup> See van Dieten (1972) 166–173; *PmbZ* 2954; *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) p. 214.

<sup>222</sup> Mansi 12, 192<sup>c</sup>–193<sup>a</sup>; Theophanes (de Boor, 1883 (1963)) 382; Cedrenus 784<sup>15–20</sup>; see van Dieten (1972) 167–169; Winkelmann 177. See also the letter of Patriarch John to Pope Constantine sent in the first four months of 712 (Mansi 12, 200<sup>b,c</sup> = PG 96, 1420<sup>d</sup>–1421<sup>a</sup>; see Grumel (1972) 321; van Dieten (1972) 169–171; Winkelmann 178). In this letter, the Patriarch insisted upholding on the Monothelite doctrine.

<sup>223</sup> See Grabar (1984) 48 ff.

<sup>224</sup> See *PmbZ* 1170, *PBE*; Winkelmann (2001) pp. 199–200; Breukelaar, 'Konstantin I,' *BBKL* [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/k/Konstantin\\_I.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/k/Konstantin_I.shtml) (10/06/2002).



was to restore Dyothelitism. He immediately informed the Pope of this by a special *sacra*.<sup>225</sup> Patriarch John VI, forced to apologize for his support of Monothelitism, wrote a letter<sup>226</sup> to the Pope assuring him that he had always been Orthodox. In his words, it was the Emperor who had compelled him to restore Monothelitism, and he yielded to his authority only by dispensation.

In 715, when Germanus ascended the patriarchal throne,<sup>227</sup> he convoked a council that permanently condemned Monothelitism and the council of 712. From this gathering, which reconfirmed the definitions of the 680/1 council,<sup>228</sup> a formal letter was issued<sup>229</sup> that anathematized Patriarchs Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, and John, and proclaimed faith in Christ's two natures, two wills, and two *energeiai*.

## 2.10. *The Maronites*

Monothelitism had been initiated by state and Church authorities. An artificial doctrine, it was designed by the élite and imposed on the broader masses. Did the élite succeed in making it popular? As the Arab conquest of Egypt showed, Monothelitism failed to gain any significant popularity, unlike Severianism which had truly become the people's faith. At the same time, in the eastern parts of the Empire, Monothelitism was received by the local communities, as is made evident, for example, in the acts of the sixth ecumenical council.

During the council's sixteenth session, held on 9 August 681, a cardinal issue under discussion was the confession of faith submitted by one Constantine, a Syrian priest from Apamea. His submission aimed at reconciling the Monothelite and Dyothelite parties.<sup>230</sup> Not only was it based on the *δύο φύσεις* formula, but it also recognized two properties in the natures. Although Constantine hesitated in professing two *energeiai*, he accepted them conditionally: 'I say that there are two natures, as was declared at Chalcedon, and two properties. Also I do not

<sup>225</sup> Mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* I 392<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>226</sup> Mansi 12, 196–208 = PG 96, 1416–1433; see CPG 8000; Grumel (1972) 322; Pargoire (1904) 167; van Dieten (1972) 171; Winkelmann 180.

<sup>227</sup> Patriarch from 11 August 715 to 17 January 730. See Winkelmann (2001) pp. 207–208.

<sup>228</sup> See Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 259.

<sup>229</sup> See *Synodicon Vetus* 146; Grumel (1972) 325; Winkelmann 180<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>230</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 696<sup>1–3</sup>.

reject (two) *energeiai*, if you say that they are the properties.<sup>231</sup> Having clarified these points, Constantine proclaimed a single will in Christ, which belongs to his divine person and is shared with the Father and the Holy Spirit:

I speak about one will of the *prosopon* (*other variant*: of the hypostasis) of God Logos. And if you want me to say the truth about what the hypostasis is—I do not know. But I say that the will belongs to the *prosopon* of God, the Logos after the incarnation. For the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are a single will.<sup>232</sup>

In spite of this profession of the single will, Constantine recognized that Christ's human nature had its own natural will.<sup>233</sup> According to his human will, Christ wanted to eat, drink, sleep, walk *etc.* After the resurrection, however, when he no longer possessed these human needs, he abandoned his human will together 'with the blood and the flesh.' Thus, Christ's human will was temporary, active only until his death on the cross.<sup>234</sup> In effect, Constantine introduced a gradation in the wills. On the one hand, he spoke about the will of the divine person of Christ, which was the only real will, owing to the fact that it was Christ's and remained with him forever. On the other hand, he recognized an auxiliary human will which belonged to Christ's nature and was therefore ephemeral. This one vanished together with the flesh and blood after Christ's resurrection.

Constantine's doctrine was syncretic, composed of elements from Chalcedonianism, Dyenergism, Monothelitism, and finally from his own views on the resurrection of Christ. He accepted the two *energeiai*, apparently inspired by the council itself, in order to gain the confidence of the council vis-à-vis his concept of the single will. Constantine's Monothelitism, however, was rooted in popular beliefs that were widespread in the region from which he came.

The province of Apamea and more widely of *Syria Secunda*,<sup>235</sup> was spiritually and intellectually dominated by the monastery of St Maron

<sup>231</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 696<sup>19–20</sup>.

<sup>232</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 696<sup>20–23</sup>.

<sup>233</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 698<sup>7–9</sup>.

<sup>234</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 698<sup>9–21</sup>.

<sup>235</sup> Syria, part of the Roman Empire since 64–63 BC was divided by Septimius Severus (193–211) into two regions: *Syria Coele* and *Syria Phoenice*. By the beginning of the fifth century, it was divided again into at least five provinces. *Syria Coele* was split into *Syria I* with its capital in Antioch, *Syria II* had its capital in Apamea, and

(Bêth Maron).<sup>236</sup> From the first half of the sixth century, a number of monasteries in the region were already under the juridical control of Bêth Maron, at least for a period.<sup>237</sup> The monastery also had a significant influence over the local Christian communities, which were known as 'Maronite'.<sup>238</sup> In order, therefore, to appreciate the beliefs of the 'Maronite' communities in *Syria Secunda* (from which Constantine of Apamea originated) it is necessary to identify the sphere of influence commanded by St Maron's monastery.

Bêth Maron had, since at least 629, belonged to the pro-Chalcedonian party. Evidence for this comes from descriptions of Heraclius' actions towards ecclesiastic reconciliation—the Emperor had remained for some time in *Syria Secunda*. These descriptions, provided by two Jacobite chronographers, Michael the Syrian (1166–1199) and Bar Hebraeus (Bar Ebraja, George Abu'l-Farag, 1225–1286), were based on the lost *Annals* of Dionysius of Tell-Mahrê, the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch (818–845). Bar Hebraeus, whose interpretation of Dionysius' text is more accurate than that of Michael,<sup>239</sup> detailed the course of events in the following way:

When the Emperor went to Mabbough (Hierapolis), he was approached by Patriarch Mar Athanasius and twelve bishops, from whom he asked a declaration of faith which they gave to him. After having read it, the Emperor spoke to them with praise. But he pressed them hard to accept the Council of Chalcedon. Since they would not consent, Heraclius was irritated and sent out a decree to the whole Empire: 'Anyone who will not adhere (to the Council), will have his nose and ears cut off and his house pillaged.' And so many converted. The monks of Bêth Maron, of Mabbough and of Emesa showed their wickedness and pillaged a number

---

*Syria III*, called Euphrates, had its capital in Hierapolis. *Syria Phoenixe* was divided into Maritime Phoenicia with its capital at Tyre and Lebanese Phoenicia, whose capital was at Damascus.

<sup>236</sup> The monastery was founded at the time of the council of Chalcedon. As for its location, this remains unknown. See Suermann (1998); thesis, University of Athens: Malouf (2001) 49–54.

<sup>237</sup> Thus, at the 536 council in Constantinople, the apocrisarius of St Maron's, the monk Paul, put his signature before the signatures of the representatives of other monasteries in *Syria Secunda* (Mansi 8, 911–912; see also Mansi 8, 881, 929, 940, and 953.) Twice in the acts the monastery appears to maintain control over other monasteries in the region: 'Paul...apocrisary of the monastery of the Blessed Maron, the monastery which governs the holy monastery of Syria II.' Mansi 8, 995, 1022.

<sup>238</sup> See Vööbus (1960) 251.

<sup>239</sup> See Suermann (1998) 190.

of churches and monasteries. Our people complained to Heraclius, who did not answer them.<sup>240</sup>

Most scholars accept that the Maronites were Chalcedonians before Heraclius' campaign.<sup>241</sup> This is implied, in particular, in the description by Bar Hebraeus, who made a clear distinction between the two different Christian groups: the monks of Bêth Maron, Mabbough, and Emesa on the one hand, and the Jacobites on the other, irrespective of whether they converted to Chalcedonianism or retained their *miaophysis* belief. Some scholars, however, have suggested that initially the Maronites were non-Chalcedonian and only later, under pressure from Emperor Heraclius, did they accept Chalcedon.<sup>242</sup> This view, however, is countered by other testimonies, among them the information provided by Eutyches, the Melkite Patriarch of Alexandria.<sup>243</sup> He reported that Heraclius, during his stay in *Syria Secunda*, paid a visit to the monastery of St Maron. Having faced hostility from the Jacobites of Homs, the Emperor found a warm welcome among the Maronites.<sup>244</sup> Although there is no other testimony that supports this episode, modern scholarship has accepted it as accurate.<sup>245</sup> Indeed, there is good reason to suggest that Heraclius' visit to this monastery was not his only one.<sup>246</sup> In consideration of what is known, therefore, it may be concluded that the Maronites were Chalcedonians and supporters of Heraclius. As such they adopted the new doctrinal proposals of the Emperor and became Monothelites. They did not of course consider Monothelitism to be a new doctrine, but adopted it as Catholic Orthodoxy. In due course, most of the Chalcedonian communities in *Syria Secunda* followed the example of the influential monastery. Now the role of Bêth Maron in promoting Monothelitism among local (Maronite) communities while significant, was not unique to this monastery. It is highly likely that imperial propaganda forced local communities to accept Monothelitism

<sup>240</sup> *Chron* I 272–274.

<sup>241</sup> See Nau (1903) 343–344; Vailhé (1906) 260; Leclercq. 'Maron' *DACL* 10, p. 1: 2188–2202; Suermann (1998) 190. Maronite historians also support this idea (see, for instance, Dib and Beggiani (1971) 9–13).

<sup>242</sup> See Moosa (1986) 33; Morony (1987) 87–95, esp. 94; Stephanides (1990) 419.

<sup>243</sup> Eutyches (Arabic name Sa'īd ibn Baṭriq) was born in 877 in Cairo. He was elected Melkite Patriarch of Alexandria in 933 and died in 940. His *Annals* are the world chronicles written in Arabic and describing events up to 938. For an account of his life, see Breydy (1983); Suermann (1998) 42–48.

<sup>244</sup> See *Annales* 7, 5; *PG* 111, 1088–1089.

<sup>245</sup> See Kaegi (1987) 104–115, esp. 106; see also Suermann (1998) 194–195.

<sup>246</sup> See Suermann (1998) 195.

immediately. Bêth Maron, however, remained at the forefront of the movement to Monothelitism.

Evidence exists that Maronite Monothelitism was Chalcedonian. In describing the history of the Monothelite controversy, Eutyches of Alexandria identified Cyrus of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch, and Honorius of Rome (protagonists of imperial Monothelitism) as Maronites.<sup>247</sup> Moreover, certain early Islamic texts equated Monothelitism with the Maronites.<sup>248</sup> As for the doctrinal content of nascent Maronite Monothelitism, some of the earliest evidence (apart from that of Constantine of Apamea), includes that by Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople (715–730) who stated that the Maronites accepted the fourth ecumenical council but rejected the fifth and the sixth.<sup>249</sup> Another description by Patriarch Dionysius of Tell-Mahrê bears on the situation in the region at the beginning of the eighth century.<sup>250</sup> His description can also be dated to the end of the seventh century:

<sup>247</sup> See *Annales* 7, 12–13, 27–28.

<sup>248</sup> In Muslim sources there are three major testimonies about the Monothelitism of the Maronites. The earliest is that of Mas'ūdī (ca. 893–956) (*Maçoudi. Le livre de l'avertissement et de la révision. Traduction par B. de Vaux*: Paris, 1896, 210–212); the second by Qādī 'Abdalğabbār. The latter lived three quarters of a century later (d. 1025) and mentioned the Maronites in his summa of Muslim theology ('Abdalğabbār b. Aḥmad, al-Qādī, al-muğnī fī abwāb at-tauḥīd wa l-'adl (ed. 'Abdalḥalīm Muḥmūd, Sulaimān Dunyā, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Ḥilmī, Abū l-Wafā' al-Ganīmī, Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ḥudairi) *V. al-firaq ġair al-islāmīya* (ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ḥudairi), Cairo 1958, 83–85, 146). Finally, the 15th century Arab historian, Al-Maqrīṣī (d. 1442), in describing the historical topography of Egypt (Al-Maqrīzī, Taqī ad-Dīn Abū l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī, *k. al-mawā'iz wa l-i'tibār bi ḍikri al-ḥiṭaṭ wa l-āṭār*, Imprimerie de Bulaq 1270/1853), described the Maronites as those who believe in two natures and one will of Christ.

<sup>249</sup> See *deHaeres* PG 94, 81.

<sup>250</sup> The following is Dionysius' account of the appearance and dissemination of Monothelitism in Syria: 'Although we have already spoken, he says, of the heresy of Maximus and of the manner in which Constantinus (= Constantine IV) introduced it in the churches of the Romans, after it had been wiped out by his father, Constant, we ought now to take note of the schism which survived among them (= the Chalcedonians) in this year 727 regarding this heresy and the expression "who has been crucified." In the Roman territory, this opinion continues since the time of Constantinus, but in the regions of Syria, it was not admitted. It is being sown now by prisoners and captives that the troops of Taiyaye (= Arabs) have led into and placed in Syria. No doubt, because of their esteem of the Empire of the Romans, those who have allowed themselves to be perverted by this opinion (= Dyothelitism) and accepted it were especially the bishops and the chiefs. One of them was Sergius, son of Mansour, who oppressed many of the faithful who were at Damascus and Emese. Not only did he make them remove the expression "who was crucified" from the *Trisagion*, but he drew also many of ours into his heresy. This heresy perverted also the Sees of Jerusalem, Antioch, Edessa and other towns, that the Chalcedonians had occupied since the time of Emperor Heraclius.'

The monks of Bêth Maron and the bishop of this Monastery, and some others, did not accept this opinion (the two wills), but the majority of the people and their bishops did. How many anathemas (were delivered), how many fights up to the present cannot be enumerated or reckoned. In the discussions, the Chalcedonians of the party of Bêth Maron insulted the Maximites: 'You are Nestorians, the companions of the pagans and the Jews. You do not say that Christ is God, that He was born of the Virgin, that He suffered and was crucified in the flesh, but that He is an ordinary man, an individual person, abandoned by God, who feared and dreaded his death and cried: "My Father! If it be possible, would that the chalice pass from Me, nevertheless your will and not mine be done," as if one and another were the wills of the Father and the Son; that is, there would therefore be in Christ two wills separated and opposed, or even enemies, and battle one against the other.'<sup>251</sup>

This text contains the classical set of Monothelite beliefs: opposition to the reality of fear in Christ and in his human will—on the assumption that it would be contrary to God's will—as well as the accusations of Nestorianism against the 'Maximites.' Some Maronite historians, however, doubted that the early Maronite communities confessed classical Monothelitism. Instead they ascribed to them a certain 'moral' Monothelitism.<sup>252</sup> Initially, such an interpretation was offered by the 17th century Maronite scholars, Stephan Duayhy (d. 1704)<sup>253</sup> and Faustus Naironus (d. 1711).<sup>254</sup> More recently, the Maronite bishop of Cairo, Pierre Dib, made a significant contribution to this notion<sup>255</sup> when he developed arguments using several medieval texts, as for example the Maronite Missal of the eleventh century, which in particular contains the following passage:

The Merciful, who in Mary lived poor  
And, as a human, came from her womb humbly,  
Has entered the world by miracle and marvellously,  
In the union of two natures truly.  
Having one person, He had one will doubly  
With the properties of two natures indivisibly.

---

Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IV 457–458/Dib and Beggiani (1971) 18. Some modern Maronite scholars have concluded from this passage that Monothelitism was introduced into Syria after 727 (see Dib and Beggiani (1971) 19). This conclusion, however, contradicts the remaining witnesses of early Maronite Monothelitism, mentioned above.

<sup>251</sup> Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IV 458–459/Dib and Beggiani (1971) 19.

<sup>252</sup> See Salibi (1959) 17, 19–21.

<sup>253</sup> Duayhy (1974).

<sup>254</sup> Naironus (1679) 95–96.

<sup>255</sup> Dib and Beggiani (1971) 19–25.

The natures remain in one hypostasis divinely  
 Recognized without separation or confusion.  
 By his Divine nature, He performed wonders divinely.  
 By his human nature, He endured suffering humanly.  
 Paul has said: 'He has become like us entirely  
 Except sin, iniquity, impiety, truly.'<sup>256</sup>

This text quite clearly contains the standard Monothelite formula: there is one will in Christ which manifests itself in a twofold way, divine and human. Dib, in spite of the obvious, tried to interpret the passage in such a way that it would imply a human will subjected to the divine: 'Christ is at the same time both God and man; He possesses a double will, but this will is one in the sense that the human faculty is irrevocably submitted to the divine. Also, according to Maronite thinking, the unity of wills extended only to the moral sense, for the author (of the hymn) did not doubt the existence of a human will insofar as physical power was concerned...'<sup>257</sup> Another late Maronite text, found in the *Book of Direction*,<sup>258</sup> contains similar, conventional Monothelite formulas:

He (= Christ) has one person and two intellectual natures; He is God and man... We do not believe however that He is two, two Christs, two persons, two wills and two *energeiai*. Far from it!...

The Melkites and Maronites are divided on the question of the will (in Christ). The Melkites profess two wills, the Maronites one; and each party brings forth arguments to support its thesis... The Maronites say (to the Melkites): These two wills that you profess in Christ ought to be either conformed or opposed to each other. If they are conformed to each other one ends up with one will; but if they are opposed to each other, it follows that the divine nature wills what the human nature does not will, and the human nature wills what the divine nature does not will. If this is so, there would be division and opposition, resulting in two (persons in Christ); and therefore the (hypostatic) union would not exist anymore, the Trinity would become a quaternity and one would find himself reduced to the point of view of Nestorius and his opinions on Christ.<sup>259</sup>

In this passage where the doctrine of two wills and *energeiai* is openly condemned, there is one of the most popular Monothelite objections to the two wills: Christ cannot have two wills, because they of necessity

<sup>256</sup> Ms. Vat. Syr. 396, fol. 24; transl. Dib and Beggiani (1971) 21.

<sup>257</sup> Dib and Beggiani (1971) 21.

<sup>258</sup> Known also as *Book of the Law* or *Book of Perfection*—a Maronite canonical collection translated from Syriac into Arabic in 1059.

<sup>259</sup> See Dib and Beggiani (1971) 22.

would oppose one another. Dib, however, has once more interpreted this classic objection as 'moral' Monothelitism: 'The two natures, divine and human, are so closely united in Him that one is unable to imagine the least discord between them. Thus, the basis of the argumentation is always the absolute impossibility of an opposition between the two wills, without considering the specific question of a human will in Christ. The dogma of the two physical wills of the Saviour is found in an implicit state, as it had been among other Chalcedonians before the Monothelite quarrels. The human will in Christ would not be denied, since Christ possessed our whole nature, except sin. What is denied is the possibility of a conflict in Jesus Christ opposing the human will to the divine will, for if the two wills "are conformed to each other, one ends up with one will." In other words, the two wills are so united that one would not notice an exterior distinction between them.'<sup>260</sup> According to Dib, therefore, the Maronites rejected two opposing wills but accepted as implicit the existence of two accorded wills. There is, however, no evidence in the text that such accorded wills are implied. The two wills are rejected because *a priori* they contradict one another. The aforementioned passages, therefore, represent the mainstream Monothelitism which was condemned at the sixth ecumenical council.

As for Constantine of Apamea, Dib asserted that his version of Monothelitism was a personal opinion inherited not from the Maronites but from Macarius of Antioch. To defend this point, Dib produced the following argument: first, Constantine did not, in support of his claims, defer to the authority of the ecclesiastical leaders of Apamea, but to that of Macarius. Second, if the Fathers of the council had known of Monothelitism in Syria, they would have asked Constantine about it.<sup>261</sup> Such arguments, however, fail to convince one that Constantine represented either himself or Macarius. Much more believable are the testimonies that demonstrate the Maronites at the time of the council of 680/1 to have been Monothelites.

The issue of 'moral' Monothelitism as promulgated by the Maronite scholars has recently found support from the Italian scholar Filippo Carcione.<sup>262</sup> He has proposed an original classification of different kinds of Monothelitism and has distinguished in particular between a

---

<sup>260</sup> Dib and Beggiani (1971) 23.

<sup>261</sup> Dib and Beggiani (1971) 17.

<sup>262</sup> Carcione (1990).



Monothelitism that is 'real' and one that is 'apparent'. The former, he claimed, originated from the doctrines of Apollinarius and Eutyches, whereas the latter—*di marca cirilliana*<sup>263</sup>—was supported by the followers of Cyril of Alexandria<sup>264</sup>. The *monotelismo reale*, on the one hand, was present in doctrines which confessed a single nature in Christ.<sup>265</sup> The 'apparent' or *ipostatico*<sup>266</sup> Monothelitism, on the other hand, could be found in the dogmatic system of Severus. This latter, says Carcione, was confessed and promoted by Sergius of Constantinople.<sup>267</sup> He also identified a distinctive subdivision of Monothelitism in the teachings of the Aphthartodocetes and Agnoetes.<sup>268</sup> The Monothelitism of the Maronites, for him, was of a very different order; it originated in Antiochian Christology and was cognate with the Monothelitism of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Carcione was correct in his distinctions among Monothelitisms (though in the present case it would be more correct to speak of Monenergisms): those of Apollinarius, the Antiochian theologians, Aphthartodocetes or Julianists, Agnoetes, the Severans, and the Maronites. At the same time, his identifications were erroneous. First, he confused Severan with the imperial Monothelitism represented and promoted by Sergius. As indicated earlier, the former was based on the *mia-physis* formula, while the latter was Chalcedonian. Secondly, he wrongly equated Antiochian Monothelitism and the Monothelitism of the Maronites, considering each a dubious 'moral' Monothelitism.

Finally, there is the opinion of the Russian scholar Basil Lourié. He correctly distinguished 'entre la doctrine du monothélisme "classic" et celle des sévériens de la Syrie de la fin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle.'<sup>269</sup> Simultaneously,

<sup>263</sup> Carcione (1990) 31.

<sup>264</sup> 'Sicché, sin dal IV–VI secolo erano andate determinandosi nella cristianità, accanto ad un'ortodossia fermamente duotelita avente nella cristologia di papa Leone Magno la sua più chiara espressione, una corrente *realmente* monotelita, figlia naturale dell'apollinarismo e del monofisismo eutichiano, ed una corrente solo *apparentemente* monotelita, seguita soprattutto da quegli ambienti alessandrini che erano i più genuini custodi della fede di Cirillo (dove si guardava esclusivamente al soggetto agente in modo da attribuire *l'operari* unicamente alla persona di Cristo, prescindendo dalle sue nature).' Carcione (1990) 23.

<sup>265</sup> 'Dal punto di vista storico, infatti, il *monotelismo reale* deriva dall'affermazione dell'unicità di natura nella persona del Cristo.' Carcione (1990) 26.

<sup>266</sup> See Carcione. *Sergio di Costantinopoli* (1985) 27; (1990) 31.

<sup>267</sup> See Carcione. *OCP* (1985) 263–276; (1990) 31.

<sup>268</sup> See Carcione *Sergio di Costantinopoli* (1985) 29–30; (1990) 31.

<sup>269</sup> Lourié (1997) 291, n. 4.

he attributed the Monothelitism of Constantine to the Severan tradition, which, as has been shown, was incorrect.

In conclusion, Maronite Monothelitism was similar to the imperial Monothelitism promoted by Heraclius. A popular sort of Monothelitism, shared by the Syrian Chalcedonians and presented by Constantine of Apamea to the 680/1 council, differed from the Monothelitisms of the Apollinarian, Antiochian, and Severan varieties. Communities of Maronites have preserved their identity up to the present day. Their identity gradually changed from dogma to ethnicity. During the Crusades the Maronites, absorbed into union with the Roman Church, were gradually stripped of Monothelitism (some centuries later however) but they have retained their specific national identity. Today they constitute a Christian majority in the Lebanon and also have a presence in Cyprus, Palestine, Syria, the United States, and Australia.

### 2.11. *Conclusions*

Examination and evaluation of the theological controversy over will and activity in Christ demonstrate that the motives of the imperial and ecclesiastic authorities towards promotion of Monenergism-Monothelitism were essentially pragmatic. The goal of both Emperors and bishops was to gain the confidence of the non-Chalcedonian communities in Egypt, Armenia, and Syria. The protagonists, however, did not create but rather recruited the *energeia*-will concepts and formulas, that had existed before Heraclius launched his campaign of reconciliation with the Severans. As made evident above, the confession of a single *energeia* in Christ was a shibboleth among the anti-Chalcedonians. The issue also received attention in the Chalcedonian circles. When Heraclius initiated his cause, neither of the chief proponents, Sergius and Cyrus, was a convinced Monenergist or Monothelite. They could easily have accepted Monenergism-Monothelitism or Dyenergism-Dyothelitism. Their choice was determined mainly by political expediency and the desire to heal the rupture with those who rejected Chalcedon. At some stage, however, Monenergism and especially Monothelitism turned into a self-sufficient doctrine that was incorporated into the Chalcedonian framework.

## CHAPTER THREE

### ‘IMPERIAL’ MONENERGISM-MONOTHELITISM *VERSUS* DYENERGISM-DYOTHELITISM

In this section, I shall explore simultaneously (to the degree that existing sources allow) the ‘imperial’ or ‘Chalcedonian’ Monenergism-Monothelitism and Dyenergism-Dyothelitism, with the objective of clarifying the similarities and differences between the two opposing doctrines.

#### 3.1. *Key notions*

##### 3.1.1. *The oneness of Christ*

Owing to a common neo-Chalcedonian background, adherents of both Monenergite-Monothelite and Dyenergite-Dyothelite doctrines accepted the oneness of Christ as a fundamental starting point. Monenergists-Monothelites, however, placed more emphasis on this oneness. In the relatively brief Alexandrian pact, for example, the oneness of Christ is referred to more than twenty times. All statements about the single *energeia* and will were normally preceded by a confession of Christ’s oneness.<sup>1</sup> Dyenergists-Dyothelites also began their commentaries on *energeia* and will by postulating the oneness, though not as frequently or as insistently as their opponents. In one of the earliest Dyenergist-Dyothelite texts, the encyclical of Sophronius, a statement of faith on the two *energeiai* and wills begins with a reference to Christ’s oneness.<sup>2</sup> In these and many other ways, both parties demonstrated their adherence to the Christological language of Cyril of Alexandria.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Pact of the Alexandrian union (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>5-6</sup>), Sergius’ letter to Pope Honorius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 542<sup>6-7</sup>), *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>29-31</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 440<sup>17-18</sup>.

### 3.1.2. *One hypostasis and two natures*

The followers of the Monenergist-Monothelite doctrine as it emerged in the seventh century, were Chalcedonians who felt it necessary to make a clear distinction between Christ's hypostasis and his nature. They also acknowledged that Christ had two natures<sup>3</sup> which for them were united unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, and inseparably.<sup>4</sup> Christ had two births: eternal from the Father, and temporal from the Virgin Mary.<sup>5</sup> He is consubstantial with the Father according to his divine nature and with us according to his humanity.<sup>6</sup> He is like us except in sin.<sup>7</sup> The Monenergists-Monothelites avowed the completeness of both natures of Christ<sup>8</sup> and their immutability.<sup>9</sup> Sometimes they spoke of 'one incarnate nature of God the Word' (μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη). They understood the expression, however, in a strictly Cyrillian sense.<sup>10</sup> They also made use of other similar expressions, such as the single Christ 'contemplated in'<sup>11</sup> and coming 'from two natures'<sup>12</sup> etc.

Although the Monenergists-Monothelites fully accepted the terminology of Chalcedon, the expressions they used were not identical with those usually employed by their opponents. Both parties had their own preferences. With regard in particular to Christ's human nature, the Monenergists-Monothelites favoured the expression 'flesh endowed with a soul' (ἐψυχωμένη σάρξ),<sup>13</sup> which they had borrowed from

<sup>3</sup> On the terms 'nature' and 'hypostasis,' see the letter of Patriarch Sergius to Pope Honorius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 542<sup>16</sup>), *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>20-21</sup>), the confession of Patriarch Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 226<sup>20-21</sup>) etc. On the distinction between the two natures see, for example, the *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>31-32</sup>), Pyrrhus (*Disputatio* 340<sup>b</sup>).

<sup>4</sup> See the letter of Sergius to Honorius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 542<sup>10</sup>); *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>8</sup>); the confession of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>11</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> See the confession of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>15-17</sup>).

<sup>6</sup> See *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>8-9</sup>), the confession of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>14-15</sup>), testimony of Anastasius Sinaita (*Opera* 2 VII 3<sup>33-36</sup>).

<sup>7</sup> See *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>9-10</sup>).

<sup>8</sup> See *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 598<sup>7-8</sup>).

<sup>9</sup> See *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>35-36</sup>). Patriarch Paul also wrote to Pope Theodore, saying that the two natures of Christ did not mix and did not change, despite the fact that Christ had only one will (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 608<sup>17-19</sup>); see also the confession of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>5-8</sup>).

<sup>10</sup> See the Alexandrian Pact (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>6-8</sup>), the letter of Sergius to Cyrus (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 138<sup>3-5</sup>).

<sup>11</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>5-6</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> There were several variations on the expression: λογικῶς τε καὶ νοερῶς ἐψυχωμένη σάρξ (letter by Patriarch Paul to Pope Theodore ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 608<sup>20</sup>), and σὰρξ ἐψυχωμένη ψυχῇ λογικῇ τε καὶ νοερῇ (letter by Sergius to Cyrus ACO<sub>2</sub> I 136<sup>31</sup>).

Cyril.<sup>14</sup> This wording more adequately articulated their understanding of Christ's human nature which, according to their understanding, lacked its own will. Dyenergists-Dyothelites also accepted this expression,<sup>15</sup> although they used it in a somewhat different manner. When citing it, they emphasised that Christ's human nature had its own will. As for the terminological preference of the latter, their favourite phrase in referring to Christ's two natures was 'forma' (μορφή),<sup>16</sup> by which they underlined their legacy from the Christology of Pope Leo and his famous formula:

Each nature (*forma*) functions in communion with the other, as is fitting, with the Word truly doing what belongs to the Word and the flesh carrying out what belongs to the flesh. The one shimmers with miracles, the other succumbs to the injuries.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, both Monenergists-Monothelites and their opponents employed basic Christological notions and formulas in an almost identical way, without overstepping the boundaries of Chalcedonian and Cyrillian theology. At the same time, they put different emphases on particular formulas.

### 3.1.3. *Natural properties*

Discussion about the qualities or properties of Christ's two natures (αἱ φυσικαὶ ιδιότητες or τὰ φυσικὰ ιδιώματα) constituted a general framework for considering matters of will and *energeia* during the controversy. Monenergists-Monothelites allowed for a significant distance between Christ's natural qualities and his *energeia*-will, whereas their opponents regarded the *energeia* and will as natural properties. There was no disagreement, however, between the Monenergists-Monothelites and their opponents, with respect to the properties *qua* properties, though, each continued to have its own preferences in presenting them.

<sup>14</sup> See *RespTiberium* 589<sup>12-14</sup>, *QuodUnus* 718<sup>28-32</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, the speech of Pope Martin at the 5th session of the Lateran council, in which the Latin word *natura* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 359<sup>29</sup>) corresponds to the Greek phrase 'ἔμψυχος καὶ παναγία σάρξ.' ACO<sub>2</sub> I 358<sup>31</sup>. See also Maximus, *ep* 12 (PG 91, 496<sup>c</sup>), *ep* 13 (PG 91, 525<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>16</sup> See Pope Agatho: 'forma id est natura.' ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 77<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> 'Agit enim utraque *forma* cum alterius communione quod proprium est, Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est. unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud subcumbit iniuriis.' *adFlav* 28<sup>12-14</sup>.

In particular, Dyenergists-Dyothelites emphasised the invariability of the properties of each nature. For them, the natural properties were immutable because they were immanent to the natures. The ninth anathema of the Lateran states:

If one does not properly and truly confess, according to the Holy Fathers, the natural properties of Christ's divinity and humanity, which are preserved in him without omission and decrease (ἀνελλιπῶς καὶ ἀμειώτως) and truly ensure that the same is perfect God and perfect man according to nature, let him be condemned.<sup>18</sup>

Although immanent to their natures, the properties interlace with one another so closely that Sophronius named the same Christ

visible and invisible, in the same way created and uncreated, bodily and unbodily, touchable and untouchable, circumscribed and uncircumscribed, earthly and heavenly, the same is the flesh endowed with an intellectual soul and divinity.<sup>19</sup>

In other words, the unity of the natures caused a so-called *communicatio idiomatum*. Maximus was more comprehensive in analysing this phenomenon,<sup>20</sup> as indicated in his response to Pyrrhus' question:

Do the Fathers, whose doctrines constitute the law, the rule, the glory, and the pride of the Church, do they not say 'that from which comes the common glory (τῆς δόξης κοινόν) is one thing, and that from which comes the common humiliation (τό τῆς ὑβρεως) is another?'

Maximus explained that this was possible owing to an exchange of the natural properties. He also noted that exchange is possible only between two things which are not equal to each other:

That holy Father said this in reference to the mode of exchange of attributes (τῷ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως τρόπῳ). As is clear from the previous statement, the exchange (ἡ ἀντίδοσις) does not concern one, but two, things, and different kinds of things. According to the exchange, the natural attributes (τὰ προσόντα) of the two parts of Christ are exchanged according to the ineffable union, without a change or mixture of the natural principles.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>18</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 574<sup>1-8</sup>; 575<sup>1-8</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 438<sup>19</sup>–440<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> As Lars Thunberg remarks, 'At this point (= *communicatio idiomatum*) he (= Maximus) seems to some extent to have made a pioneering contribution.' (1965) 22. Here see also a brief history of the notion *communicatio idiomatum*.

<sup>21</sup> *Disputatio* 296<sup>d</sup>–297<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 15–16.

Dyenergists-Dyothelites commonly used Chalcedonian definitions in referring to Christ's natural properties. Pope Agatho, for one, in his *Report* to the 680/1 council reproduced Chalcedonian statements: 'We recognize that each of his natures has a natural property'<sup>22</sup> and applied to Christ's natural properties a definition initially ascribed to the natures:

And we recognize that each one (= of the two properties) of the one and the same incarnated, that is, humanated (= *humanati*) Word of God is in him unconfusedly, inseparably and unchangeably, intelligence alone discerning a unity, to avoid the error of confusion.<sup>23</sup>

The Chalcedonian definition that each nature preserves its own property and that the properties form the hypostasis was also popular among Dyenergists-Dyothelites:

The peculiarities of neither nature being lost by the union but rather the proprieties of each nature being preserved, concurring in one Person and in one subsistence.<sup>24</sup>

The keyword in this phrase is συντρέχω (*concurro*), which here can be translated as 'to run together so as to meet'.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the natural properties 'run' together without being mixed or forming one hypostasis. This definition, reproduced in the acts of the Lateran,<sup>26</sup> was also referred to by Pope Agatho in his *Report*.<sup>27</sup>

In similar fashion Monenergists-Monothelites believed that each of Christ's natures possessed its own properties, which remained immutable in their union with one another.<sup>28</sup> By virtue of this union, the natures had *communicatio idiomatum*.<sup>29</sup> Monenergists-Monothelites did not miss the opportunity to emphasise that an exchange of natural properties was only possible because of Christ's oneness. The *Ecthesis*, in particular, illustrated this point in a series of antinomies similar to those used by

<sup>22</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 61<sup>8-9</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 61<sup>10-12</sup>/NPNE, <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/letaga.htm> (23/07/2003).

<sup>24</sup> Horos ACO<sub>1</sub> I<sup>2</sup> 129<sup>31-33</sup>/NPNE, <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/faith.htm> (23/07/2003).

<sup>25</sup> Liddell and Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

<sup>26</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> I 240<sup>3-5</sup>, 241<sup>2-4</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 81<sup>13-14</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> See, for example, *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>20</sup>), the confessions of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 216<sup>14-15</sup>, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>7-9</sup>).

<sup>29</sup> See the letter of Patriarch Paul to Pope Theodore (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 200<sup>22-24</sup>).

Sophronius: the same Christ is eternal and temporal, impassible and suffering, visible and invisible.<sup>30</sup>

### 3.1.4. *Energieia*

#### 3.1.4.1. *Notion*

One of the puzzling things about the controversy over Christ's activities is that the notion of *energeia* as such remained virtually untouched by the discussion, although it played an important role in theological and polemical reasoning. Only Maximus applied penetrating analysis to deepen common understanding of the notion, whereas other polemicists, both Monenergists and Dyenergists, used it as if they already agreed about the meaning of *energeia*. It is even more puzzling given that the controversy proceeded against a background of boosted interest in Aristotelian categories of logic, which in turn were chiefly induced by the Christological controversies of the period.<sup>31</sup> Aristotle's categories were being scrutinized at that time by two representatives of the Alexandrian Neoplatonic school, Elias<sup>32</sup> and David,<sup>33</sup> who adapted them for scholarly purposes.<sup>34</sup> They were followed by Stephan of Alexandria, the last known philosopher of the school, who in 612 moved to Constantinople and was offered by the Emperor Heraclius the position of professor at the imperial academy (οἰκουμενικὸς διδασκαλός).<sup>35</sup> Stephan might, according

<sup>30</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>37–39</sup>.

<sup>31</sup> Thus Mossman Roueché links the Syriac commentaries on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry to the context of the Monoenergist-Monothelite quarrels (1974) 64.

<sup>32</sup> Little is known about Elias. He belonged to the school of Olympiodorus, was Christian, lived and worked perhaps in Alexandria in the second half of the 6th century. See Westerink (1990) 336–339; Wildberg, 'Elias,' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2003 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.) <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2003/entries/elias/> (17/06/2003).

<sup>33</sup> Of David even less is known. He was also Christian and worked in Alexandria in the second half of the 6th or beginning of the 7th century. His works were translated into Armenian and became very popular in Armenia. See Westerink (1990) 338–340. On the Armenian translations of David see the publication of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem <http://micro5.mssc.huji.ac.il/~armenia/repertory/david.html> (17/06/2003).

<sup>34</sup> See Roueché (1974) 64.

<sup>35</sup> Stephan of Alexandria (6/7 c.) was apparently a disciple of Elias. It is noteworthy that in 582 he reportedly disputed with Probus, initially an anti-Chalcedonian and later Chalcedonian metropolitan of Chalcedon. The point for Stephan was that the properties of the natures in Christ could remain unchanged only if they are considered through the prism of the Chalcedonian theology of two natures. See Westerink (1990) 340–341; Lumpe, 'Stephanos von Alexandria,' *BBKL*, [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephanos\\_v\\_a.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephanos_v_a.shtml) (27/09/2002), in which an extended bibliography is provided.



to John Moschus, have been the teacher of Sophronius in Alexandria.<sup>36</sup> Distinctions and definitions applied by the three philosophers to various categories, including that of activity, formed a backdrop to theological controversy in the seventh century,<sup>37</sup> given that (a) Elias and David produced popular manuals in logic, (b) Stephan might have taught Sophronius, and (c) all three worked in Alexandria, where Monenergism was promoted more than anywhere else. They, in turn, depended on Aristotle himself and on his earlier commentators, primarily Porphyry. Paying significant attention to the notion of activity, they held much in common in their interpretation of that notion and in what occurred during the controversy.

Elias preferred to call the activity ποίησις. It was contrary, he affirmed, to a passive acceptance of activities (τὸ πάσχειν)<sup>38</sup> and included aspects of a process and a result: 'For the *energeia* and the result (ἀποτέλεσμα) are called ποίησις.'<sup>39</sup> In a remarkable reference to Plato, he called it 'movement': 'Plato called the existence (ὑπαρξιν) of every (being) the essence (οὐσίαν), the communication he called identity (ταυτότητα), the difference (διαφορὰν) he called ἐτερότητα, and the *energeia*, movement (κίνησιν).'<sup>40</sup> Thus, following Porphyry, he employed Plato's distinctions together with those of Aristotle.<sup>41</sup> Elias placed activity (together with passivity) in the category of qualities.<sup>42</sup> *Energeia* for him was strictly a property of nature. He spoke about nature, which acts (ἐνεργεῖ ἡ φύσις),<sup>43</sup> and about natural *energeia* (τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἐνεργείᾳ).<sup>44</sup> He saw the human body as passive and moved by the soul.<sup>45</sup> Elias also engaged with the problem of the confrontation that occurs between the different parts of man. For him, the parts as such do not create any opposition, which occurs exclusively on the level of *energeiai*.<sup>46</sup> Following Aristotle, Elias also drew a distinction between potential

<sup>36</sup> See John Moschus, *PratSpirit* 2929<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> See Roueché (1974) 63–64; Louth (2002) 42–44.

<sup>38</sup> See *inAristotCat* 160<sup>3ff</sup>. The opposition ἐνέργεια-πάθος has in fact occurred since the time of the Presocratics (see Pascher. 'Energeia.' RAC V 4).

<sup>39</sup> *inAristotCat* 240<sup>21–22</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> *inPorphyry* 53<sup>3–5</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> On the issue of the integration of Platonism and Aristotelianism in the neoplatonic tradition, see Armstrong (1967) 53–85; Dillon (1977) 248–256; Verdenius and Waszink (1947).

<sup>42</sup> *inAristotCat* 240<sup>23–24</sup>.

<sup>43</sup> *inAristotCat* 112<sup>11–12</sup>.

<sup>44</sup> *inAristotCat* 112<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> *inPorphyry* 12<sup>25–26</sup>, 43<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> *inAristotCat* 180<sup>9–17</sup>.

and actual beings: τῇ δυνάμει—τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ,<sup>47</sup>—a distinction that was fundamental to Aristotle's understanding of *energeia*.<sup>48</sup> It was, however, mostly ignored by the theologians of both Monenergist and Dyenergist camps, who preferred to identify force and activity.

David, on the other hand, made further interesting contributions to the concept of *energeia*. He devoted much attention to the relation of *energeia* and knowledge, having been apparently impelled to do so by the controversy provoked by the Agnoetes. Speaking in particular about the *energeiai* of the soul (ψυχικαὶ ἐνέργειαι),<sup>49</sup> he included knowledge,<sup>50</sup> which, far from being a mere *energeia*, prevailed over the other activities that are performed according to knowledge.<sup>51</sup> David applied to 'knowledge,' the Aristotelian distinction between potential and actual beings<sup>52</sup> and agreed with Elias that the body as such is motionless. Whatever feeling and motion it has, is given to it by the soul.<sup>53</sup> Again following Aristotle, he linked nature and *energeia*.<sup>54</sup> The former he understood as a source of both movement and motionlessness.<sup>55</sup> However, nature as a source of movement and movement itself were not identical.<sup>56</sup>

As for Stephan, he presented a thorough analysis of different cases of action, especially in relation to their subjects and he also paid special attention to the verb ἐνεργέω, researching its various usages. He asserted that *energeia* is an active action as opposed to something pas-

<sup>47</sup> See, for example, *inPorphyrisag* 83ff.

<sup>48</sup> As is known, Aristotle developed the concept of *energeia* in response to the *aporia* of the Eleatic school. The *aporia* emerged from the presupposition that every being (τὸ ὄν) can come into existence either from what already exists or from non-existence. Both options, however, appear to be impossible, because existing things already exist and because something cannot come from nothing. Hence, the origin (γένεσις) of things turns out to be impossible and the world therefore cannot exist. In reply to the *aporia*, Aristotle elaborated a distinction between the potential and actual beings (δυνάμει ὄν and ἐνεργείᾳ ὄν). The origin, therefore, becomes possible owing to the passage of the beings from the state of potentiality to the state of activity or functioning (*The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Robert Audi (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 1999, 264). See Charles (1986); Losev. 'Античный космос и современная наука,' especially chapter *Учение Аристотеля о потенции и энергии* in (1993); 'Акт и потенция' in *FES* 17; Pescher, 'Energeia,' *RAC* V.

<sup>49</sup> *inPorphyrisag* 101<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> *Proleg* 71<sup>12-13</sup>, 15<sup>26-27</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> *Proleg* 71<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>52</sup> *Proleg* 36<sup>17-18</sup>.

<sup>53</sup> *Proleg* 31<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> See *inPorphyrisag* 114<sup>26-34</sup>.

<sup>55</sup> *inPorphyrisag* 182<sup>27-28</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> *inPorphyrisag* 182<sup>30-31</sup>.

sive—πάθος.<sup>57</sup> It is an action of essence. Whatever has the same activity, he claimed, also has the same essence.<sup>58</sup> The former could be manifested by a verb, while the latter by a noun. Essence prevails over *energeia* as a noun does over a verb.<sup>59</sup> Finally, Stephan made a distinction between actual and potential action (τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ—τῇ δυνάμει).<sup>60</sup>

Aside from the commentators on Aristotle, theologians of the seventh century also relied on the patristic tradition, especially that of the Cappadocians. Maximus,<sup>61</sup> Anastasius Sinaita,<sup>62</sup> and John the Damascene,<sup>63</sup> for example, turned to a fragment from Gregory of Nyssa's letter to Xenodor,<sup>64</sup> in which the writer speaks about *energeia* as the power and movement of a nature.<sup>65</sup> This definition became the most popular in both Monenergist and Dyenergist texts.

#### 3.1.4.2. 'A new theandric *energeia*'

On 3 June 633, a pact of ecclesiastical union was signed in Alexandria between the Chalcedonians—with the recently elected Patriarch Cyrus at the head—and a group of 'Theodosians,' who had rejected Chalcedon. This was a union based on a common conciliatory confession known also as 'the nine chapters' whose author was Cyrus. It remains unknown, however, whether he employed co-authors from one or the other of the two camps, though there must surely have been consultations with the Theodosians. The author(s) of the document chiefly employed Cyril's language: 'one incarnate nature of the Word,' a single Christ 'contemplated in'<sup>66</sup> and coming 'from the two natures'<sup>67</sup> *etc.* Among other Cyrillian expressions, there was also the 'theopaschite' formula, referring to Christ suffering according to his flesh and not according to his divinity:

<sup>57</sup> See *inAristot* 7<sup>30–32</sup>, 2<sup>5</sup>, 13<sup>14–15</sup> *etc.*

<sup>58</sup> *inAristot* 35.

<sup>59</sup> *inAristot* 3<sup>9–12</sup>, 13<sup>13–14</sup> *etc.*

<sup>60</sup> *inAristot* 23<sup>16–22</sup>.

<sup>61</sup> *OpuscThPol* 281<sup>ab</sup>.

<sup>62</sup> *ViaeDux* II 4<sup>76–88</sup>, *Opera* 2 VII 37–16.

<sup>63</sup> *deVol* 34, 13–14 p. 218.

<sup>64</sup> *adXenodor*. Of the entire treatise, only this fragment is preserved.

<sup>65</sup> *adXenodor* 4–13. Aristotle first considered *energeia* and movement together (see, for instance, *Metaph* 8.3.7 (1047<sup>a</sup>)). This idea was inherited also by the Stoics (see Pascher, 'Energieia,' RAC V).

<sup>66</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>5–6</sup>.

If anyone, using the expression, ‘The one Lord is contemplated in two natures,’ does not confess that he is ‘one of the Holy Trinity’ (ἓνα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος), i.e. the Logos eternally begotten by the Father, who was made man in the last times;...but that he was ἕτερος καὶ ἕτερος, and not ‘one and the same’ (ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν), as the most wise Cyril taught, ‘perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood,’ and therefore contemplated ‘in two natures,’ ‘the same suffering according to one (nature) and not suffering according to the other (nature)’ (τὸν αὐτὸν πάσχοντα καὶ μὴ πάσχοντα κατ’ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο), as the same Saint Cyril said, i.e. suffered as man in the flesh, so far as he was man, but as God remained incapable of suffering in the sufferings of his own flesh; and that this one and the same Christ and Son worked both the divine and the human (τὸν αὐτὸν ἓνα Χριστὸν καὶ Υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα)...<sup>68</sup>

The document then turned from speaking of Christ as a single subject of all action to a statement altogether unknown in Cyril:

...that this one and the same Christ and Son worked both the divine and the human by one theandric *energeia*, as Saint Dionysius teaches,...let him be anathema (τὸν αὐτὸν ἓνα Χριστὸν καὶ Υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Διονύσιον).<sup>69</sup>

It was this addition, which attributed to Christ a ‘single theandric *energeia*’ (μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ), that initiated a controversy which continued for almost a century. The phrase ‘single theandric *energeia*’ had been borrowed from the fourth epistle to *Gaius*, which is included in the *Corpus Areopageticum*:

For, even, to speak summarily, He was not a man, not as ‘not being man,’ but as ‘being from men beyond men,’ and was above man, having truly been born man; and for the rest, not having done things Divine as God, nor things human as man, but exercising for us a certain new theandric energy of God having become man.<sup>70</sup>

This alleged Dionysian text, however, is not identical with the Mone-nergist formula of the Alexandrian pact. The Dionysian ‘a *new* theandric *energeia*’ was changed into the ‘*one* theandric *energeia*’<sup>71</sup> and it was

<sup>68</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>12–21</sup>. In Cyril: *inPsal* 69.1148<sup>40–41</sup>.

<sup>69</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>18–22</sup>/Hefele (1895) vol 5, 20 (modified translation).

<sup>70</sup> *CorpDionys* II 161; PG 3, 1072<sup>b–c</sup>/modified transl. by John Parker, The Saint Pachomius Library <http://www.ocf.org/OrthodoxPage/reading/St.Pachomius/diolet4.html> (23/07/2003). The word θεανδρικός was virtually unknown in antiquity and occurred only in Christian writers, though quite rarely in the time before ps-Dionysius; see, for instance, Epiphanius of Cyprus (*inPalm* 43.432.40).

<sup>71</sup> The works of ps-Dionysius were edited in the middle of the sixth century by the Chalcedonian theologian John of Scythopolis. The Greek manuscripts that survived (73

in this form that Monenergists used it henceforth.<sup>72</sup> Later opponents accused them of deliberately altering the Areopagite's text. At the third session of the Lateran council, for example, bishop Deusdedit accused Patriarch Pyrrhus that he 'inmutavit dictionem beati Dionysii'<sup>73</sup> and the same accusation was brought against Cyrus and Sergius by Pope Martin.<sup>74</sup> Monenergists did not deny that they had made an alteration. On the contrary, they attempted to persuade their opponents that the phrases 'a new theandric *energeia*' and 'one theandric *energeia*' were interchangeable.<sup>75</sup> Dyenergists, however, refusing to accept such an equation, obliged the Lateran council to examine this point in detail. Notwithstanding these efforts, the original Dionysian phrase appears to be closer to the Monenergist interpretation than to the Dyenergist.<sup>76</sup> The Orthodox, however, chose not to criticize Dionysius, but to defend him

---

codices were examined in the critical edition of the letter to Gaius (see *CorpDionys* II 161)) go back to this edition of John, who could have changed the 'one theandric' into 'a new theandric' in order to 'Chalcedonize' Dionysius (see Louth (1996) 28–29, 54–56). However, there are some testimonies that the initial text contained 'a new theandric *energeia*' and was not altered by John of Scythopolis. The earliest surviving variant of the text is its Syriac translation, completed at the beginning of the sixth century by Sergius of Reishaina (see Sherwood *SE* (1952) 174–184). This translation, however, is not reliable, because it is in fact a remote paraphrase of the original Dionysian text. A more reliable testimony is the Armenian translation which was made approximately in the same period by Stephan, later Metropolitan of Siunik'. The Armenian text reads: 'So that we may sum up, he was not man—not as non-man but as from mankind beyond mankind, and supreme man he truly became man. Then he did not work things divine as God, nor things human as man, but God having become man he performed for us some new divinely-human activity.' Thomson (1987) 166. Another important witness is Severus of Antioch to whom scholarship owes the earliest dated witness to the *Corpus Areopageticum* (528), when in his treatises against Julian of Halicarnassus in their Syriac recension, he refers to Dionysius. Severus was apparently the first theologian who interpreted the Dionysian phrase in the Monenergist sense: "Ἡμεῖς, καθὼς ἤδη φθάσαντες ἐν ἄλλοις διὰ πλάτους γεγραφήκαμεν, τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πανσόφου Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου τὴν λέγουσαν: "ἀλλ' ἀνδρωθέντος Θεοῦ καινὴν τινα τὴν θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν ἡμῖν πεπολιτευμένος", μίαν ἐνόησαμεν σύνθετον καὶ νοοῦμεν, ἐτέρως ἡμῖν νοηθῆναι μὴ δυναμένην." *ad Ioan* 17–22. Thus, Severus, as early as the beginning of the 6th century, read 'a new theandric *energeia*.' The text implies that the 'one *energeia*' is solely Severus' own interpretation of the Dionysian expression. In conclusion, there is much evidence that the Dionysian text in its initial form contained 'a new theandric *energeia*' and no testimony that the 'one theandric *energeia*' was used instead. These accounts are provided not only by interested persons, but also by those who would prefer to read in the Dionysius' epistle 'one theandric *energeia*.'

<sup>72</sup> See, for instance, the letter of Sergius to Cyrus of Alexandria (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 136<sup>36–37</sup>).

<sup>73</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 153<sup>22–23</sup>.

<sup>74</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 142<sup>35</sup>–145<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>75</sup> See *Dogmatic Tome* of Patriarch Pyrrhus (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 152<sup>30–37</sup>).

<sup>76</sup> See Pelikan, 'The Odyssey of Dionysian Spirituality,' in Luibhéid and Rorem (1987) 20.

and to interpret his formula in a Dyenergist way. Apparently, Maximus was the chief promoter of this approach.<sup>77</sup>

A tradition of Dyenergist interpretation for the formulation had existed even before Maximus and is possibly older than any Monenergist understanding. Indeed, as mentioned above,<sup>78</sup> the earliest known Monenergist interpretation originated with Severus in his letter to John the abbot. Here Severus remarked that he could not interpret Dionysius' expression other than in the sense of the single *energeia*: 'We understood and understand... one composite (activity); it cannot be interpreted otherwise (ἐτέρως ἡμῖν νοηθῆναι μὴ δυναμένην).'<sup>79</sup> As Lebon remarks,<sup>80</sup> Severus could have been responding to information provided by John that there were other, Dyenergist interpretations of the formula in circulation, the earliest known being that by John of Scythopolis in his *scholia* to the *Corpus Areopageticum*.<sup>81</sup> John speaks of a 'compound' or 'mixed' activity of the Godhead and the manhood in Christ and simultaneously he clearly distinguishes between the two *energeiai*:

Something new: Let no one foolishly say that he calls the Lord Jesus θεανδρίτης. For he did not speak of a θεανδριτική (*energeia*)—the adjectival derivative of ὁ θεανδρίτης—but of a θεανδρική activity, in some sense a compound activity of God and man. Whence he also speaks of God as 'humanized,' which is to say, God who had become a human being. He called this mixed activity alone a θεανδρική (activity). For he acted as God alone when he, although absent, healed the centurion's child; but as human alone although he was God, in his eating and passion. He accomplished other miracles as a mixture, as when he healed the blind through an anointing and stopped a flow of blood by his touch.<sup>82</sup>

In the seventh century, the first person to advance a Dyenergist interpretation of the Dionysian formula was Sophronius, who distinguished between three kinds of *energeiai* in Christ: divine, human, and 'the-

---

<sup>77</sup> As Pelikan remarks, 'It had been the historic accomplishment of Maximus the Confessor to purge Dionysian spirituality of the interpretations that would have connected it to one or another heresy. The special status of Maximus as a saint and hero of the faith for both West and East lent his aura also to the Dionysian writings.' Luibhéid and Rorem (1987) 23. The influence of Maximus could be seen, for instance, in the fact that Pope Martin called Dyonysius 'Doctor.' ACO<sub>2</sub> I 146<sup>31</sup>; 147<sup>30</sup>; 150<sup>6</sup>; 151<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>78</sup> See p. 225.

<sup>79</sup> *DoctPatrum* 309<sup>17-22</sup>.

<sup>80</sup> See Lebon (1909) 320 n. 1; (1930) 894–895; Louth (1996) 29.

<sup>81</sup> See Suchla (1980) 31–66; *CorpDionys* I 38–54; Rorem and J. Lamoreaux (1998).

<sup>82</sup> Rorem and Lamoreaux (1998) 253.

andric,' and ranked the last between the two others (μέσιν τινὰ τάξιν ἐπέχουσιν).<sup>83</sup> This was not a single activity, said Sophronius, but a composition of two different yet unconfused activities:

We speak also about a new and so-called theandric activity (κοινήν καὶ θεανδρικήν λεγομένην ἐνέργειαν) of this power, which is not one, but has different origins and various (components) (οὐ μίαν ὑπάρχουσαν ἀλλ' ἑτερογενῇ καὶ διάφορον).<sup>84</sup>

Dyenergist interpretations of the Dionysian formula were developed further at the Lateran council. Pope Martin himself understood it in a way that virtually meant not a single *energeia*, but two activities, united in the same way as are the natures of Christ:

The holy Dionysius did not wish to profess a single *energeia*, as they say, but a dual *energeia* of the one who is dual in nature, and so he used a composite expression (διπλὴν τοῦ διπλοῦ τὴν φύσιν συνθέτω φωνῇ ἐχρήσατο), denoting his two activities, according to (their) unity (δύο τοῦ αὐτοῦ καθ' ἑνωσιν ἐνεργείας).<sup>85</sup>

The Pope tried to explain why Dionysius spoke of this double *energeia* as single. For Martin it was possible because of *communicatio idiomatum* and the unity of Christ's natures in his hypostasis. Contrary to Sophronius, Martin did not speak about purely divine or human *energeiai*. All *energeiai* of Christ are theandric and retain features of both natures:

Therefore, he (= Dionysius) wisely said that (Christ) performed neither divine (things) according to the Godhead, nor human (things) according to man (οὔτε κατὰ Θεὸν τὰ θεῖα δρῶν, οὔτε τὰ ἀνθρώπινα κατὰ ἄνθρωπον), in such a way declaring to us a complete unity—(the unity) of both the natures and his activities, according to the nature (ὥσπερ τῶν φύσεων οὕτω καὶ τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἐνεργειῶν); because it is a property of this consummate unity that the same (Christ) acts supernaturally in both ways, according to the exchange (τὸ κατ' ἐπαλλαγὴν ὑπερφυσικῶς ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἑκάτερα), i.e. the divine (things) humanly, and the human (things) divinely. He does not perform the divine (things) by divinity alone (οὐ γὰρ γυμνῇ θεότητι τὰ θεῖα), nor does he perform the human (things) by the mere humanity (οὔτε ψιλῇ ἀνθρωπότητι τὰ ἀνθρώπινα), but, on the one hand, he performs miracles in an unusual manner through the flesh, which is endowed with the intellectual soul and united to him according

<sup>83</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 456<sup>12-13</sup>.

<sup>84</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 456<sup>13-15</sup>.

<sup>85</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 148<sup>29</sup>–149<sup>32</sup>.

to the hypostasis; on the other hand, he deliberately accepted, through his almighty power, the trial of his life-giving sufferings, for our sake. In such a way, he revealed the above unity and presented the difference; the unity he revealed by the putting together of the proper activities, by exchange (τῇ κατ' ἐπαλλαγὴν προσβολῇ καὶ συμφύει τῶν οἰκείων ἐνεργειῶν), and the difference—through preserving the natural property.<sup>86</sup>

It is obvious to see the figure of Maximus hovering behind the Dyenergist interpretation of the Dionysian formula at the Lateran. In his writings Maximus paid considerable attention to the Dyenergist interpretation of the formula and in his fifth *Ambiguum* especially, he stated that the Dionysian 'new theandric *energeia*' did not in effect imply a single activity, but the unity of the two *energeiai*.<sup>87</sup> For him, the Dionysian formula meant that the *energeiai* became known in and through each other (ἐν ἀλλήλαις τε καὶ δι' ἀλλήλων).<sup>88</sup> In such a way, he denoted the ineffable mode of disclosure (ἐκφάνσις) of the two *energeiai*.<sup>89</sup>

In much the same way Maximus also interpreted other passages from the Fathers that referred to single activity. He explained in the Dyenergist sense the Cyril's expression μία συγγενὴς ἐνέργεια which had been applied to Christ when he raised the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue from the dead.<sup>90</sup> Maximus affirmed that the single *energeia* expressed by Cyril was neither hypostatic nor natural, but rather indicated the unity of the Logos and the flesh in Christ, as well as a mutual coming together (συμφύει) and περιχώρησις of the two *energeiai*.<sup>91</sup> In his *Dogmatic tome to Marinus*, Maximus analysed a passage from the treatise of Patriarch Anastasius of Antioch against the 'Arbitrator' of John the Philoponus.<sup>92</sup> In that treatise Anastasius confirmed:

Therefore, we speak about a single *energeia* of Christ, but not about a single property, let it be not, because the properties (ιδιότης) of the divinity and the humanity are not same.<sup>93</sup>

Maximus considered that the Patriarch virtually implied two activities because he recognized differences in the properties of the two natures.

<sup>86</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 148<sup>32</sup>–151<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>87</sup> *Ambig* 5, 1056<sup>a</sup>–1060<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>88</sup> *OpuscThPol* 8, 100<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>89</sup> See *Disputatio* 345<sup>c</sup>–348<sup>c</sup>; *OpuscThPol* 8, 100<sup>b</sup>–101<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>90</sup> *inIoan* PG 73, 577<sup>c-d</sup>.

<sup>91</sup> *OpuscThPol* 7, 88<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>92</sup> *contraIoanPhilop*, of which only a few fragments survive. The fragment which is analyzed here is preserved only in the *Dogmatic tome* of Maximus.

<sup>93</sup> *OpuscThPol* 20, 232<sup>bc</sup>.



In speaking of a single *energeia*, Anastasius had indicated an indissoluble union of the activities and the unity of the works accomplished by Christ.<sup>94</sup> And in interpreting the 'single-*energeia*' expressions, Maximus went even further. He equated 'single-*energeia*' and 'two-*energeiai*,' since, in his opinion, they described different aspects of the same reality. The former indicated Christ's unity, while the latter his diversity.<sup>95</sup> A lack of either would lead to a distortion of the true picture of Christ:

He who does not accept equally and appropriately both (= one-nature-*energeia*-will and two-natures-*energeiai*-wills expressions), applying the former to the union, and the latter to the natural difference, falls inevitably, as is normal, into either division or confusion.<sup>96</sup>

In the light of the above, a number of conclusions about the character of the Alexandrian union may be drawn. The oneness of the 'single theandric *energeia*' promoted by the author(s) of the pact was related to Christ by virtue of his being the single subject of activities, but it also retained an element of duality and relationship to the two natures. This duality can be traced in the very word 'theandric,' which means 'divine-human.' It should be also observed by any follower of Cyril. Hence, while Christ suffered according to his human nature, he remained untouched by suffering according to his divinity.<sup>97</sup>

Severan Monenergism, as set out above, also presupposed some duality in the single *energeia*. For Severus the single *energeia*, apart from being divine, retained some distinct human features. Later generations of Severans, however, preferred to use stronger language that virtually excluded reference to the human components of the single *energeia*. Apparently, it was this stronger version of Monenergism, associated with the name of Patriarch Theodosius, that by the time of the union had become widely accepted in the non-Chalcedonian circles of Egypt. Most likely, this was the version encountered by the Chalcedonian author(s) of the union. The Severan variant of Monenergism, implemented in the Alexandrian pact, was, therefore, a compromise between radical Theodosian Monenergism and Dyenergism. The author(s) did not slavishly copy the Monenergism of the circles whom they tried to approach by means of the union. They admitted only a partial concession to the

<sup>94</sup> See *OpuscThPol* 20, 229<sup>b</sup>–233<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>95</sup> See *OpuscThPol* 7, 88<sup>b</sup>–89<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>96</sup> *OpuscThPol* 8, 105<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>97</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>18–21</sup>.

Theodosian interpretation of the single *energeia*, making reference to the sources of their Monenergism.

The Monenergism of the Alexandrian pact was concomitant with the thinking of Theodore of Pharan, who referred to the single activity of the divinity and humanity:

Whatever the Lord has said or done, he said and did by means of the intellect, the senses, and the organs of sense. And therefore as of him, whole and one, is everything to be spoken of—the one *energeia* of the Logos, of the mind, and of the sentient and instrumental body.<sup>98</sup>

It is worth noting that Theodore considered the single *energeia* to be created by the Logos: ‘We must recognize... a single *energeia* and its artificer and creator, God.’<sup>99</sup> Pope Martin remarked on this statement at the Lateran council:

If, as it was stated, God Logos is its artificer and creator, then, according to him (= Theodore), it (= *energeia*) is created; for whatever originates from the Logos through the creation, is created.<sup>100</sup>

Theodore, at the initial stage of Monenergism, openly acknowledged Christ’s single will, which, like the *energeia*, was completely divine: ‘As for the divine will, it belongs to the same Christ, for his will is one and divine.’<sup>101</sup>

Once their alteration of the ps-Dionysian formula was revealed and heavily criticized, Monenergists rejected the expression ‘one theandric *energeia*’ and returned to the initial ‘a new theandric *energeia*’.<sup>102</sup> What now was implied in their argument in favour of the ‘theandric *energeia*’? As indicated earlier, the adjective ‘theandric’ presupposed a certain relationship between the activity and both of Christ’s divine and human natures. This relationship was acceptable to the Monenergists but they preferred to ascribe the human-divine diversity of the single *energeia* more to Christ’s deeds and less to the single activity as such. This was a distinction that had been raised in the Alexandrian pact (‘the same single Christ did divine and human (things)’).<sup>103</sup> Divine things (τὰ θεοεργεπῆ) and human things (τὰ ἀνθρώπινα) performed by Christ

<sup>98</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 602<sup>4-6</sup>.

<sup>99</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 124<sup>3-5</sup>.

<sup>100</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 124<sup>26-28</sup>.

<sup>101</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 604<sup>5-6</sup>.

<sup>102</sup> See, for instance, confessions of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 216<sup>26-28</sup>, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>20-21</sup>).

<sup>103</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 598<sup>20-21</sup>.

were apparently considered by Monenergists to be the result of a single activity. At a later stage, Macarius of Antioch spoke about *energeiai* in two senses. First, a 'simple *energeia*' (ἀπλῶς ἐνέργεια), which can be either divine or human: 'simple *energeiai*' can be equated to Christ's deeds. Secondly, a 'theandric *energeia*,' which is a strictly single activity enacted by Christ. Thus, by distinguishing between activity and its result Monenergists were able to defend the concept of Christ's single *energeia* and avoid the accusation that they had denied either a divine or a human component in Christ's actions.

Maximus the Confessor also articulated a distinction between *energeia* and its effects, which he called ἀποτέλεσμα.<sup>104</sup> In order to rebut the Monenergist argument, which was based on the distinction between the activity and its result, he asserted that effects always correspond to the activity. To make his point, he used the metaphor of an inflamed sword:

Different actions have different effects (ἄλλης ἄλλο πράξεως ἀποτέλεσμα), not one effect, as was demonstrated by the example of the sword being hardened by fire. If the operation of the sword and that of the fire are both mutually united, and yet we observe that the fire's effect is burning and the iron's effect is cutting.<sup>105</sup>

Pope Honorius himself contributed to this elaboration of terms by propounding a new theory about Christ's *energeia*. In reply to a letter from Patriarch Sergius who informed the Pope about the history of the union with the anti-Chalcedonians, Honorius agreed that it was preferable to avoid speaking either of one or of two activities in Christ:

And if some who, so to speak, stammer, think to explain the matter better, and give themselves out as teachers, yet may we not make their statements to be Church dogmas, as, for example, that in Christ there is one energy or two, since neither the Gospels nor the letters of the apostles, nor yet the Synods, have laid this down.<sup>106</sup>

Honorius seems to have come to this conclusion not from the mere Christological agnosticism of the *Psephos*, but from a belief that Christ's activities were neither one nor two, but multiple. Every act of Christ was for him an *energeia*: 'For we have not learnt from the Bible that Christ and his Holy Spirit have one or two energies; but that he works

<sup>104</sup> *Disputatio* 341<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> *Disputatio* 341<sup>b</sup>/Farrell (1990) 61–62.

<sup>106</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 555<sup>3–6</sup>.

in manifold ways.<sup>107</sup> Honorius, then, was not a Monenergist, but rather a *Polyenergist*. At the same time, he preferred to ascribe activities to their single subject:

We must assert neither one nor two energies in the Mediator between God and men, but must confess that both natures are naturally united in the same Christ.<sup>108</sup>

### 3.1.4.3. *Two energeiai*

In speaking of either the oneness of Christ, who performs acts both divine and human,<sup>109</sup> or the 'theandric *energeia*,' the Dyenergists always made a clear distinction between divine and human *energeiai*. They distributed Christ's actions into various categories. For example, bishop Deusdedit at the Lateran council saw a distinction between similar *energeiai* that belong to the different natures of Christ. Christ, he would have claimed, speaks as God and as man. Although the two *energeiai* of speaking in this case seem to be similar, on closer examination they are different:

For he speaks as man and as God, and in both he has a power. As man he said: 'Now my soul is troubled' (John 12, 27); as God he said: 'I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again' (John 10, 18). To be troubled is a property of the flesh, while to have power to lay down and then take up the soul is a work of the faculty of the God Logos.<sup>110</sup>

Sophronius was more imaginative in his explanation of the different kinds of *energeiai*. He classified them in the same way as grammatical voices. The first was those activities which transpired from either Christ's divine or human nature and corresponded to the active voice. Among the 'active' *energeiai* produced by the human nature, Sophronius enumerated birth 'according to flesh,' breast-feeding, growth of the body, becoming adult (or passing from one age to another, as Sophronius calls this process), hunger, thirst, and tiredness.<sup>111</sup> Christ also performed actions that 'actively' came out of his divine nature, with or without the involvement of his human nature. Among these Sophronius enumerated conception

<sup>107</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 555<sup>16-18</sup>/Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 31.

<sup>108</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 625/Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 50.

<sup>109</sup> See Sophronius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 442<sup>4-7</sup>).

<sup>110</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 356<sup>2-7</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> I 357<sup>2-6</sup>.

<sup>111</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 448<sup>15-20</sup>.

without seed, leaping in the womb of Elisabeth, incorruptible birth (in which divine activity was directed upon the Virgin), preservation of Mary's virginity before, during, and after her birthgiving, the revelation given to the shepherds on Christmas night, directing the Magi by the star, bringing the gifts and worship, knowledge without learning, changing water into wine at the marriage in Cana, healing the ill, blind, lame, paralysed, and leprous, filling the hungry, embittering persecutors, taming the wind and the sea, walking on the sea, exorcizing evil spirits, earthquakes, solar eclipses, opening the tombs, resurrection after three days, the abolition of corruption and death, emerging from the tomb with the stone and seals untouched, passing through the closed doors, and the ascension into Heaven.<sup>112</sup>

A further category comprised those *energeiai* that were accepted by Christ as man and acted out by him as subject (as in the grammatical 'middle voice'). Sophronius enumerated among such *energeiai* sitting, sleeping, and the slaking of hunger and thirst.<sup>113</sup>

The final grouping embraced those *energeiai* which Christ accepted from somebody or something else (as in the grammatical 'passive voice'), as, for example, being conceived in the incorruptible womb of the Virgin, reclining in it, being carried by the parents and embraced by the mother,<sup>114</sup> feeling the pain of blows and suffering from flagellation and crucifixion.<sup>115</sup> Finally, Sophronius considered the very fact that Christ had a body that could be depicted to be a kind of suffering, or passive *energeia*. The form of the body limited Christ and this was also a type of submissive activity.<sup>116</sup>

Although Dyenergists made a clear distinction between Christ's human and divine activities, they observed in them a certain unity which, they affirmed, was of the same character as the unity of the two natures. As such, the *Horos* of the 680/1 council considered the human and the divine *energeiai* as united inseparably, immutably, indivisibly, and unconfusedly:

<sup>112</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 452<sup>12</sup>-454<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>113</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 450<sup>4-6</sup>.

<sup>114</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 450<sup>3-6</sup>.

<sup>115</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 450<sup>7-8</sup>.

<sup>116</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 448<sup>20</sup>-450<sup>2</sup>.

We glorify two natural operations indivisibly, immutably, inconfusedly, inseparably in the same our Lord Jesus Christ our true God, that is to say a divine operation and a human operation.<sup>117</sup>

In the Tome of Leo, it was emphasised strongly that Christ's natural *energeiai*, owing to their inconfusable unity, had communication, which, by analogy with the *communicatio idiomatum*, could be called *communicatio operationum*.<sup>118</sup> During the controversy, Leo's statement was first employed by Sophronius:

The Logos truly did what belongs to the Logos in communication with the body (μετὰ τῆς κοινωνίας τοῦ σώματος), while the body carried out what belongs to the body, with which the Logos of the action (τῆς πράξεως) communicated.<sup>119</sup>

Thus, Christ acted as God with the participation, *communicatio*, of the body and as man with participation in the divine nature. After Sophronius, this idea was developed further at the Lateran council. A speech attributed to Pope Martin contains a more explicit description of the *communicatio operationum*.<sup>120</sup> Whatever Christ performed, he did both as man and God. All of his divine activities were done with the participation of the human nature and *vice versa*. Particularly with miracles, which are divine *energeiai*, the human nature was involved together with the divine. Moreover, the divine nature accepted suffering in unity with the human nature.

#### 3.1.4.4. *Created and uncreated energeiai*

In the course of the controversy, the issue of whether Christ's *energeiai* were created or uncreated, was raised, especially by Dyenergists, who employed it for polemical purposes. They emphasised that divine activity is uncreated while human activity is created. This statement was taken for granted and apparently required no defence or proof, given that there are no indications of polemic about it in the surviving texts. The statement, used as an argument in favour of Christ's two natural *ener-*

<sup>117</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 776<sup>1-3</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/index.htm> (23/07/2003).

<sup>118</sup> 'Agit enim utraque *forma* cum alterius communione quod proprium est, Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud subcumbit iniuriis.' *ad Flav* 28<sup>12-14</sup>.

<sup>119</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 442<sup>16-18</sup>. The dependence of Sophronius on Leo can also be seen in his use of the word *forma* (μορφή) for the natures (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 444<sup>4</sup>).

<sup>120</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 148<sup>32-151</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> I 149<sup>32-151</sup>.

*geiai*, included the following details. Christ had both divine and human *energeiai*; the former uncreated; the latter created. These two *energeiai* cannot be united or mixed into a single activity because it is impossible to mix things created with those uncreated: such a mixture could produce nothing. Pope Martin, in particular, employed this argument in order to prove that Dionysius understood 'theandric *energeia*' as two activities. The text, ascribed to the Pope, states that Dionysius must have implied two *energeiai* and not one, for otherwise this would mean that something created could be turned into something uncreated, and *vice versa*—or they can be mixed together. In both cases, the changeability of either one or the other of Christ's natures becomes possible:

Dionysius used his phrase 'not in order to prove that two *energeiai* i.e., divine and human, are one and the same, as they claim, because this would imply their changeability and full disappearance (τροπή καὶ ἀφανισμός), and not to show that what is naturally uncreated became created, or what is naturally created became uncreated, or what is created and uncreated became by confusion one thing, but to prove that one (activity) occurred without confusion through the other.'<sup>121</sup>

It is apparent that Martin had expanded on an idea of Maximus, who first used the argument of created-uncreated activities during his disputation with Pyrrhus. Maximus had argued, first, that there could be no middle status between being created and uncreated. Second, the very fact that a nature is created means that its *energeia* is created as well, and, correspondingly, if it is uncreated, its *energeia* is also uncreated:

You are also forced to state whether this energy be created or uncreated, since in general nothing exists between the created and the uncreated natures. If you say it is created, then it will reveal only the created nature. Conversely, if you say uncreated, then it characterizes only the uncreated nature.<sup>122</sup>

Later, the 680/1 council confirmed that Christ had a created human and an uncreated divine, activity. They remained unchanged and could not be converted into each other or mixed: otherwise, this would create a change of human nature into the divine, and *vice versa*.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>121</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 150<sup>6-11</sup>. This argument was also applied with the reference to the formula of Leo (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 150<sup>21-25</sup>).

<sup>122</sup> *Disputatio* 341<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 61.

<sup>123</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 776<sup>1-10</sup>. In support of this idea, the fathers of the council referred to Leo and to Cyril (*Thesaurus* 453<sup>27-31</sup>).

3.1.5. *Will*3.1.5.1. *Notion*

As with the *energeia*, the notion of will was scarcely investigated, either by Dyothelites or Monothelites, with the sole exception of Maximus. On what, therefore, did they rely, when referring to the notion of will? Neither ancient nor contemporary philosophical traditions could have benefitted them very much. The former virtually ignored the will as an independent faculty,<sup>124</sup> while contemporary commentators, such as Elias, David, and Stephan, also passed over the issue in silence. Thereafter theological discussion on the matter remained quite weak. It largely attributed the notion ‘will’ (θέλησις, θέλημα) to God in the sense of his commandments and his desire to save humankind.<sup>125</sup> Obeying the Father’s will, the Son became man and underwent suffering.<sup>126</sup> Humans were also considered to be endowed with will. Irenaeus understood it as a free force of the human soul.<sup>127</sup> For Didymus, it preceded any action.<sup>128</sup> Deeper insight into will was achieved in the context of the Arian controversy. Gregory of Nyssa attributed ‘will’ to the common nature of the Holy Trinity and ranked it together with activity, strength, force, and purpose.<sup>129</sup> For him and for Augustine it was ‘movement’ (κίνησις)<sup>130</sup> or ‘deliberate movement’ (αὐτεξούσιος κίνησις).<sup>131</sup> The latter repeatedly stressed that ‘ipse animi motus voluntas est.’<sup>132</sup> Augustine’s point was

<sup>124</sup> See Dihle (1982) esp. chapter ‘Will-nous.’

<sup>125</sup> See Ignatius, *ep* 1 p 1<sup>4-5</sup>; Clement of Rome, *adCorinth* I 20.4<sup>2</sup>; Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* 12.120.4<sup>4-5</sup> etc.

<sup>126</sup> See Melito, *dePascha* 551; Justin the martyr, *Apologia* 63.10<sup>4-5</sup>; Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 1.2.4.1<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>127</sup> *Fragm* 5.6<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>128</sup> *adRoman* 5<sup>10-12</sup>.

<sup>129</sup> *adImag* 44.1344<sup>10-13</sup>.

<sup>130</sup> *adAblab* 3,1.48<sup>20-49</sup>; see *adverMaced* 3,1.100<sup>7-11</sup>.

<sup>131</sup> *inEcclesiast* 5.407<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>132</sup> See for instance: ‘Animus enim sine dubitatione natura est: proinde voluntas motus est naturae, quoniam motus est animi... Sed natura non sit voluntas: certe tamen nisi in natura non potest esse; quantum enim pertinet ad hominem, motus est animi, animusque natura est’ (*contrJulian* 1476); ‘Quid autem opus est ut quaeratur unde animi motus, cum satis appareat non potuisse animi motum nisi de animo existere? Quod si impudentissime atque insulsissime negas, adhuc ex te quaeritur, unde exstiterit in homine primo voluntas mala: nec jam permitteris dicere, “De motu animi, cogente nullo,” quia ipse animi motus cogente nullo, voluntas est. Quapropter, hoc est dicere, Voluntas exstiterit de animi motu, quod est dicere, Animi motus’ (*contrJulian* 1494) etc. See also: ‘Voluntas est animi motus, cogente nullo, ad aliquid vel non amittendum vel adipiscendum’ (*Retractationes* 609); ‘Voluntas est animi motus, cogente nullo, ad aliquid vel non amittendum, vel adipiscendum’ (*duabAnim* 104).



mentioned once in the *Report* of Pope Agatho<sup>133</sup> and twice during the sessions of the 680/1 council.<sup>134</sup>

These and other definitions were referred to during the controversy and were also further developed by Maximus<sup>135</sup> who began by distinguishing between will as a faculty of nature and as the object of volition.<sup>136</sup> Maximus called the former θέλησις or θέλημα, and the latter θελητόν or θεληθέν illustrating this distinction by the example of God and the Saints, both of whom have the same object—the salvation of the world. At the same time, their wills remain different in that divine will is by nature saving, whereas human wills are by nature saved.<sup>137</sup> Maximus developed this distinction in order to demonstrate that the human and divine wills are not conflated into one when targeted onto the same object.<sup>138</sup> Another distinction introduced by Maximus was between common and particular wills, which he denoted by the expressions ἀπλῶς θέλειν<sup>139</sup> or πεφυκέναι θέλειν,<sup>140</sup> and πῶς θέλειν.<sup>141</sup> This distinction will be explored below.

### 3.1.5.2. *One or two wills*

From the point of view of the Dyothelites, their opponents deprived Christ of a human will and replaced it by the divine. This single will of Christ was not a mixture or a composition of two wills, but remained plain and unmixed. Such a picture of Monothelite doctrine can be found, for instance, in Anastasius of Sinai:

They (= the Monothelites), defining his one simple and completely uncomposed will, say that the will of Christ was not theandric, common, or mixed, but simple, unmixed, and nothing participated in it. They do not

<sup>133</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 79<sup>2-6</sup>.

<sup>134</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 248<sup>1-2</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 350<sup>1-4</sup>.

<sup>135</sup> See Léthel (1979); Farrell (1989), based on his DPhil thesis at the University of Oxford (1987); a PhD thesis at the Yale University by Anastos (1986), where special emphasis on the theology of Maximus is made; a PhD thesis at Fordham University by Butler (1993); Bathrellos (2005), based on his PhD thesis at King's College, London (2001); Pospelov. 'Преподобный Максим Исповедник как историческое лицо и богослов,' in (2004) esp. 67–93.

<sup>136</sup> This was, according to Jaroslav Pelikan, an important contribution of Maximus to the development of the conception of will (1974) vol. 2, 74. This distinction, however, occurred as early as in the works of Irenaeus (*Frag* 5.6<sup>5</sup>).

<sup>137</sup> *OpuscThPol* 1, 21<sup>c</sup>–28<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>138</sup> *Disputatio* 292<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>139</sup> *Disputatio* 292<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>140</sup> *OpuscThPol* 3, 48<sup>a</sup>; *Disputatio* 293<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>141</sup> *Disputatio* 292<sup>d</sup>–293<sup>a</sup>.

think, know, count, or at all imply that his intellectual and immaculate soul had a certain power, habit, and property, which was rational, volitional, and related to desire, will, thought, power, cultivation, reasoning, and wisdom, but say that the divinity and its will replaced all the mentioned faculties of our intellectual soul in Christ.<sup>142</sup>

This depiction may be an exaggeration, but in such a fashion the Monothelites gave their opponents cause to consider their beliefs. Indeed, they never considered the single will of Christ to be theandric. Their favourite expression for Christ's human nature was 'flesh endowed with a soul' (ἐνψυχωμένη σάρξ), which seemed to exclude or disable the will of human nature. According to Patriarch Paul, the divine will enriched the human nature of Christ:

His (= Christ's) flesh endowed with a rational and immaterial soul was through the same consummate unity enriched with divine (things), for it (= flesh) obtained the divine and invariable will of the Logos who united it with himself according to the hypostasis, and it was constantly led and moved by him.<sup>143</sup>

Christ's human nature was guided and controlled by his divine will or command (νεῦμα), as it had been called by Monothelites from the time of the *Ecthesis*.<sup>144</sup> Their suggestion that his human nature was led by divine commands delivered them from avoiding any possible conflict between the humanity and the Godhead in Christ. Were there a human will, such a conflict would be inevitable. This was perhaps the most popular argument supporting the single will; it occurred in almost every Monothelite text, from the *Ecthesis* onwards.<sup>145</sup>

The Dyothelites agreed that Christ's human nature was moved by divine will. In the *Ambigua* Maximus used the image of a body being governed by the soul, in order to illustrate Christ's humanity being moved by his divinity.<sup>146</sup> Dyothelites understood this model as implying two wills. His human will was not in conflict; it wholly submitted to the divine. With reference to his remark that Moses and David were moved by divine command, Maximus replied to Pyrrhus that this did

<sup>142</sup> *Opera* 2 X 1<sup>6-18</sup>.

<sup>143</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 200<sup>32-34</sup>.

<sup>144</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 160<sup>25-29</sup>. Later on Patriarch Paul reproduced this point of the *Ecthesis* in his letter to Pope Theodore (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 200<sup>35-37</sup>); see also *Disputatio* 297<sup>a</sup>; the confession of Macarius (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 224<sup>12-16</sup>); testimony by Anastasius Sinaita (*Opera* 2 VI 1<sup>58-61</sup>).

<sup>145</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 160<sup>13-29</sup>; see also letter of Patriarch Paul to Pope Theodore (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 200<sup>25-28</sup>), Macarius of Antioch (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 244<sup>7-11</sup>).

<sup>146</sup> See *Ambig* 1049<sup>d</sup>; 1056<sup>a</sup>.

not deprive them of their own will and activity. The humanity of Christ also retained its own will, which was in full accord with the divinity:

For Moses and David, and as many as were susceptible to the influence of the divine energies, were moved by his command and laid aside human and fleshy properties. But, following all the holy Fathers in this as in all things, we say: since the God of All has himself become man without change, it follows that the same person not only willed appropriately (καταλλήλως) as God in his godhead, but also willed appropriately as man in his humanity.<sup>147</sup>

Some scholars<sup>148</sup> have suggested that Monothelites had in effect implied a human will that was in full submission to Christ's divinity, though they did not declare this explicitly. In rejecting the human θέλημα, they in fact disallowed only that will which would be contrary to divine will. Dyothelites, clearly misunderstanding the situation, accused them wrongly. This hypothesis, however, cannot be deduced from the sources. Monothelites might have been implying certain volitional capacities in the human nature, but they never identified or named them either as will or by any other term. On the contrary, even after the Dyothelites had explained to them that they should not accept a corrupted will, but one that was natural and in concord with the divinity, they insisted that this was impossible. For them, conflict between the two wills was inevitable because the human will was by definition liable to sin and corruption.<sup>149</sup> They tended to identify a human will with a 'fleshy' (σαρκικόν) will, as they often called it. On this, one may refer to the statement of Macarius of Antioch in his confession:

For we confess that our one Lord Jesus Christ is in a new image (ἐν εἰκόνι καινότητος) i.e., without fleshy wills (σαρκικῶν θελημάτων) and human thoughts (λογισμῶν ἀνθρωπίνων).<sup>150</sup>

This presented Anastasius of Sinai with the opportunity to accuse the Monothelites, albeit hyperbolically, of applying to Christ's human will characteristics such as 'secular' (κοσμικόν),<sup>151</sup> 'evil' (πονηρά),<sup>152</sup> and even 'diabolic' (διαβολικόν).<sup>153</sup>

<sup>147</sup> *Disputatio* 297<sup>a-b</sup>/Farrell (1990) 16.

<sup>148</sup> See e.g. Carcione *Sergio di Costantinopoli* (1985) 27; (1990) 31.

<sup>149</sup> See testimony of Anastasius Sinaita (*Opera* 2 III 4<sup>82-85</sup>).

<sup>150</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 216<sup>18-19</sup>.

<sup>151</sup> *Opera* 2 *scholia longiora*, sch. 16 p. 52.

<sup>152</sup> See Anastasius Sinaita, *Opera* 2 III 2<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>153</sup> *Opera* 2 III 2<sup>4-6</sup>.

Dyothelites and Monothelites agreed that corrupted human nature, together with its will and *energeia*, would be contrary to a divine being. In Christ, however, neither his human nature nor his will and *energeia* were corrupted. Maximus provided an explanation for this. No volitional impulse and action of man, he declared, providing that it finds itself in accordance with nature (κατὰ φύσιν) and is not impelled by sin, can be opposed to the will of God: ‘Whatever is natural and blameless is not in opposition one to the other.’<sup>154</sup> Only what is against nature (παρὰ φύσιν) opposes the will of God. Christ, who as man willed and acted in accordance with nature, could not have any conflict of wills. This argument was reproduced at the Lateran by Maximus of Aquileia, who claimed that neither nature as such, nor will and *energeia* in their natural state, can cause any dissension in Christ, but only sin:

We recognize that confession of his natures or his natural wills and activities is not productive of dissension (διχονοίας), but only sin, of which the Lord was entirely free by his nature (ἥς πάντῃ καθαρὸς φύσει). He redeemed us from it. He was free from the dissension, which is common to us.<sup>155</sup>

It is not Christ’s, but our will which is corrupted by sin and, as a result, conflicts with divine will. In order to be healed, this nature had to be adopted by Christ. Dyothelites placed the issue of the human will into a soteriological context, using it as an argument in support of Christ’s two wills. To human will they applied the rule: ‘That which is not assumed is not healed; and whatsoever is saved is that which is united with God.’<sup>156</sup> Had human will not been assumed at the incarnation, it would have been deprived of salvation. Consequently, the salvation of all human nature cannot be completed and becomes an illusion, as Maximus warned.<sup>157</sup> The entire mystery of the incarnation loses its meaning.<sup>158</sup> Were the Monothelites right, then

he (= Christ) either condemned his own creation as something that is not good...or he begrudged us the healing of our will depriving us of complete salvation and showing himself to be subject to passion, because he either did not want or could not save us completely.<sup>159</sup>

<sup>154</sup> *OpuscThPol* 20 PG 91, 236<sup>a-b</sup>.

<sup>155</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 346<sup>8-11</sup>, 347<sup>6-10</sup>.

<sup>156</sup> Gregory of Nazianzus, *epTheol* 101.32<sup>2-3</sup>.

<sup>157</sup> *Disputatio* 305<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>158</sup> See *Disputatio* 316<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>159</sup> *Disputatio* 325<sup>b</sup>/Bathrellos (2001) 151.

Moreover, according to Maximus, will, a human faculty, must be saved since, in the first place, it was through the will that sin penetrated human nature, when Adam first willed to eat, and then tasted the forbidden fruit. Therefore, if Christ had not assumed the will of Adam, men would remain under the law of sin:

If Adam ate willingly, then the will is the first thing in us that became subject to passion. And since the will is the first thing in us that became subject to passion, if, according to them (= the Monothelites), the Logos did not assume it along with the nature when he became incarnate, I have not become free from sin. And if I have not become free from sin, I was not saved, since whatever is not assumed is not saved.<sup>160</sup>

Similar postulations can be found in the acts of the Lateran council. Pope Martin in his speech dwelt particularly on this question. Christ, he maintained, had to possess all the blameless passions in order to eliminate them from our nature:

Such was, according to the teaching of the Fathers, the reason of his incarnation, which was inspired by love to humankind. He allowed these entirely blameless passions (τὰ πάθη τὰ δίχα μώμου παντός) to move in him according to his will (ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατὰ θέλησιν κινηθῆναι παραχωρήσαι), so as to eliminate them totally and to liberate from them our nature.<sup>161</sup>

Opposite approaches, such as those between Monothelites and the Dyothelites on the problem 'will-sin,' were reflected in their different stands on the question of what kind of will the first Adam had possessed. This question was crucial since it determined whether or not Christ had his own human will: 'If the first Adam had a natural will, so did the second Adam our Lord Jesus Christ, our true God who became like him (= the first Adam), except in sin.'<sup>162</sup>

In their approach to this question the Monothelites proceeded from the assumption that natural will is identical to the 'fleshy wishes,' hence they refused to accept that Adam had his own will before the Fall. As Macarius stated, the only will that Adam had in Eden was divine will. He was, therefore, a 'co-willer' with God (συνεθελητής τῷ

---

<sup>160</sup> *Disputatio* 325<sup>a</sup>/Bathrellos (2001) 152. As Vladimir Lossky has remarked, 'If the will of the Son is identical with that of the Father, human will, which becomes that of the Word, is His Own: and in this His own will, resides the entire mystery of our salvation.' (1989) 107.

<sup>161</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 360<sup>5-8</sup>, 361<sup>5-7</sup>.

<sup>162</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 248<sup>6-8</sup>.

Θεῶ).<sup>163</sup> After the fall, however, he received a will of his own, which Macarius characterized as deliberate and self-governed (προαιρετικὸν καὶ αὐτεξούσιον θέλημα).<sup>164</sup> Pope Honorius also identified Adam's will with the sin belonging to his nature as a result of his transgressing God's commandment: 'We confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, since our nature was plainly assumed by the Godhead, and this being faultless, as it was before the Fall.'<sup>165</sup>

The Dyothelites proceeded from a different assumption. They held the human will to be a natural faculty, which should not necessarily be identified with fleshy wishes. In these terms, they regarded any absence of will in Adam as absurd. Thus, at the 680/1 council, the Bishop Dometius of Prusiade remarked that if Adam was a co-willer of God, then he was also co-creator.<sup>166</sup> Moreover, as the representatives of the West added, he would have been of the same essence as the Holy Trinity. In support of this point, a passage from Cyril of Alexandria was cited: 'As he (= Christ) is homoousios, so he is co-willer with his Father, because one essence undoubtedly has one will.'<sup>167</sup> Another problem that arose from the equivalence of Adam's and God's will is how Adam could have transgressed God's commandment:

If Adam had divine will before the Fall, then he was homoousios to God and the will of Adam was unchangeable and life-giving. How then did he change (his mind), transgress the commandment, and become subjected to death? Because whoever is a co-willer (συνθελητής), is always homoousios.<sup>168</sup>

The issue of Adam's will was also examined at the Lateran council. Christ had to pass through all our weaknesses, including sorrow, confusion, fear *etc.*, in order to deliver us from them, precisely as he allowed death to overcome him, in order thereby to annihilate it.<sup>169</sup> Dyothelites applied this commonly accepted position to Adam's will. Because Adam willingly committed sin, the will had to be assumed by Christ:

He (= Christ) adopted and hypostatically united with himself everything. He healed whatever belongs to our nature: body, soul, mind, *energeia*, and

<sup>163</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 244<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>164</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 244<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>165</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 550<sup>16-21</sup>/Hefele (1895) vol. 5, 29.

<sup>166</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 244<sup>17-18</sup>.

<sup>167</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 246<sup>1-2</sup>.

<sup>168</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 244<sup>23-25</sup>.

<sup>169</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 360<sup>11-19</sup>; 361<sup>10-18</sup>.

will, through which Adam deliberately transgressed the commandment. (Adam) as a whole had committed sin and had been convicted to death. Therefore, he as a whole had a need to be healed by him who firstly created and then renewed our nature.<sup>170</sup>

The same reasoning was employed also in later Dyothelite texts, as, for example, Pope Agatho's *Report*,<sup>171</sup> and the Emperor's *Edict*.<sup>172</sup>

Dyothelites emphasised not only the salvific aspect of Christ's assumption of human will, but also the issue of its deification (θέωσις). This emerged from discussions on the controversial reference to Gregory of Nazianzus:

Let them quote in the seventh place that the Son came down from Heaven, not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him. Well, if this had not been said by himself who came down, we should say that the phrase was modelled as issuing from human nature, not from him who is conceived of in his character as the Saviour, for his willing cannot be opposed to God, seeing it has altogether become divine; but conceived of simply as in our nature, inasmuch as the human will does not completely follow the Divine, but for the most part struggles against and resists it. For we understand in the same way the words, Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; Nevertheless let not what I will but thy will prevail. For it is not likely that he did not know whether it was possible or not, or that he would oppose will to will. But since, as this is the language of him who assumed our nature (for he it was who came down), and not of the nature which he assumed, we must meet the objection in this way, that the passage does not mean that the Son has a special will of his own, besides that of the Father, but that he has not; so that the meaning would be, 'not to do mine own will, for there is none of mine apart from, but that which is common to, me and thee; for as we have one Godhead, so we have one will.'<sup>173</sup>

The crucial phrase here is 'for his willing cannot be opposed to God, seeing it has altogether become divine' (τὸ γὰρ ἐκείνου θέλειν οὐδὲ ὑπεναντίον Θεῷ, θεοθὲν ὅλον), which for Monothelites denoted a single divine will in Christ.<sup>174</sup> Instead of θεοθὲν, they may have read θεόθεν, which means 'from God.' The whole phrase then would be: 'For his willing cannot be opposed to God, seeing it has altogether come

<sup>170</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 362<sup>3-7</sup>.

<sup>171</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 74<sup>28</sup>-76<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>172</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 840<sup>20</sup>-842<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>173</sup> *deFilio* 12<sup>1-18</sup> (or. 30)/modified transl. Browne-Swallow, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/310231.htm> (05/09/2003).

<sup>174</sup> See *florilegium* by Macarius and Stephan (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 270<sup>14-16</sup>).

down from God.' This would have convinced them even more than that Gregory spoke of a single will.

Dyothelites apparently read the phrase as θεοθέν, that the will became divine. This for them was evidence of two wills: one divine and another human, which was deified (θεοθέν). If the will, which in the phrase of Gregory was denoted as θεοθέν, is the only will of Christ and that is divine, then it results in an absurdity, because the divine cannot be deified.<sup>175</sup> According to Maximus, this would also mean that Christ's human nature either cannot be deified or must undergo unacceptable changes:

Otherwise, if the deification of the human will opposes the belief that there are two wills, as they say, the deification of the nature will oppose the belief that there are two natures.<sup>176</sup>

The point was repeated in the *Horos* of the 680/1 council, which stated that deification of the human will does not imply that it undergoes any change:

For as his most holy and immaculate animated flesh was not destroyed because it was deified but continued in its own state and nature (ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτῆς ὄρῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ διέμεινεν), so also his human will, although deified, was not suppressed, but was rather preserved.<sup>177</sup>

Anastasius of Sinai commented on the Monothelite interpretation of Gregory's saying in his usual overstated way. He concluded that the Monothelite concept of the *theosis*, which meant 'a decrease of the number of the will',<sup>178</sup> eventually led them to eliminate human nature in Christ,<sup>179</sup> something that the Monothelites never acknowledged.

On several occasions the opposing groups tried to arrive at theological compromises. During his dispute with Maximus, for example, ex-Patriarch Pyrrhus proposed a compromise interpretation of 'composed

<sup>175</sup> See the speech of Maximus of Aquileia at the Lateran (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 350<sup>17-30</sup>); Maximus the Confessor, *OpuscThPol* 3, 48<sup>a-b</sup>; 20, 236<sup>a</sup>; 4, 61<sup>a-c</sup>; 6, 65<sup>a-68</sup>; 7, 81<sup>c-d</sup>; 15, 160<sup>d-161</sup>; 20, 233<sup>b-237</sup>; *Disputatio* 316<sup>c-d</sup>; Pope Agatho, *Suggestio* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 84<sup>2-6</sup>); *Edict* (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup>, 844<sup>18-22</sup>).

<sup>176</sup> *Disputatio* 316<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>177</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 774<sup>30-32</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/faith.htm> (23/07/2003). The text of the *Edict* published after the ecumenical council stated that Christ has turned our empathetic nature to the state of impassibility (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 840<sup>13</sup>).

<sup>178</sup> *Opera* 2 VI 3<sup>20-21</sup>.

<sup>179</sup> See *Opera* 2 VI 3<sup>21-22</sup>.



will.' When in the course of the argument Pyrrhus accepted that the wills could belong to the natures of Christ and not to his hypostasis, he suggested considering them to be a single will composed of two natural wills:

Just as we say that it is possible for there to be one synthetic nature from two natures (ἐκ τῶν δύο φύσεων ἓν τι σύνθετον), so it is also possible for there to be one synthetic will from two natural wills (ἐκ τῶν δύο φυσικῶν θελημάτων ἓν τι σύνθετον).<sup>180</sup>

This may have been a proposal that emerged during the dispute but did not represent 'true' Monothelite doctrine. Nevertheless, even as a suggestion it bears interest because it indicates that Monothelites were disposed to search for theological conciliation with Dyothelites and identifies what sort of compromise formulations they were prepared to admit. Obviously they were ready to appeal to settlements elaborated in the disputes with the anti-Chalcedonians. Other negotiable expressions, acceptable also to the Monothelites, had been voiced during the confrontation. In particular, as Maximus informs us, some Monothelites were ready to accept that Christ had a human will under the condition that it was adopted by Christ by 'relative assimilation' (σχετική οἰκείωσις)<sup>181</sup> or 'assimilation in a mere relation' (οἰκείωσις ἐν ψιλῇ σχέσει).<sup>182</sup> This type of assimilation is similar to when we feel what others do or undergo, but do not do or undergo it ourselves: 'We appropriate in a friendly manner something otherwise foreign to us, neither suffering nor effecting any of these things of ourselves.'<sup>183</sup> As Joseph Farrell remarks about this notion, 'The refusal (i.e. of Christ to accept suffering) truly belongs to a real human will, contrary to that of God, but this will is that which is really in us and not in Christ.'<sup>184</sup> According to Léthel, 'the final interpretation of Sergius is therefore inverted: for Sergius, this refusal was in Christ, but it was not a true human will. In this new perspective the refusal is a true human will, but is not in Christ.'<sup>185</sup> Maximus criticised this idea because it jeopardized the salvation of human nature and implied two persons in Christ.<sup>186</sup>

<sup>180</sup> *Disputatio* 296<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 14.

<sup>181</sup> *Disputatio* 304<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>182</sup> *Disputatio* 305<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>183</sup> *Disputatio* 304<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 24.

<sup>184</sup> Farrell (1989) 80.

<sup>185</sup> Léthel (1979) 50; transl. Farrell (1989) 80.

<sup>186</sup> *Disputatio* 305<sup>b</sup>.

The suggestion of 'relative assimilation' was linked to another compromise formulation, probably proposed by Monothelites in their polemics with Dyothelites. They were apparently ready to admit two natural wills in Christ on the condition that they were controlled by a single 'gnomic' will (γνώμικὸν θέλημα), which for them would be associated mainly with Christ's hypostasis<sup>187</sup> and his free choice.<sup>188</sup> This assumption, however, was countered by Maximus, who in order to refute it developed a detailed theory about 'gnomic will.' During his disputation with Pyrrhus he denounced clearly that in Christ there was a gnomic will that could dominate the natural wills:

It is not possible to say that this (= assimilated will) is a gnomic will, for how is it possible for a will to proceed from a will? Thus those who say that there is a γνώμη in Christ, as the inquiry demonstrates, teach him to be merely a man, deliberating in a manner proper to ourselves, having ignorance, doubt, and opposition, since one only deliberates about something which is doubtful, not concerning what is free of doubt. We have by nature an appetite for that which is good in a particular way, this comes about through inquiry and counsel. Because of this, then, the gnomic will is fitly ascribed to us, being the mode of the employment (of the will), and not its principle of nature: otherwise, nature itself would change innumerable times.<sup>189</sup>

Here Maximus has offered several objections to the alleged gnomic will in Christ. First, this will cannot be a source for other, natural wills, because no one will can proceed from another. Secondly, it is associated mainly with the hypostasis, because in men it constitutes 'the mode of the employment of the will.'<sup>190</sup> Finally, a gnomic will would turn Christ into a mere man in the Nestorian sense.<sup>191</sup> Christ would be vulnerable and capable of error because the gnomic will in men is usually a result of ignorance, doubt, and a contest of opinions and evaluations.<sup>192</sup> Indeed, γνώμη for Maximus, as Bathrellos spells out, is 'a disposition of the appetite towards what deliberation has shown to

<sup>187</sup> See Farrell (1989) 119, n. 66.

<sup>188</sup> See Farrell (1989) 119.

<sup>189</sup> *Disputatio* 308<sup>c-d</sup>/Farrell (1989) 123.

<sup>190</sup> As Bathrellos remarks, 'For Maximus, it is not natural will that introduces a human person. Natural will, as the term itself implies, is related to nature, whereas the gnomic or proairetic will is related to the human person.' Bathrellos (2001) 176.

<sup>191</sup> See *Disputatio* 308<sup>d</sup>–309<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>192</sup> See Pheidias (1995) 745–746; Matsoukas (1992) 341; Thunberg (1965) 215; Farrell (1989) 123; Louth (1996) 61–62; (2002) 168.

be the most appropriate thing to choose.<sup>193</sup> Evaluation of what is most appropriate, however, is often limited and even distorted by sin<sup>194</sup> and therefore can be erroneous and misleading. Gnostic will, thus, as a function of selecting or choosing, is imperfect.<sup>195</sup> It cannot, therefore, be ascribed to Christ, who unlike mere men had no need of choosing between good and evil; his natural will was always directed to good. He did not hesitate or doubt, but always knew, willed, and did what was ultimately good.

In his polemics, Maximus rejected a gnostic will in Christ. He was prepared to accept, however, that the notion as such could be applied to Christ under certain conditions. In his early works he admitted in Christ a γνώμη: 'He preserved the γνώμη passionless (ἀπαθῆ) and not opposed (ἄστασίαστον) to nature.'<sup>196</sup> Maximus understood this as a synonym of 'will.' Thus, whereas in his early works he spoke of γνώμη,<sup>197</sup> in the later ones he preferred θέλησις.<sup>198</sup> In addition, as Sergey Epiphonovitch remarked, by using the word γνώμη he intended to underline the free character of all blameless passions in Christ.<sup>199</sup>

### 3.2. Relations between main categories

#### 3.2.1. Energeia—One-Who-Acts

The approaches of the contending parties to the issue of relations between the *energeiai* and their subject (*One-Who-Acts*) had, at the same time, certain points in common as well as essential differences. Both groups accepted that Christ, singly, is subject of all his actions. Even on the eve of the controversy Patriarch Sergius' letter to Patriarch Cyrus professed 'the same one Christ, who worked the divine and human things.'<sup>200</sup> At approximately the same time Sophronius produced a similar statement:

<sup>193</sup> Bathrellos (2001) 172.

<sup>194</sup> As Epiphonovitch remarks, it is sinful and egoistic ('греховная и эгоистическая'; (1916) 105).

<sup>195</sup> See Florovsky (1933) 215.

<sup>196</sup> *OratDomin* 877<sup>d</sup>; see also *adThalas* 313<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>197</sup> *ep* 2 396<sup>d</sup>, 400<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>198</sup> *OpuscThPol* 4, 60<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>199</sup> (1916) 108, n. 1.

<sup>200</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 136<sup>36-37</sup>.

Emmanuel, who was one...acted κατ' ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο; as God, he himself (ὁ αὐτὸς) (worked) the divine (things), while as man, he the same (worked) the human things; in such a way he wished to show himself to everybody as God and as man... And it is not (true) that one, on the one hand, worked the miracles and another, on the other hand, worked the human (works) and suffered, as Nestorius wants.<sup>201</sup>

Beyond the commonly recognized fact that it is one and only one who acts (*i.e.* Christ), nevertheless, the parties drew different conclusions. On the one hand, Monenergists adduced that Christ had but one *energeia*. Pyrrhus had stated: 'If he who acts is single, then the *energeia* is single too, as belonging to the single (Christ).'<sup>202</sup> And again in another passage Pyrrhus defined the connection between the oneness and the *energeia* with more precision: the *energeia* is single because the person is one—διὰ τὸ μοναδικὸν τοῦ προσώπου.<sup>203</sup>

For Dyenergists, on the other hand, one and the same Christ acted not 'monadically,' but 'doubly.'<sup>204</sup> This concept was not as easy to affirm by rational argument as that of a single activity proceeding from a single subject. To explain it, Dyenergists first referred to the fact that the subject of activities, which in Christ was his hypostasis, could not act on his own. To be revealed as subject, he needs to have a nature. Maximus of Aquileia articulated this point at the fifth session of the Lateran council:

Although the will belongs to him who wills and the *energeia* belongs to him who acts, they (belong) not to him who simply wills (ἀπλῶς τοῦ θέλοντος), but who wills according to the nature, and not to him who simply acts (ἀπλῶς τοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος), but who acts according to nature.<sup>205</sup>

As proof he added that *energeia* and will had an appellation (ὀνομασία, *appellatio*), which characterized them as belonging to a certain nature: human, angelic, or divine:

Every (activity and will) has as its appellation the nature of those who act and will. Thus, we call human, the will and *energeia* of man, angelic we call the will and *energeia* of Angel, and divine we call the will and

<sup>201</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 442<sup>4-10</sup>; see Maximus (*Disputatio* 340<sup>b</sup>), Horos (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 776<sup>8-9</sup>).

<sup>202</sup> *Disputatio* 340<sup>a</sup>; see also the letter of Sergius to Cyrus (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 542<sup>6-7</sup>), *Ecthesis* (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>39</sup>–160<sup>1</sup>), and the letter of Patriarch Paul to Pope Theodore (ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 608<sup>11-12</sup>).

<sup>203</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>204</sup> *Disputatio* 340<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>205</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 344<sup>39</sup>–346<sup>1</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> I 345<sup>38</sup>–347<sup>2</sup>.

*energeia* of God. Therefore, the teachers of the Catholic Church ascribe each one, I mean divine and human (*energeia* and will) to the same who is God and man.<sup>206</sup>

Together with other arguments recorded in the acts of the Lateran council, this one is also found in the works of Maximus the Confessor, who appears to be its real inventor. Maximus insisted that the alleged single will cannot be given any proper name.<sup>207</sup> If it were called 'theandric' or 'composite', it would not be identical with the will of the Father or of the Holy Spirit. Were it seen as natural, this would confuse the two natures of Christ. If hypostatic, then the Holy Trinity would be divided into three parts by three different wills. If relative, this would divide the person of Christ and result in Nestorianism. If the will were disposed against nature (παρὰ φύσιν), it would destroy Christ. Finally, if it were left without a proper name, this would make nonsense. The same argument can be traced back to Aristotle who, in his *Categories*, spoke of things called from substances as synonymous. These synonymous things, wrote Aristotle, have the same name and the same definition:

But synonymous things were precisely those with both the name in common and the same definition. Hence, all the things called from substances and differentiae are so called synonymously.<sup>208</sup>

Some things are called by *paronymy*, taking their names from other things to which they are related:

When things get their name from something, with a difference of ending, they are called *paronymous*. Thus, for example, the grammarian gets his name from grammar, the brave get theirs from bravery.<sup>209</sup>

In order to prove that a single subject need not comprise only one activity, the Dyenergists attempted to show how the *energeiai* relate to their subject, *i.e.* the hypostasis of Christ. For this purpose, they developed certain formulas, including a modification of the following definition of Chalcedon:

<sup>206</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 346<sup>3-7</sup>; ACO<sub>2</sub> I 347<sup>2-6</sup>.

<sup>207</sup> See, for instance, *OpuscThPol* 1, 25<sup>d-29c</sup>; 3, 53<sup>c-56a</sup>; 8, 100<sup>a-b</sup>.

<sup>208</sup> *Cat* 3b<sup>7-9</sup>/Ackrill (1971) 3.

<sup>209</sup> *Cat* 1a<sup>12-15</sup>/Ackrill (1971) 3. Similar definitions can be found in Porphyry: *inCat* 4,1.68<sup>5-27</sup> (concerning synonymous things); *inCat* 4,1.69<sup>14-70</sup><sup>24</sup> (concerning paronymous things).

The difference of the natures is not destroyed because of the union, but on the contrary, the character of each nature is preserved (σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως) and comes together in one person and one hypostasis (εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης).<sup>210</sup>

What is stated here concerning natural properties, the Dyenergists-Dyothelites applied to the *energeiai* and wills of Christ, which they placed among the natural properties. Thus, the *energeiai* and the wills ‘concur’ and proceed from a single subject, as stated in the *Horos* of the council of Constantinople:

We confess two wills and two operations, concurring most fitly for the salvation of the human race.<sup>211</sup>

Sophronius clarified in greater detail the role of the single subject in the processes of acting and willing. He determined the subject-hypostasis to be the ‘seat’ (ἔδρα) of the natures<sup>212</sup> and therefore of the *energeiai* and wills. As to the relationship between subject and activities, the former played not only the static role of a place or a seat, where activities ‘meet each other,’ but also a dynamic role of distributing, controlling, and ruling. In defining this role, Sophronius characterized the relationship between the subject and the *energeiai* as ταμίας and πρύτανις:

He (= Christ) was a ταμίας of his human sufferings and deeds, and not only a ταμίας, but also a πρύτανις.<sup>213</sup>

There is merit in analysing these two words precisely, as they shed a good deal of light on the role of the single subject in the process of acting. The noun ταμίας originates from the verb τέμνω—‘to cut, hew, divide, bisect’ *etc.* In classical times, it was primarily associated with the occupation of a priest,<sup>214</sup> a treasurer of sanctuaries,<sup>215</sup> or a secular

<sup>210</sup> *Horos*, ACO<sub>1</sub> I<sup>2</sup> 129<sup>31-33</sup>/Norris (1980) 159.

<sup>211</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 776<sup>17-18</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/faith.htm> (23/07/2003).

<sup>212</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 442<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>213</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 452<sup>3-5</sup>.

<sup>214</sup> Pindarus wrote about a *tamias* of Zeus (*Olympia* 6<sup>5</sup>); Plato mentioned a *tamias* of a goddess (*Leges* 774b<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>215</sup> Euripides referred to a *tamias* who was a gold-keeper in the temple in Delphi (*Ion* 46<sup>54-55</sup>); Aristotle wrote about a *tamias* of sacred money (*ΑθηνΠολιτ* 30.2<sup>6</sup>); see also *ΑθηνΠολιτ* 4.2<sup>3</sup>; *ΑθηνΠολιτ* 7.3<sup>5</sup>; 8.1<sup>7</sup>–8.2<sup>1</sup>; *ΑθηνΠολιτ* 49.4<sup>5</sup>; *ΑθηνΠολιτ* 60.3<sup>1</sup>; *ΑθηνΠολιτ* 60.3<sup>4</sup>; *ΑθηνΠολιτ* 61.7<sup>1</sup>. In the same treatise Aristotle explained who were *tamiai* and how *tamiai* of the goddess Athena in Athens were elected (*ΑθηνΠολιτ* 47.1<sup>1</sup>–47.1<sup>7</sup>).

treasurer.<sup>216</sup> It also signified those who supply others with goods<sup>217</sup> or have something stored.<sup>218</sup> Since the fifth century B.C., the word had been attributed to gods and emphasised first their function as dispensers of different goods, but also their power, might, and superiority.<sup>219</sup> Among Christian authors, Clement of Alexandria characterized God as a *tamias*—the holder and provider—of eternal life.<sup>220</sup> For Eusebius God was a *tamias* and a 'giver' (χορηγός) of life, light, truth, and all goods,<sup>221</sup> and Christ—a *tamias* of his own prototypes, which were attested in the Old Testament.<sup>222</sup> Gregory of Nyssa referred to God as *tamias* of our lives,<sup>223</sup> and Christ, a *tamias* of wisdom and knowledge.<sup>224</sup> In the spurious work *Christus patiens* ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzus, God was called *tamias* of unexpected things,<sup>225</sup> meaning that God often does things that none would expect. *Tamias* in this context connoted someone who has power to do what he wills or decides upon. Gregory of Nazianzus calls Christ a *tamias* of the Holy Spirit,<sup>226</sup> who possesses and supplies us with what we need.<sup>227</sup> In addition, Gregory saw Christ as *tamias* in the sense that he had power over everything relating to him. Broadly speaking Gregory understood this to mean anybody and anything that

<sup>216</sup> Also called 'hellenotamias' that means someone responsible for public money. Aelius Herodianus explained: "Ἑλληνοταμίας, ὁ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ταμίας." *Partitiones* 30<sup>13-14</sup>. This word appears as early as Thucydides (*Historiae* 1.96.2<sup>1-3</sup>); see also Antiphon (*deCaede* 69<sup>9</sup>), Andocides (*dePace* 38<sup>2</sup>), Aristotle (*Ἀθηνῶν Πολιτ* 30.2<sup>7</sup>, 30.2<sup>12</sup>), Plutarchus (*VitOrat* 841.B<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>217</sup> Thus, Aristippus, in the *Lives of Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius, mentioned that the first Athenians were *tamiai* of Socrates and provided him with the essentials of life (*VitPhilosoph* 2.74<sup>7-9</sup>). Also Athenaeus wrote about a certain Oulpianus who provided dinners (*Deipnosophistae* 2.51<sup>1-2</sup>).

<sup>218</sup> Pindarus, for example, used the word to denote a person who had a store of crowns: 'ταμίας στεφάνων.' *Nemea* 6<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>219</sup> The word was linked particularly to Zeus. Thus, for Euripides Zeus is *tamias* i.e. distributor of many things, also a ruler, judge, and controller at Olympus (*Medea* 1415). The functions of Zeus as distributor and provider of different things, both good and bad, were emphasised in Plato's *Respublica* (379.e<sup>1-2</sup>). Isocrates used the word *tamias* as synonymous to κύριος—master (*Busiris* 13<sup>7-9</sup>). Aelius Aristides in his treatise *Εἰς Δία* put on the same level such characteristics of Zeus as *tamias*, 'father,' 'benefactor,' 'overseer,' 'defender,' 'ruler' (πρύτανις), and 'lord' (*Εἰς Δία* 8<sup>10-14</sup>).

<sup>220</sup> *QuisDives* 6.4<sup>3-5</sup>. What is remarkable here is that the Son is a mediator—he gives us what he takes from the Father; therefore, he is not a *tamias*.

<sup>221</sup> *PraepEvang* 1.1.4<sup>2-3</sup>, 11.4.3<sup>2-4</sup>, 3.6.6<sup>1-3</sup>.

<sup>222</sup> *Gener* 23<sup>2-3</sup>.

<sup>223</sup> *inCant* 6.13<sup>18-19</sup>.

<sup>224</sup> *deOccursu* 46.1177<sup>52-53</sup>.

<sup>225</sup> *ChristusPatiens* (spuria) 1130.

<sup>226</sup> *CarmDogm* 512<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>227</sup> *contralulian* 2, 35.672<sup>19-20</sup>.

contains or possesses an object. Hunters, for example, have power over their prey and are able to distribute the latter as they want.<sup>228</sup> Basil of Caesaria also spoke of God as giver and *tamias*.<sup>229</sup> Thus, by the time of Sophronius the word *tamias* had a wide range of meanings. Essentially it signified primarily someone (rarely something) that distributes, provides, and supplies; it also referred to a person who contains, keeps stored, preserves, guards; and finally to a regulator, controller, and ruler.

Meanings for the word *prytanis* were less varied than those for *tamias*. Primarily, it meant a public figure that performed different administrative functions. In Athens, where the term first appeared, it signified a representative of a clan in the council (ἐκκλησία), whereas in other states it referred to a chief magistrate. At a later time it was attributed to the president of a council.<sup>230</sup> But before the term assumed the meaning of a public service, it was applied to the gods, especially Zeus, the *prytanis* of lightning,<sup>231</sup> of the blessed,<sup>232</sup> the common king, master, father, and *prytanis* of gods and humans,<sup>233</sup> of everybody and everything without exclusion.<sup>234</sup> In using this word, the ancients wanted to emphasise supremacy and domination. It also meant that somebody or something had certain properties of a greater magnitude than others. Athenaeus described the ode as *prytanis* of hymns,<sup>235</sup> while Clement of Alexandria, in his *Hymn to Christ*, depicted Christ as *prytanis* of wisdom,<sup>236</sup> of boundless life.<sup>237</sup> In his treatise *Exposition of the right faith* Theodoret of Cyrus praised the Logos as *prytanis*<sup>238</sup> and Synesius' hymns named God *prytanis* of

<sup>228</sup> *inBasil* 8.1<sup>1-2</sup>.

<sup>229</sup> *TempFamis* 31.309<sup>17-18</sup>.

<sup>230</sup> Hesychius Lexicographus offered in his *Lexicon* the following synonyms for the word: βασιλεύς, ἄρχων, χορηγός, ταμίης, διοικητής (4130). See also Thucydides (*Historiae* 4.118.14<sup>1-4</sup>, 5.47.9<sup>1-3</sup>, 6.14.1<sup>1-2</sup>, 8.70.1<sup>3-7</sup>); Isocrates (*dePac* 154<sup>-5</sup>, *Trapez* 34<sup>9</sup>); Aristophanes (*Ach* 173); Andocides (*Myst* 12<sup>2</sup>); Xenophon (*Hell* 1.7.15<sup>1-3</sup>); Plato (*Apol* 32.b<sup>5-7</sup>, *Prot* 319.c<sup>5-7</sup>, 338.a<sup>7-8</sup>, *Gorg* 516.e<sup>1</sup>, *Leges* 755.e<sup>4-5</sup>, 760.b<sup>1</sup>, 766.b<sup>2</sup>, 953.c<sup>1</sup>); Lysias (*Or* 6 29<sup>3</sup>); Demosthenes (*Cor* 37<sup>7</sup>); Aeschines (*FalsLeg* 53<sup>4</sup>); Aristotle (*Pol* 1322b<sup>28-29</sup>, *ΑθηνΠολιτ* 4.2<sup>9</sup>, 29.4<sup>2</sup>, 41.3<sup>3</sup>, 43.6<sup>8</sup>, 44.1<sup>1</sup>, 44.2<sup>1</sup>, 44.2<sup>2</sup>, 45.4<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>231</sup> Pindarus (*P* 6<sup>23-26</sup>).

<sup>232</sup> Aeschylus (*Pr* 169).

<sup>233</sup> Dio Chrysostom (*Orationes* 12.22<sup>1-2</sup>).

<sup>234</sup> Aelius Aristides (*ΕἰςΔία* 8<sup>10-15</sup>).

<sup>235</sup> *Deipnosophistae* 14.33<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>236</sup> *HymnChristi* 14.

<sup>237</sup> *QuisDives* 25.8<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>238</sup> *Expositio* 390<sup>a</sup>–390<sup>b</sup>.



stars<sup>239</sup> and of 'nous'.<sup>240</sup> Eusebius wrote that Christ is *prytanis* of peace<sup>241</sup> and God is *prytanis* of the entire world<sup>242</sup> and all that is good.<sup>243</sup> For Gregory of Nazianzus 'nous' is *prytanis* of the soul.<sup>244</sup> Athanasius spoke about philosophers who are unable to provide people with peace of mind or harmony of opinions—they were incapable of becoming *prytaneis* of like-mindedness.<sup>245</sup> Here the word carried a nuance of 'providing' or 'supplying.' God, too, is, for Athanasius, a *prytanis*.<sup>246</sup> Consequently, the word *prytanis* meant somebody or something superior, dominant, even almighty. The closest Greek word was κύριος, which also meant somebody or something that rules and controls. *Prytanis* also had the meaning of being able to provide or keep things together.

Analysis of the two words makes it possible to draw out what Sophronius meant when he defined 'subject' as *tamias* and *prytanis* of the *energeiai*. It was the ultimate source of the *energeiai*, from where and by which they are distributed and provided, as well as directed and controlled, evaluated and judged. In addition, the subject was master, superior, head, and simultaneously a guard. To some extent, it also meant a vessel and a holder of the *energeiai*.

Bathrellos has suggested that a difference exists between the Leonine tradition and the Dyothelite concept of a single subject of activities. He concluded that Leo considered the natures of Christ as two subjects of action: 'The principal problem with Leo's formula is not that it uses divine-like expressions to refer to the divinity of Christ and human-like ones to refer to his humanity, but that it turns the natures of Christ into subjects of action.'<sup>247</sup> Dyothelite theologians and seventh century conciliar rulings did not assume the natures to be the only subjects of action: 'Sophronius at times regarded Christ as the subject of the human and the divine actions, and at others regarded the natures as the subjects of their proper actions.'<sup>248</sup> As for Maximus, Bathrellos has rightly concluded that 'even when nature "wills" or "acts," it is the person who is

<sup>239</sup> *Hymni* 1<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>240</sup> *Hymni* 2<sup>181</sup>.

<sup>241</sup> *inIsaiam* 2.48<sup>104</sup>.

<sup>242</sup> See *VitConst* 1.24.1<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>243</sup> *VitConst* 4.52.4<sup>1-2</sup>.

<sup>244</sup> *CarmMoral* 685<sup>1-7</sup>.

<sup>245</sup> *contraGen* 29<sup>31</sup>.

<sup>246</sup> See *inPsal* 27.160<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>247</sup> Bathrellos (2001) 205.

<sup>248</sup> Bathrellos (2001) 207–208.

the ultimate bearer and so, indirectly, the subject of willing and acting.<sup>249</sup> However, he has incorrectly opposed the later Dyothelites to Leo and has falsely ascribed to the latter the belief that Christ's natures are the only subjects of the activities. On the one hand one may agree with Bathrellos that Leo's phrase 'Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium habuit, Verbo quidem operante quod Verbi est, carne autem exequente quod carnis est, et horum coruscat miraculis, aliud vero subcumbit iniuriis,' implied that the two natures were the subjects of the activities. The phrase, therefore, should be translated: 'And so each nature functions in communion with the other, (performing) whatever belongs to each one.' Nevertheless, the preceding and following sentences suggest that for Leo Christ was also the subject of action:

The same one (= Christ) who is a genuine human being is also genuinely God, and in this unity there is no deception.<sup>250</sup>

For there is one and the same—as we must say over and over again—who is genuinely Son of God and genuinely Son of man. He is God by reason of the fact that 'in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God' (John 1, 1). He is human by reason of the fact that 'the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us' (John 1, 14).<sup>251</sup>

By way of conclusion, it could be said that the entire phrase implied a double activity and a double subject of actions. On the one hand, it is primarily Christ who acts. On the other, however, it is the divinity that operates (*Verbo operante*) and humanity that executes (*carne exequente*) what belongs to each nature. Leo in fact implied a hierarchy within the subjects of the activities. The person of Christ appears to be a primary subject, whereas the natures are secondary. This Leonine tradition was fully adopted by Sophronius, Maximus, and their colleagues in the Dyothelite camp.<sup>252</sup> Sophronius, for one, sometimes regarded Christ as a person: the subject of the human and divine actions;<sup>253</sup> and at other times he ascribed this role to the natures.<sup>254</sup> As for Maximus, he also

<sup>249</sup> Bathrellos (2001) 217.

<sup>250</sup> *adFlav* 28<sup>9-10</sup>/Norris (1980) 149.

<sup>251</sup> *adFlav* 28<sup>16-19</sup>/Norris (1980) 150.

<sup>252</sup> Moeller, therefore, is correct in saying that Leonine formula is absolutely orthodox and 'assures the realism of each nature and their indissoluble union.' *Le Chalcedonism* (1951) 716–717.

<sup>253</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 440<sup>17-20</sup>; 442<sup>1-2</sup>, 4–14; 444<sup>5-7</sup>, 14–15; 448<sup>8-10</sup>.

<sup>254</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 442<sup>2-4</sup>, 15–18; 442<sup>22</sup>–444<sup>2</sup>; 444<sup>4</sup>, 10–11, 16–18.

spoke of both the single Christ<sup>255</sup> and the natures<sup>256</sup> as subjects of the activities.

### 3.2.2. Will—One-Who-Wills

In that there is a single Christ who wills, Monothelites concluded that his will is single as well, and belongs to his hypostasis. Consequently, in their view, two wills would of necessity introduce two persons.<sup>257</sup> At the same time, they never argued that two *energeiai* would also presuppose two acting subjects. Macarius of Antioch was, as in other situations, the most consistent in his understanding of this concept, identifying the single will of Christ as 'hypostatic': 'I confess...one hypostatic will in our Lord Jesus Christ.'<sup>258</sup> As noted above, Monothelites rejected the notion of two wills in Christ because they would necessarily oppose one another. Aside from being liable to sin, the human will would differ from the divine for the following reason: in that Monothelites accepted that will belongs to hypostasis, it would, therefore, assume the same characteristics as the hypostasis. The most important of the characteristics was to be 'particular' (τὸ ἴδιον), not 'universal' or 'common' (τὸ κοινόν). Accordingly, the will should also be 'particular' and not 'universal.' This implied that every given will is unique and there are no two similar wills, just as there are no two similar hypostases. Therefore, two identical wills would be absurd and could not coexist in the same Christ.

The Dyothelites took a different approach. They attributed the will not to the hypostasis but to nature: the will was not 'particular,' but 'universal' or 'common.'<sup>259</sup> As such, two wills could easily have coexisted in Christ in total harmony, subject only to the condition that his

<sup>255</sup> See, for instance, *OpuscThPol* 15, 168<sup>a</sup>: 'ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ δὲ μορφῇ.' According to Doucet, however, initially the phrase here could be used in the nominative and was later turned by the copyists into the ablative (1972) 417.

<sup>256</sup> In Migne: 'Ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας.' *Disputatio* 352<sup>b</sup>. Doucet, however, remarks that initially Maximus used ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ in the nominative, but this was later turned into the ablative. This can be concluded from the continuation of the phrase: 'Ὁ γὰρ εἰπών, "Ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας", τί ἕτερον πεποίηκεν; ἢ ὁ εἰπών. "Καὶ γὰρ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἀπόσιτος διαμείνας, ὕστερον ἐπεινάσεν" ἔδωκε γὰρ τῇ φύσει, ὅτε ἠθέλησε, τὰ ἴδια ἐνεργῆσαι.' Thus, Christ allowed his nature to function as was fitting to it.

<sup>257</sup> See Patriarch Paul (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 200<sup>25-26</sup>).

<sup>258</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 216<sup>12</sup>, 24-25.

<sup>259</sup> See *Disputatio* 293<sup>a</sup>.

human will could not be corrupted by sin. At the same time, Dyothelites ascribed to the wills of Christ not only his natures but also his hypostasis. Maximus asserted that not only the natures but also one and the same Christ was 'volitional' (θελητικός) and 'energetic' (ἐνεργητικός).<sup>260</sup> He added that Christ willed not 'monadically' (μοναδικῶς), but 'doubly' (δυνικῶς), that is as God and as man.<sup>261</sup> Maximus developed further the language of 'monadic' and 'double' willing and more broadly that of unity and diversity in Christ's natures, activities, and wills. To indicate the difference between notions of hypostasis and nature, he applied to a particular being the term 'mode of existence' (τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως), whereas to a common being—the term 'logos'.<sup>262</sup> Maximus could have inherited this distinction from Sophronius,<sup>263</sup> who, in turn, may have borrowed it from earlier authors, such as Diadochus of Photice and the Cappadocians.<sup>264</sup> He applied the definition both to the Holy Trinity and to Christ.<sup>265</sup> With respect to his Christology, Maximus used this distinction to describe the balance between the unity and diversity of Christ's natures, together with their activities and wills. Thus, for him, *energeia* belongs to the *logos* of the nature, but its *tropos* is determined by the person:

The coming together of these (= natures) effects the great mystery of the nature of Jesus who is beyond nature, and shows that in this the difference and the union of the *energeiai* are preserved, the (difference) beheld without division in the natural *logos* of what has been united, and the (union) acknowledged without confusion in the monadic mode of what has come to pass.<sup>266</sup>

The same applies equally to the wills:

The ability to will (πεφυκέναι θέλειν) and the willing (θέλειν) are not the same, and the ability to speak (πεφυκέναι λαλεῖν) and speaking (λαλεῖν) are not the same either. For the ability to speak (λαλητικόν) exists always in man by nature, but man does not speak always, for the former belongs to essence and is held by the *logos* of nature, whereas the latter belongs to deliberate desire (βουλή), and is modelled by the *gnome* of him who

<sup>260</sup> *Disputatio* 289<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>261</sup> *Disputatio* 289<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>262</sup> See Louth (1996) 51.

<sup>263</sup> As Schönborn remarks, 'Saint Sophrone connaît donc, en substance déjà, la distinction entre *logos* et *tropos* que saint Maxime développera fortement' (1972) 193.

<sup>264</sup> See Schönborn (1972) 193 n. 97.

<sup>265</sup> See, for instance, *Ambig* 1.

<sup>266</sup> *Ambig* 1052<sup>b</sup>/ Louth (1996) 55; see also *OpuscThPol* 10, 136<sup>d</sup>–137<sup>a</sup>.

speaks; therefore the ever-existing ability to speak belongs to nature, but the mode of speaking (πῶς λαλεῖν) belongs to hypostasis, and the same goes for the ability to will (πεφυκέναι θέλειν) and the willing (θέλειν). And since the ability to will and the willing are not the same (for, as I said, the former belongs to essence, whereas the latter to the deliberate desire of one who wills), the enfleshed Logos had as man the ability to will (πεφυκέναι θέλειν), which was moved and modelled by (or according to) his divine will (τῷ αὐτοῦ θεϊκῷ θελήματι κινούμενον τε καὶ τυπούμενον). For his willing (θέλειν), as the great Gregory says, does in no way oppose God, because it is wholly deified.<sup>267</sup>

Thus, as Bathrellos has remarked, the human will of Christ, which belonged to his nature, 'was modelled, moved and actualised in particular acts of human willing by the divine person of the Logos in obedience to the Father.'<sup>268</sup> For Maximus, human will is common to all people and characterises human nature. However, its way of actualisation both depends upon and characterises the person. This perception is related to Maximus' Christological vision, which points to the Logos as personal subject who, by virtue of having a human natural will and *energeia*, was capable of willing and accomplishing our salvation not only as God but also as man.<sup>269</sup> Therefore, the unity of the two *energeiai* and the two wills identified the equivalence of their *tropoi*, whereas the difference between them was preserved in their proper *logoi*. The *tropos-logos* language not only denoted unity and diversity in the natures, activities and wills, but also elucidated how they existed and manifested themselves without intersection and contradiction. This language, however, was not adopted in the broader Dyenergist-Dyothelite tradition, which contented itself with Chalcedonian language. According to the definition of the 680/1 council, therefore, the human will of Christ belonged to his hypostasis to the same extent as his human nature:

For as his flesh is called and is the flesh of God the Word, so also the natural will of his flesh is called and is the proper will of God the Word, as he himself says: 'I came down from heaven, not that I might do mine own will but the will of the Father which sent me!' (John 6, 38) where he calls his own will the will of his flesh, inasmuch as his flesh was also his own.<sup>270</sup>

<sup>267</sup> *OpuscThPol* 3, 48<sup>a-b</sup>.

<sup>268</sup> Bathrellos (2001) 185.

<sup>269</sup> Bathrellos (2001) 219–220.

<sup>270</sup> *Horos*, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 774<sup>26–29</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/faith.htm> (23/07/2003).

Other aspects of the relationship between Christ's wills and their willing subject were developed in the context of discussions on the prayer of Christ in the garden of Gethsemane (Matt 26, 36–46; Mark 14, 32–42). Monothelites interpreted the agony of Christ as imaginary. It was for them more a moral lesson, a pattern to follow, that had been given to believers: Christ represented our human nature, not his own. Pope Honorius interpreted the Gethsemane prayer as a mere moral lesson.<sup>271</sup> Another Monothelite, Patriarch Paul, rejected the idea that the human will of Christ could really have wished to avoid the cup of suffering. He maintained that the words of Christ in Gethsemane must not be understood as a manifestation of human will.<sup>272</sup> Dyothelites, on the other hand, alienated themselves from a didactic interpretation of the Gethsemane prayer. Maximus of Aquileia claimed at the Lateran that one and the same Christ in a mysterious way combined the will to suffer and the will to avoid suffering. His willingness to accept suffering belonged to his divine nature, while his willingness to avoid it stemmed from his human nature. These wills, far from contradicting each other, coexisted in a mysterious way—just as in God there resides power of creation and the power of dispensation. Christ's willingness to assume human nature is similar to creation, whereas his willingness to undergo suffering in order to redeem fallen nature is akin to dispensation.<sup>273</sup> Another speaker at the Lateran, Bishop Deusdedit, also contributed to this discussion. He declared that Christ accepted voluntary suffering, because it was his will to save humankind. This suffering, though undesirable, became desirable because he desired our salvation.<sup>274</sup>

Maximus took a somewhat clearer approach to the matter. During his disputation with Pyrrhus he explained that it was only natural for created beings to desire life and avoid corruption and death. In the case of Christ, therefore, his human will quite naturally went against death. But this did not manifest disobedience to God's will; it was, rather, a full concordance of his human will with the laws given by God to human nature. The fear (δειλία) felt by Christ was different from sinful fear, which dwells in fallen nature. It was natural (κατὰ φύσιν), and as such at odds with all that threatened nature. Sinful fear, on the other hand, conflicts with nature (παρὰ φύσιν). Christ's natural fear was not

<sup>271</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 552<sup>15–19</sup>.

<sup>272</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 200<sup>38</sup>–202<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>273</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 346<sup>37</sup>–348<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>274</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 356.

caused by any natural necessity; it was deliberate, as with all of other 'blameless passions':

He verily did hunger and thirst, not in a mode (τρόπῳ) similar to ours, but in a mode which surpasses us (τῷ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν), in other words, voluntarily. Thus, he was truly afraid, not as we are (καθ' ἡμῶν), but in a mode surpassing us (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν).<sup>275</sup>

Maximus also remarked that Christ's prayer was addressed to the Father from his humanity, not his divinity, as Monothelites would assert. If the divine nature and, correspondingly, the divine will were the source of his prayer, then Christ's divine will would have differed from that of the Father. In the prayer, Christ showed that his human will was fully obedient to his divine will, in spite of its natural fear and aversion to death.<sup>276</sup>

### 3.2.3. *Will—'nous'*

In antiquity, the mental and volitional faculties of a man were considered virtually identical. Volitional activity was regarded as one aspect of intellectual activity. It was not accorded particular significance among the human virtues and was in no way considered to be an independent faculty. According to Aleksey Losev, 'will in its pure form is not at all an antique notion.'<sup>277</sup> Albrecht Dihle who has studied this issue concluded that 'the Greeks had no word...in their language to denote will or intention as such.'<sup>278</sup> Early Christian authors inherited this legacy. Dihle adds, 'Most of the arguments by which man's free decision was corroborated were taken (= by the early Christian authors)

<sup>275</sup> *Disputatio* 297<sup>d</sup>/Farrell (1990) 18.

<sup>276</sup> See *OpuscThPol* 6, 65<sup>a</sup>–69<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>277</sup> Losev (1969) I<sup>1</sup> 87. Recent research has indicated some embryonic thoughts on will in Aristotle, though will is not distinguished from reason; see Kenny (1979).

<sup>278</sup> (1982) 20. Dihle continues: 'During the period when the two verbs βούλομαι and (ἐ)θέλω were still different in meaning, the first signified primarily the planning and reflecting which precedes action. The second only meant "to be disposed, to be prepared"... On the other hand, many words for cognition or thought inevitably imply the semantic element of decision or intention which results from intellectual activity. This applies to γιγνώσκω, διανοέομαι, νοέω, and other words... Προαιρέομαι, which comes very close to our concept of will, clearly refers to the choice which the intellect makes out of several possible objectives of action. Προαίρεσις—literally "prediction" or "preference"—denotes the act of intellectual perception rather than intention itself, the general direction which action takes, or the strength of the impulse towards action.' (1982) 20–21. See also Jaeger (1967).

from philosophical doctrines. So, for example, both Justin and Irenaeus derive the faculty of free choice from man's endowment with reason, that is to say from his intellectual forces... Clement of Alexandria, too, follows the philosophical tradition in attributing free decision on which moral responsibility rests on man's intellectual perception and judgement (προαίρεσις) which leads to the view that human action is the consequence of cognition.<sup>279</sup>

The situation changed dramatically in the fourth century, when the faculty of will came to be considered as more or less independent from reasoning.<sup>280</sup> The first theologian that broke through the ancient tradition of equating the volitional and intellectual faculties was Athanasius, who was impelled to do so by the Arian controversy.<sup>281</sup> Arius had indeed confused the Father's activity of creating and giving birth to Son, a confusion which led him to the conclusion that the Son was created. In order to refute Arius, Athanasius introduced a distinction between the acts of creating and of giving a birth. He defined volition as a major factor that demarcated the difference between them. Will is involved in the process of creation, whereas birthgiving is realised without will.<sup>282</sup>

Thus, in the context of the Arian controversy, God's will was comprehended and identified as a distinctive power. Human will, however, continued to be considered as an aspect of the intellect. Gregory of Nyssa followed an idiosyncratic line in his examination of the human will. On the one hand, he faithfully followed the intellectualism of antiquity claiming, for example, that 'thoughts are the fathers of the will'.<sup>283</sup> On the other hand, he tended to consider the two faculties separately. Gregory believed man to be moved constantly by the unquenchable desire to reach truth and perfection, both of which always remain unattainable. This aspiration thus emerges as a self-standing volitional power.<sup>284</sup> In the East, human will developed into a fully-fledged faculty owing to

---

<sup>279</sup> (1982) 107–108. As for Origenes, Dihle remarks: 'According to him (= Origenes), the will of man proceeds from his reason without becoming separated from it.' (1982) 111; see also Irenaeus (*Fragm* 5<sup>1–6</sup>).

<sup>280</sup> See Dihle (1982) 113.

<sup>281</sup> See Dihle (1982) 116.

<sup>282</sup> See, for instance, *contArian* 26.72.

<sup>283</sup> See *VitMos* 2<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>284</sup> See Dihle (1982) 120–122 and in particular: 'If man was told to proceed, in the moral and religious conduct of his life, towards the cognition of something which was imperceptible by its very nature, the admonition had to be made explicit with the aid of an anthropological notion of will.'



the Christological controversy.<sup>285</sup> By the beginning of the Monothelite controversy, the human will of Christ was already perceived as a relatively independent and self-sufficient faculty, though it had not lost its ties with the intellect. Monothelites emphasised the close connection between will and intellect and used this connection for polemical purposes against the Dyothelites. Two wills, according to their logic, would necessarily lead to a disorder in Christ's mind (διχόνοια-dissensio).<sup>286</sup> Dyothelites used the same connection also for polemical purposes. In particular, Maximus remarked:

They say that natural will (φυσικὸν θέλημα) or volition (θέλησις) is a faculty desirous of what is in accordance with nature, a faculty that holds together in being the attributes that belong essentially to a being's nature. The essence, being naturally held together by this, desires to be and live and move in accordance with perception (αἴσθησις) and mind (νοῦς).<sup>287</sup>

Maximus insisted that beings without rational will are deprived of reason and intellect (ἄλογον and ἀνόητον).<sup>288</sup> The same ideas were repeated in the conciliar documents that supported Dyothelitism. The *Edict*, for example, stated that we cannot speak of the intellect without speaking of the will and *vice versa*:

Intellect is an indication of the human perfection. Owing to it, we will, think, and differ from the mindless animals. Nothing which lacks a mind has a will (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄνου θελητικόν), while everything which has a will is intellectual (πᾶν δὲ θελητικὸν νοερόν). For where is an intellect, there always is a will.<sup>289</sup>

### 3.2.4. Energeia—*nature*

It has already been mentioned that Monenergists allowed some distinction between Christ's divine and human activities. It would be an exaggeration to say that they did not attribute the activities to the natures, though to a significantly lesser degree than to the hypostasis. Typically, Patriarch Sergius wrote in a letter to Honorius that Christ's activities

<sup>285</sup> In the West, the situation was somewhat different. Here the conception of human will emerged from the Pelagian controversy and was developed mainly by Augustine; see Dihle (1982) ch. 6: 'St. Augustine and his concept of will.'

<sup>286</sup> See ACO<sub>2</sub> I 34<sup>68-11</sup>; 347<sup>6-10</sup>.

<sup>287</sup> *OpuscThPol* 1, 12<sup>c</sup>-13<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>288</sup> *OpuscThPol* 8, 97<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>289</sup> *Edict*, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 840<sup>18-20</sup>.

are united ‘ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀδιαίρετως,’<sup>290</sup> in precisely the same way as his natures. Monenergists did not ascribe the *energeiai* to the natures to the same degree as the Dyenergists. The following remark by Patriarch Pyrrhus on the point is characteristic:

When we assert a single *energeia* of both the Godhead and manhood of Christ, we do not ascribe it to him by reason of nature (λόγῳ φύσεως) but in the mode of union (ἐνώσεως τρόπῳ).<sup>291</sup>

Here, it is evident that Christ’s activities, so far as Pyrrhus was concerned, belonged to both the divine and human natures. At the same time, they formed a single *energeia* because of the union of the natures. In another passage, Pyrrhus specified that the *energeia* of Christ is single because the *prosopon* is single (διὰ τὸ μοναδικὸν τοῦ προσώπου).<sup>292</sup> The Dyenergists’ perception of Christ’s *energeiai*, as indicated earlier, proceeded from the same premises. They too accepted that it was one and the same Christ who acted, and that he acted humanly and divinely. But these tenets did not lead them to the conclusion that the *energeia* of Christ was single. Maximus would claim that one and the same Christ acted not ‘monadically,’ but ‘dually,’<sup>293</sup> because of the double character of his nature (διὰ τὸ διπλοῦν τῆς φύσεως). Dyenergists, then, ascribed Christ’s human and divine *energeiai* to his human and divine natures respectively. In his synodic epistle, Sophronius remarked that differentiation in Christ’s activities is possible because of the diversity of his natures: ‘For this causes the difference of the *energeiai* in Christ, as well as... of the natures.’<sup>294</sup> Sophronius may have learned about the direct dependence of the *energeia* on its nature from Stephan of Alexandria,<sup>295</sup> who shared this opinion in his commentaries on Aristotle and virtually reproduced the Aristotelian slant to the relation between *energeia* and nature. He stated that whatever has the same activities also has the same essence.<sup>296</sup> Sophronius developed the idea further, asserting that *energeia* cannot exist on its own and is indissolubly related to its nature. Because of this, he called it ‘essential’ (οὐσιώδης), ‘natural’ (φυσική),

<sup>290</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 546<sup>14–15</sup>.

<sup>291</sup> *Disputatio* 340<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>292</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>293</sup> *Disputatio* 340<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>294</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 446<sup>3–4</sup>.

<sup>295</sup> See John Moschus, *PratSpirit* 2929<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>296</sup> *inAristot* 35.

and 'correspondent' (κατάλληλος).<sup>297</sup> The following statement is quite characteristic of Maximus: 'For the *energeia*, provided it is natural, is a constitutive (συστατικός) and innate (ἔμφυτος) character of the nature.'<sup>298</sup> The connection between the *energeia* and its nature was so close for the Dyenergists that in their understanding one *energeia* would invariably mean one nature. Thus, Sophronius typically remarked:

Christ worked naturally what (belongs) to each nature according to the essential quality (οὐσιώδη ποιότητα) or natural property (φυσικὴν ιδιότητα) attached (προσοῦσαν) to each (nature).<sup>299</sup>

This argument was reproduced and developed further by other polemicists. Pope Martin affirmed that the reality of nature depended on whether it possesses its own natural *energeiai* and wills. Consequently, if the natural properties, among which the Pope listed the will and *energeia*, are abolished, then

the nature is necessarily abolished together with them, because it cannot be perceived anymore through the natural property, which essentially characterizes it.<sup>300</sup>

Thus, if nature does not have its own *energeia* and will, it cannot exist:

Whatever exists without participating in any will or *energeia* (πάσης ἁμοιρον ὑπάρχον θελήσεως καὶ ἐνεργείας) also lacks essential existence (οὐσιώδους ὑπάρξεως).<sup>301</sup>

The same opinion was held by Maximus who declared that a nature without its own *energeiai* cannot be considered truly to be a nature: 'A nature can neither be conceived nor can it exist without the energies proper to it.'<sup>302</sup> The fathers of the 680/1 council placed this concept in a soteriological perspective. A lack of human *energeia* in Christ would in their eyes mean incompleteness in human nature and therefore incompleteness of salvation for the human race: 'For can we call him perfect in humanity if he does not suffer or act in any way as a human being?'<sup>303</sup>

<sup>297</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 444<sup>21</sup>–446<sup>2</sup>. See also a *scholion* to *contEunom* attributed to Basil of Caesaria, PG 87, 4012<sup>ab</sup>.

<sup>298</sup> *Disputatio* 348<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>299</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 440<sup>18–20</sup>.

<sup>300</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 406<sup>13–15</sup>, 407<sup>12–14</sup>.

<sup>301</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 406<sup>7–8</sup>, 407<sup>6–7</sup>.

<sup>302</sup> *Disputatio* 341<sup>c</sup>/Farrel (1990) 62–63.

<sup>303</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 814<sup>12–13</sup>.

The relationship between nature and its activity was considered so intimate that the former could be perceived only through the latter. Nature itself, stripped of activity, becomes unknowable. Sophronius articulated this idea shortly after 610 to the Dyenergists.<sup>304</sup> In his *Narration of the Miracles of SS Cyrus and John*, he wrote, with reference to John 10, 37 ('If I am not doing the works of my Father, then do not believe me'):

The Saviour gave us 'an infallible and sure cognition, as well as a judgement that never errs to discern those who act by their deeds (ἔργα).'<sup>305</sup>

The subject was raised again during the fourteenth century at the time of the so-called 'hesychast' controversy when the idea of the cognoscibility of a nature by its activity was applied to the Holy Trinity. The point made by Gregory Palamas and his hesychast followers was that the essence of the Holy Trinity can be perceived only through the divine *energeiai*. Their opponents, initially the Calabrian monk Barlaam and later Gregory Akindynos, at first doubted that there was any correspondence between the divine essence and its *energeiai*. They claimed that the *energeiai* are created, and secondly, they affirmed that the essence can be discerned by itself without any mediation of *energeiai*. They seem to have ignored the theological conclusions of the Monothelite controversy, while, as Christopher von Schönborn rightly remarks, 'le "palamisme" et les développements du VII<sup>e</sup> siècle autour de la question des "énergies" sont profondément dans la même ligne, celle d'une théologie économique et mystique.'<sup>306</sup>

In his refutation of two natural *energeiai*, Pyrrhus articulated his own objection. If the *energeia* ought to be ascribed not to the hypostasis but to the natures of Christ, he inferred, this would eventually introduce a multiplicity of activities, given that human nature, being composed of two major parts, soul and body, have their own distinct activities:

If you say there are two energies on account of the distinction (διὰ τὸ διάφορον) of the two natures in Christ, and not one energy on account of the singularity (διὰ τὸ μοναδικόν) of the Person, then you must also discover two energies of humanity because of that distinction between the soul and the body, which is an essential distinction (διὰ τὸ κατ' οὐσίαν

<sup>304</sup> See Schönborn (1972) 105.

<sup>305</sup> *Narratio* 29, 3509c.

<sup>306</sup> Schönborn (1972) 211.

διάφορον). And if this be so, then there will be three energies of Christ, and not two.<sup>307</sup>

Pyrrhus in fact was reviving an argument (already used in the sixth century by the Severans) that if Christ had two natures, then in effect there would have been even more, because human nature is not simple, but intrinsically composite.<sup>308</sup> This viewpoint was challenged by Leontius of Byzantium, who, to refute it, applied to Christ and his natures the Aristotelian category of species (εἶδος). According to Leontius, all humans share one composite nature because they belong to the same species. For Christ, it is incorrect to speak of a single nature because there is no species. Furthermore, said Leontius, there is no species of 'Christ'.<sup>309</sup> Maximus, in reply to the *aporia* of Pyrrhus, used the same argument, but somewhat modified and developed. First, he remarked that if the logic of Pyrrhus was followed, then Christ should have not two, but three natures:

The very point which you do allege as a negation of the natural properties also stretches out to engulf the natures in the same negation... If you say, as we do, that there be two natures of Christ in the one hypostasis by means of the distinction between soul and body, which are also two natures, then there shall be three natures of Christ and not two. And if you say as we do that there are two and not three natures of Christ, how can you maintain that there are two energies on account of the distinction of natures, for shall there not then be three energies united in the hypostasis?<sup>310</sup>

Secondly, in passing to the argument involving the category of species, he called man a species (εἶδος), but his soul and body merely essences (οὐσίαι). The oneness of the species appears to be stronger than the oneness that is related to the essence. The former understanding, therefore, makes all individual men unchangeable as men. The latter, however, tends to vanish when essences separate from each other. Thus, every man, in sharing the same species with other men, has a oneness, which is stronger than the collective 'onenesses' of his parts, such as soul and body. Therefore, the human *energeia* of Christ, here called by Maximus ἐνέργεια κατ' εἶδος, is one:

<sup>307</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 56.

<sup>308</sup> *contNestEutych* I PG 86<sup>1</sup>, 1289<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>309</sup> *contNestEutych* I PG 86<sup>1</sup>, 1292<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>310</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>a-b</sup>/Farrell (1990) 56.

But we said that this unity is not proper to the species of man (τὸ κατ' εἶδος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἓν), but is the unity proper to the essence of soul and body (τὸ κατ' οὐσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἓν). If the unity be proper to the species of man on the one hand, then the indistinguishability of the nature is proven, in spite of the particular energies of body and soul. It is for this reason that we said of man that he has one energy, and we did so not without support, rather, we adduced support for it. Contrariwise, you would mishandle the unity of body and soul, and push it into complete non-existence. If this unity which is proper to the essence of body and soul be not proper to him (*i.e.* Christ), then it is, of necessity, not proper to us. Thus, one must say either that the one energy of humanity is proper to the species, and is therefore hypostatic, or else that there are three energies because the energies are proper to nature.<sup>311</sup>

Anastasius of Sinai also turned to the matter of the unity of activity in human nature, though his analysis is poorer. He merely affirmed that the human soul has one complete *energeia*. All of its parts, namely soul, logos, and *nous*, operate in interaction which in turn is an image and likeness of the single *energeia* of the Holy Trinity.<sup>312</sup>

### 3.2.5. Will-nature

The Monenergists-Monothelites attributed the single *energeia* of Christ to his person and, to some extent, to his natures, whereas the single will they ascribed solely to Christ's person. There is no mention—at least in the surviving texts—that the will bore any relation to the natures. For their part, Dyenergists-Dyothelites fully applied to the wills the pattern of relations of the two *energeiai* to the person and to the natures of Christ. Some aspects of this pattern have already been noted, but the most important are the following: (a) Christ's two wills belong primarily to his natures, but also to his hypostasis. On this, Maximus of Aquileia, at the fifth session of the Lateran council, depicted Christ as 'volitional' (θελητικός, *voluntarius*) according to each of his natures.<sup>313</sup> (b) The wills and the natures are indissolubly connected. This was pronounced in a letter by Pope Agatho: 'The human will is natural, and who refuses the human will in Christ, without only the sin, does not recognize that he has a human soul.'<sup>314</sup> Each nature, argued the Pope, can only have its

<sup>311</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>b-c</sup>/ Farrell (1990) 56–57 (modified translation).

<sup>312</sup> *Opera* 2, I 5<sup>99–104</sup>.

<sup>313</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 344<sup>12</sup>; 345<sup>11–12</sup>.

<sup>314</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 77<sup>26–27</sup>.

own will, which, while able to follow some other will, is never to be substituted by it:

For an angelic nature cannot have a divine or a human will, neither can a human nature have a divine or an angelic will. For no nature can have anything or any motion which pertains to another nature but only that which is naturally given by creation.<sup>315</sup>

The *energeiai* and the wills are connected with their proper natures so closely that the way of their unity reflects the way of unity of the two natures. This means that human and divine *energeiai* and wills are united in such a manner that they undergo 'no confusion, no change, no division, no separation,' as stated in the *Horos* of the 680/1 council, which professed 'two natural wills and two natural operations indivisibly, inconvertibly, inseparably, unconfusedly.'<sup>316</sup> Following *verbatim* this Chalcedonian formulation, the sixth ecumenical council declared that there is both unity and diversity in the two *energeiai* and wills of Christ. The balance between unity and diversity was carefully observed by the Dyenergists-Dyothelites but especially by Maximus, who stated:

As the number of natures of the one and the same Christ, correctly understood and explained, does not divide Christ but rather preserves the distinction of natures in the union, so likewise the number of essential attributes (τῶν οὐσιωδῶς προσόντων), wills, and operations attached to those two natures does not divide Christ either.<sup>317</sup>

Nevertheless, the chief polemical concern of the Dyothelites was to prove that the wills belonged primarily to the natures. In his disputation with Pyrrhus, Maximus offered the following arguments to support this position. To begin with, he employed a classic Aristotelian distinction between three kinds of life: vegetable (φυτική), perceptible (αἰσθητική), and intellectual (νοερά).<sup>318</sup> A natural feature of the last is the ability of self-determination (αὐτεξούσιος), given that any particular being which shares intellectual life is endowed with this ability. Maximus concluded:

<sup>315</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 79<sup>23-25</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/letaga.htm> (23/07/2003).

<sup>316</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 774<sup>20-21</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/faith.htm> (23/07/2003).

<sup>317</sup> *Disputatio* 289<sup>bc</sup>/Farrell (1990) 4-5.

<sup>318</sup> See *Eudem* 1219b<sup>37</sup>; *Nicom* 1102a<sup>32</sup>; *Nicom* 1102b<sup>29</sup>; *deAn* 403b<sup>17</sup>; *deAn* 408a<sup>13</sup>; *deAn* 429a<sup>17</sup>; *deAn* 431b<sup>26</sup>; *deAn* 433b<sup>3</sup>; *deAn* 415a<sup>17</sup>; *deAn* 433b<sup>3</sup>; *De anima* (codicis E fragmenta recensionis a vulgata diversae) 3.421a<sup>19</sup>; *deGen* 736a<sup>30</sup> etc.

If self-determination (ἡ αὐτεξούσιος κίνησις) be proper by nature to rational natures, then every rational creature is by nature a creature that wills (φύσει θελητικόν), for blessed Diadochus of Photike defined the will as self-determination (τὸ αὐτεξούσιον). So, if all rational natures possess the faculty of will by nature, and if God the Word truly became flesh which was rationally and intellectually animated, then he also became man, possessing the human faculty of will by virtue of his human essence (καθ' ὃ ἄνθρωπος, οὐσιωδῶς ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν θελητικός). And if this be so, then should the natural will ever be mentioned it will be offensive to the ears, not of the devout, but of heretics!<sup>319</sup>

Furthermore, nobody is taught to will, but by nature knows how to will. In this sense, willing is a feature of nature, because men employ the properties of nature without being taught:

Not only those who have examined the nature of things with their reason, and thus who have surpassed the multitude, but the usage of the uneducated has also affirmed that what is natural is not taught (ἀδίδακτα εἶναι τὰ φυσικά). So, if natural things be not acquired through teaching, then we have will without having acquired it or being taught it (ἀδίδακτον δὲ ἔχομεν τὸ θέλειν), for no one has ever had a will which was acquired by teaching. Consequently, man has the faculty of will by nature.<sup>320</sup>

Another argument, derived from Triadology, comes from Maximus who remarked that if Christ's *energeiai* belong to the hypostasis and not to the natures, then we must assume that God has either one hypostasis or three *energeiai*: 'Because of the one operation of the holy Godhead there is one persona as well, or because of its three hypostases that there are three operations.'<sup>321</sup> The same argument applies to the wills. If they are not natural, but hypostatic, then God has either one hypostasis or three wills and as a result, three natures:

If one suggests that a 'willer' is implied in the notion of the will, then by the exact inversion of this principle of reasoning, a will is implied in the notion of a 'willer.' Thus, will you say that because of the one will of the superessential Godhead there is only one hypostasis, as did Sabellius, or that because there are three hypostases there are also three wills, and because of this, three natures as well, since the canons and definitions of the Fathers say that the distinction of wills implies a distinction of natures? So did Arius!<sup>322</sup>

<sup>319</sup> *Disputatio* 301<sup>c</sup>/Farrell (1990) 22–23.

<sup>320</sup> *Disputatio* 304<sup>b-c</sup>/Farrell (1990) 24–25.

<sup>321</sup> *Disputatio* 336<sup>d</sup>–337<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 57.

<sup>322</sup> *Disputatio* 289<sup>d</sup>/Farrell (1990) 5–6.



This Triadological argument was also employed at the Lateran. Maximus of Aquileia asserted that those who claim that Christ's *energeia* and will to be single, on the assumption that they belong respectively to the One-Who-Acts and the One-Who-Wills, fragment the Holy Trinity because, were this to be the case, each divine hypostasis would have to have his own will and *energeia*.<sup>323</sup> Later Pope Agatho would remark in his *Report*:

For if anybody should mean a personal will, when in the holy Trinity there are said to be three Persons, it would be necessary that there should be asserted three personal wills, and three personal operations (which is absurd and truly profane).<sup>324</sup>

With reference to Christ, this meant:

When we make a confession concerning one of the same three Persons of that Holy Trinity, of the Son of God, or God the Word, and of the mystery of his adorable dispensation according to the flesh, we assert that all things are double in the one and the same our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ according to the Evangelical tradition, that is to say, we confess his two natures, to wit the divine and the human, of which and in which he, even after the wonderful and inseparable union, subsists. And we confess that each of his natures has its own natural propriety, and that the divine has all things that are divine and the human all things that are human without any sin. And we recognize that each one (of the two natures) of the one and the same incarnated, that is, humanated (*humanati*) Word of God is in him unconfusedly, inseparably and unchangeably, distinguishing in thought alone what is united, to avoid the error of confusion. For we equally detest the blasphemy of division and of commixture. For when we confess two natures and two natural wills, and two natural operations in our one Lord Jesus Christ, we do not assert that they are contrary or opposed one to the other (as those who err from the path of truth and accuse the apostolic tradition of doing. Far be this impiety from the hearts of the faithful!), nor as though separated in two persons or subsistences, but we say that as the same our Lord Jesus Christ has two natures so also he has two natural wills and operations, to wit, the divine and the human: the divine will and operation he has in common with the coessential Father from all eternity: the human, he has received from us, taken with our nature in time.<sup>325</sup>

<sup>323</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 344<sup>34-39</sup>.

<sup>324</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 69<sup>6-8</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/letaga.htm> (23/07/2003).

<sup>325</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 61<sup>3-21</sup>/NPNF <http://www.ccel.org/fathers/NPNF2-14/6const3/letaga.htm> (23/07/2003).

Although the distinction between hypostasis and nature, together with the attribution of *energeiai* and wills to nature had been clarified—with reference to the Holy Trinity—by the Cappadocian Fathers as early as the fourth century, it was not automatically applied to Christ when Christological problems progressively emerged during and after the fifth century. An early attempt at applying related triadologic language to distinguish between Christ's hypostasis and his two natures can be seen in the *Tome of Patriarch Proclus* (434–446) *to the Armenians*.<sup>326</sup> Henceforth the terminology that distinguished between individual and common essences was finally applied to Christology owing to the efforts of the neo-Chalcedonians. As for *energeiai* and wills, their attribution to the natures of Christ was not taken for granted, notwithstanding first, that these categories had been attributed to the divine nature of the Holy Trinity,<sup>327</sup> and secondly, that Cappadocian language had been applied to Christ during the controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries. Starting with Maximus, seventh century theologians were once more obliged to demonstrate that Trinitarian or Cappadocian language was valid with respect to the *energeiai* and wills of Christ. The legitimacy of this language was finally endorsed by the 680/1 council.

Among the objections that prevented Monothelites from accepting natural *energeiai* and wills in Christ was their understanding that whatever related to nature automatically meant subject to necessity. On the *energeiai*, according to Anastasius Sinaita, they claimed that:

Christ subjected himself to, accepted, and did the human (works) deliberately (ἐκουσίως); and those (things) that happen deliberately and not of necessity (ἐξ ἀνάγκης), do not relate to the laws of the nature.<sup>328</sup>

As for the wills, their objection was expressed by Pyrrhus:

If you say that the will is natural, and if what is natural is compelled, and if you say that the wills in Christ are natural, how can you avoid being obliged to take away all his voluntary motion?<sup>329</sup>

Thus, if for the Monenergists-Monothelites the *energeia* and the will were natural, they would indeed be subject to necessity. In other words, whatever Christ acted and willed was not voluntary, but through com-

<sup>326</sup> ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 187–195 (CPG 5897); see Richard (1945) 12–17.

<sup>327</sup> See, for instance, Gregory of Nyssa (*adImag* 44.1344<sup>10–13</sup>, *adAblab* 3,1.48<sup>20–49</sup>); Didymus (*deTrinit* (dubia) 39.601<sup>12–15</sup>).

<sup>328</sup> *Opera* 2 VI 1<sup>69–72</sup>.

<sup>329</sup> *Disputatio* 293<sup>b</sup>; see also Pope Martin (ACO<sub>2</sub> I 348<sup>12–13</sup>; 349<sup>11–12</sup>).

pulsion by the law of nature. Maximus challenged this *aporia* by reducing it *ad absurdum*. If it were the case that Christ's natural will was subject to necessity, then this would also apply to God's will. That is to say, whatever relates to God's nature would not be voluntary either. Hence God would be good, Creator, but above all else, God by necessity. As for created intellectual beings, in that they are linked to will and to nature, their intellectual capacities would also be enslaved by necessity:

Not only does his divine and uncreated nature have no natural compulsion (οὐδὲν ἡναγκασμένον ἔχει φυσικόν), neither does his rational and created nature. For the rational nature has the natural ability and rational appetite (λογικὴν ὄρεξιν) proper to it. This is called the 'faculty of will' of the rational soul. It is according to this faculty that we consider when willing, and in considering, we choose the things which we would. And when willing we also inquire, examine, deliberate, judge, are inclined toward, elect, impel ourselves toward, and make use of a thing. As has already been stated, if the rational appetite, in other words, willing and consideration, be proper to our nature, then so are deliberation, inquiry, examination, choice, judgement, inclination towards, election, and the impelling of ourselves toward something the natural actions of rational things, and these are not subject to compulsion. Once this is admitted, your proposition is shown to be most absurd, for according to it, what is natural is also entirely compelled (τὸ φυσικὸν πάντως καὶ ἡναγκασμένον). If one were to continue in this line of reasoning, then God, Who is by nature good, and by nature Creator, must of necessity be not only God and good, but also Creator. To think, much less to speak, in this manner is blasphemous.<sup>330</sup>

The problem of alleged necessity with respect to the natural *energeiai* and wills in Christ was also raised at the Lateran council where the arguments developed by Maximus during his disputation with Pyrrhus, were repeated by Maximus of Aquileia:

Is it not true that man is rational by nature? (Does this mean that he is such) not voluntarily, but by force (ἀβουλῆτως καὶ ἡναγκασμένως)? Tell me, is not the God of the universe good by nature? (Is he not by nature) light, life, wisdom, and power? (Does this mean that) he is such also not voluntarily, but because of necessity (ἀβουλῆτως καὶ ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγκης)?<sup>331</sup>

<sup>330</sup> *Disputatio* 293<sup>b-c</sup>/Farrell (1990) 11–13.

<sup>331</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 348<sup>26–29</sup>, 349<sup>25–28</sup>.

The answer of the Dyothelites was succinct: ‘The wills are natural and free of any necessity.’<sup>332</sup>

### 3.2.6. *Energieia—will—natural properties*

Monenergists-Monothelites generally agreed that the properties of each nature in Christ remained unchangeable<sup>333</sup> and that they also complied with the concept of the *communicatio idiomatum*.<sup>334</sup> At the same time, they exploited this concept for their own polemical purposes and more especially to underscore their teaching on the single will in Christ. Patriarch Paul wrote to Pope Theodore:

We preach the miracles and know the sufferings of one and the same God Logos who became flesh and deliberately suffered for our sake through the flesh; hence it is said that God suffered and the son of man descended from heaven...; for this reason we confess one will of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ.<sup>335</sup>

Since Monenergists-Monothelites did not attribute the *energeiai* and the wills to the natures of Christ, they would not consider them to be natural properties. Dyenergists-Dyothelites thought differently; they regarded the wills and the *energeiai* as properties of the natures. In due course they persuaded their opponents to accept that the *energeiai* and wills, through their properties, belong to the natures. In their understanding, each of the two natures of Christ preserved its own *energeia* and will, as would any other property. By way of demonstration Sophronius asserted:

For, as each nature in Christ preserves without omission its property, in the same way each form (μορφή) acts in communion with the other whatever is proper to it (τοῦθ’ ὅπερ ἴδιον ἔσχηκε).<sup>336</sup>

Maximus agreed:

It is surely necessary for natural things to correspond with their appropriate natures, for how is it possible for the energy of a created nature to be uncreated, without beginning, infinite, creative, and sustaining? And

<sup>332</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 350<sup>7</sup>; 351<sup>6-7</sup>.

<sup>333</sup> See, for example, *Ecthesis*, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>20</sup>; the confessions of Macarius, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 216<sup>14-15</sup>, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 222<sup>7-9</sup>.

<sup>334</sup> See, for example, the letter of Patriarch Paul to Pope Theodore, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 200<sup>22-24</sup>.

<sup>335</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 608<sup>14-15</sup>.

<sup>336</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 442<sup>14-16</sup>.

the reverse: how is it possible for the uncreated and eternal nature to be created, a thing made, tried and compelled by other things?<sup>337</sup>

Pope Martin proved that the will belonged to the natural properties: 'The *energeia* and will of our essence constituted its (= of the essence) natural property'<sup>338</sup> Maximus added:

The Fathers decreed that... the same person is visible and invisible, mortal and immortal, corruptible and incorruptible, touchable and untouchable, created and uncreated. And according to the same reverent way of understanding, they also correctly taught that there are two wills of one and the same person.<sup>339</sup>

Maximus went even further when he argued that the will was not merely a 'natural power' (φυσικὴ δύναμις), but also an 'intellectual desire' (λογικὴ ὁρεξις) of the soul.<sup>340</sup> As such, the faculties of the 'intellectual soul' such as willing, thinking, *etc.*, are indissolubly connected with each other so that

we consider when willing, and in considering, we choose the things which we would. And when willing we also inquire, examine, deliberate, judge, are inclined toward, elect, impel ourselves toward, and make use of a thing.<sup>341</sup>

This statement implies first, that the listed faculties are in effect different names for the same thing.<sup>342</sup> Secondly, all have some relation to the will and consequently could be characterized as volitional. Once the will is acknowledged to be one of the natural properties, then by virtue of the *communicatio idiomatum* it would also be possible to speak about *communicatio voluntatum*. As with the natural properties, *communicatio voluntatum* does not imply that the wills undergo any change or confusion: 'Thus, if you say that there is a common will by the mode of exchange (τῷ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως τρόπῳ), then you are really saying that there is not one will but two wills.'<sup>343</sup>

<sup>337</sup> *Disputatio* 341<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 61.

<sup>338</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 406<sup>12-13</sup>; 407<sup>11-12</sup>; see also Pope Agatho, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 67<sup>26</sup>-68<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>339</sup> *Disputatio* 300<sup>b</sup>/Farrell (1990) 19.

<sup>340</sup> *Disputatio* 293<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>341</sup> *Disputatio* 293<sup>b-c</sup>/Farrell (1990) 11-12.

<sup>342</sup> See Maximus, *Disputatio* 352<sup>a-b</sup>.

<sup>343</sup> *Disputatio* 297<sup>a</sup>/Farrell (1990) 16.

3.2.7. *Energeia*—will

For either party *energeia* and will in Christ were closely connected one with the other. Sophronius stated that Christ acted only when he willed, and not by natural necessity. This effectively implied an indissoluble link between *energeia* and will:

When he himself willed to suffer, work, and act humanly . . . , and not when the natural and fleshy movements wanted to move naturally towards the accomplishing of *energeia* (αἱ φυσικαὶ κινήσεις καὶ σαρκικαὶ κινεῖσθαι φυσικῶς πρὸς ἐνέργειαν ἤθελον).<sup>344</sup>

Maximus of Aquileia considered *energeia* and will to be so interwined that he called the *energeiai* ‘volitional’ (θελητική, *voluntaria*).<sup>345</sup> Monenergists-Monothelites also claimed that Christ suffered voluntarily (ἐκουσίως),<sup>346</sup> by which they meant the *energeia* of suffering was accompanied by an act of willing. Macarius of Antioch in his oral confession defined will as power to suffer.<sup>347</sup> The authors of the *Ecthesis* understood the *energeia* of Christ, which they called *natural motion* (φυσικὴ κίνησις), to be subordinate to the command (νεῦμα) of the Word *i.e.* to his divine will.<sup>348</sup> Thus, for Monenergists-Monothelites, the single *energeia* of Christ automatically meant a single will, whereas for their opponents two *energeiai* meant two wills. The relationship between will and *energeia* in Monenergist-Monothelite thought, however, was not as immediate and direct as it was for their adversaries. As indicated earlier, Dyenergists-Dyothelites considered the relationship between Christ’s *energeiai* and wills as that between properties of the same nature. In other words, *energeiai* and wills were manifestations of the same thing. Monenergists-Monothelites treated the dyad *will-energeia* differently. To the single will of Christ they ascribed his person, whereas to his hypostasis they did not attribute the *energeia* exclusively. Consequently a certain ‘gap’ between *energeia* and will emerged—a ‘gap’ that would probably have disappeared had the Monenergists-Monothelites attributed the *energeia* exclusively to the person of Christ. By not doing so, the relationship between *energeia* and will in their system was weakened.

<sup>344</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 450<sup>14–16</sup>.

<sup>345</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 334<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>346</sup> See Patriarch Paul, ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>2</sup> 608<sup>11–12</sup>; *Ecthesis*, ACO<sub>2</sub> I 158<sup>17, 28</sup>.

<sup>347</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 216<sup>20–21</sup>.

<sup>348</sup> ACO<sub>2</sub> I 160<sup>26–29</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

Monenergism-Monothelitism and Dyenergism-Dyothelitism constituted two alternative interpretations of how Christ acted and willed. These interpretations, as they manifested themselves in the seventh century, were cut from the same cloth. Both were Chalcedonian and expressed in the same neo-Chalcedonian language. Monenergism, which over time would convert into Monothelitism, actually surfaced as a continuation of the neo-Chalcedonian attempts to find points of theological rapprochement with the dissident anti-Chalcedonian communities. The postulations neither of the one-*energeia*-will, nor of the two-*energeiai*-wills adherents were clearly or adequately raised in the preceding theological tradition upon which the opposing parties relied. At the same time, the language of a single *energeia* was applied to Christ in traditions such as the Apollinarian, 'Nestorian,' and especially the Severan. But the beliefs of these groups were deemed unreliable by both Dyenergists-Dyothelites and Monenergists-Monothelites in the seventh century. As Chalcedonians, they *a priori* rejected them. The two parties were faced with the formidable task of having to develop concepts of *energeia* and will without authoritative theological indications from past theological definitions. Prior to the seventh century, concepts of *energeia* and of will were scarcely distinguished (especially will) and remained undeveloped. Owing to the controversy, however, these terms occupied an important place in the Orthodox theological tradition. Despite their common Chalcedonian and neo-Chalcedonian background, Dyenergists-Dyothelites laid emphasis on the Christological formulas of Chalcedon and on those in the Tome of Leo, while their opponents appeared to prefer neo-Chalcedonian concepts and theological methods. This does not infer that Monothelites ignored Chalcedon or that Dyothelites shunned neo-Chalcedonian language.

Monenergism-Monothelitism was exploited as a political project to establish a rapprochement between Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians. In its initial form, concepts of the two natures and a single *energeia* in Christ were coalesced. Over the course of time it developed into Monothelitism, which focused on Christ having a single will. In political terms, Monenergism-Monothelitism was the child of the concordance (*symphonia*) between the secular and

ecclesiastical authorities of the eastern Roman Empire. On occasion, it enjoyed a consensus in the major Episcopal sees of the Empire, including Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (the *pentarchy*). As such, it demonstrated that both *symphonia* and *pentarchy* could malfunction and cause harm to the unity of Church. Monenergism-Monothelitism eventually subsided, and this for many reasons. First, it began and remained as an artificial doctrine, rather superficially combining features of both the Chalcedonian and the Severan theological traditions. Secondly, it was restricted mostly to the élite, only on rare occasions did it excite popular interest. In fact the promotion of Monenergism-Monothelitism was often accompanied by violence and duly aroused protest from the people, especially in Egypt. Thirdly, not even the theological and political élite could reach complete agreement on it. Strong opposition surfaced in the West, both from the Church (after Honorius) and from the political authorities (especially in North Africa). The influential monastic circles of the East, primarily in Palestine and Constantinople, became an obstacle to the spread of Monenergism-Monothelitism eventually contributing to its failure and condemnation at an ecumenical council.

A complex question in connection with the controversy is whether the two arguing parties actually integrated the issue of Christ's *energeia* and will in different ways. Or, put differently, did they in effect share the same perspective on the issue? It would appear that crucial words such as θέλημα and θέλησις often connoted different things to either party. For Dyothelites the term implied a broad variety of concepts, including physiological attributes such as growth, instinctive drives (for example, love of life), volitional impulses, and acts of rational choice. Monothelites, however, in referring to human θέλημα or θέλησις, primarily inferred a corrupted will, which, by definition, is contrary to divine will. Taking into consideration this difference in word usage, one might deduce that when the Dyothelites accused their opponents of denying the human will, they missed the point, because the Monothelites in effect denied a will that was corrupted. But this is an oversimplification of the conflict. The two parties often treated each other with hostility, but they also tried to understand better what the other side meant and endeavoured to explain their own points with great clarity in order to make them acceptable. This can be seen in the dispute between Maximus the Confessor and Pyrrhus. Dyothelites made it clear that they eschewed a corrupt will in Christ, since this



would be contrary to his divinity. Instead they promoted a human will that was in full accord with the divine will of Christ. This ultimately would not persuade the Monothelites to reconsider their notion of the will or encourage them to look more broadly at the question. The Monothelites may have been implying a degree of human volitional impulses in Christ, but they insistently ascribed his single will primarily to his hypostasis, while the Dyothelites regarded the two wills as mostly natural. A major disagreement flared up between them precisely on this issue of the natural properties. Dyothelites identified the *energeia* and will as natural properties, something unacceptable to their opponents. In the end the two parties not only employed different languages, but they also disagreed on the concepts of *energeia* and will *per se*.

This said, the difference in their views was in fact not as dramatic as the Dyothelites (who constitute the main source about Monothelite doctrine) presented it. Both groups had much in common: first, as Chalcedonians they accepted in common two natures in Christ, each one with its own unchangeable properties. Secondly, they shared an important point, namely, that one and the same Christ was a single subject of all his actions and volitions. Thirdly, they ascribed action to both the hypostasis and the natures, though in different proportions. It is evident that Monothelites were also prepared to accept some volitional activity associated with Christ's human nature, though they never named it either *energeia* or will. To this list of common beliefs, others may be added.

A problem common to both theologies is that neither was entirely consistent. On the one hand, Monenergism-Monothelitism was characterized by fluctuating opinions about the relationship of the single *energeia* and will to Christ's divine nature and hypostasis. Dyenergists-Dyothelites, on the other hand, were not always consistent in delineating the character of the theandric *energeia*. Some believed that all *energeiai* of Christ were theandric, while others insisted that there were also purely divine and purely human activities.

Monenergism-Monothelitism failed to produce high-ranking theologians who could articulate original and persuasive approaches to defend their beliefs. However two exceptions were Theodore of Pharan at the very beginning of the controversy, (especially if he can in fact be identified with Theodore of Raithu) and Macarius of Antioch at the very end of the controversy. Even so, it is difficult to evaluate properly their theological originality since most of their works are lost. The

Dyenergist-Dyothelite party was more fortunate in this regard; it produced a number of remarkable theologians, the most prominent being Maximus the Confessor. His theology constituted an integral part of the Dyenergist-Dyothelite doctrine, which in turn was the result of efforts made by many theologians. Maximus' theology was astonishingly close to that of the Lateran council, a fact which argues favourably for the theory of Riedinger that Maximus, and possibly the circle of his disciples, were the real authors of the proceedings of the council. Maximus had also inherited many ideas from his predecessors, primarily those of his spiritual father, Sophronius of Jerusalem.

The entire theology of Maximus and of other Dyothelites were reflected neither in the acts and decisions of the council of Lateran nor of Constantinople, except for those aspects that related specifically to the Christological problems that had disquieted the Church in the Empire. Participants at the councils, in selecting arguments and employing a variety of theological postulations, followed what could be called the principle of sufficiency. That is to say, they confined themselves to arguments of necessity and sufficiency to prove their points and refute their opponents. It might seem surprising that the two councils paid scant attention to the Apollinarian, Antiochian, or Alexandrian strands of Monenergisms *per se*, but rather referred to them only when they wished to demonstrate their similarity to Chalcedonian Monenergism-Monothelitism. Moreover, they virtually neglected Maronite Monothelitism, even though they had inquired into the case of its representative, Constantine of Apamea. These choices may be explained by the aforementioned principle of argument sufficiency. The councils did not enter into controversy with Apollinarian, Antiochian, Alexandrian or Chalcedonian Maronite Monenergisms-Monothelitisms, because none of these endangered the unity of the Church, at least within the boundaries of the Empire.

The controversy over *energeia* and will constituted one of the greatest challenges ever encountered in the Church's Christological tradition. It lasted almost a century, caused the convocation of two great councils (of which one was ecumenical) and produced outstanding theologians. The disputes enriched the Church's theological tradition immensely; there evolved a more profound understanding of the categories of activity and will, as applied equally to Christology and to understanding of human nature. Moreover, some aspects of the notions of hypostasis, nature, and property were more precisely determined, given that activity and

will were closely related to them. Although this controversy brought to a close the era of Christological dispute, its theological achievements were insistently referred to on occasions of theological debate in later periods, particularly during the controversy between the 'hesychasts' and 'Barlaamites' in the fourteenth century, when the issue of divine *energeiai* and their relation to divine essence was disputed again.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Editions of texts consulted*

- Aelius Aristides  
*Εἰς Δία* *Eis Dia*: W. Dindorf. *Aristides*. vol. 1. Leipzig: Reimer, 1829 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964).
- Aelius Herodianus  
*Partitiones* *Partitiones* (= *Epimerismoi*): J. F. Boissonade. *Herodiani partitiones*. London, 1819 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963).
- Aeschines  
*FalsLeg* *De falsa legatione*: V. Martin and G. de Budé. *Eschine. Discours*. vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1927 (repr. 1962).
- Aeschylus  
*Pr* *Prometheus vinctus*: G. Murray. *Aeschyli tragoediae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955 (repr. 1960).
- Anastasius of Antioch  
*contraIoanPhilop* *Contra Iohannis Philoponi Diaetetem* (CPG 6956): F. Diekamp. *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1907 (CPG 7781).
- Anastasius the Emperor  
*confFid* *Confessio Fidei*: E. W. Brooks. *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*. CSCO 83, 84, 87, 88 (CPG 6995).
- Anastasius Sinaita  
*Opera 2* (CPG 7747–7749, 7756): K.-H. Uthemann. *Anastasii Sinaitae Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem Dei; necnon opuscula adversus Monotheletas*. CCh.SG 12.  
*ViaeDux* *Viae Dux* (CPG 7745): K.-H. Uthemann. *Anastasii Sinaitae Viae dux*. CCh.SG 8.
- Andocides  
*dePace* *De pace*: G. Dalmeyda. *Andocide. Discours*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930 (repr. 1966).
- Anthimus of Trebizond  
*adIustin* *Sermo ad Iustinianum* (CPG 7086): ACO<sub>2</sub> II<sup>1</sup> 372<sup>2-5</sup>.
- Antiphon  
*deCaede* *De caede Herodis*: L. Gernet. *Antiphon. Discours*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1923 (repr. 1965).
- Apollinarius  
*adDion I* *Ad Dionysium I* (CPG 3669): H. Lietzmann. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Tübingen: Teubner, 1904.

- adIulian* *Ad Iulianum* (CPG 3661): H. Lietzmann. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Tübingen: Teubner, 1904, fr. 150–152.
- deFideInc* *De fide et incarnatione contra adversaries* (CPG 3647): H. Lietzmann. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Tübingen: Teubner, 1904, fr. 193–203.
- deUnioneCorp* *De unione corporis et divinitatis in Christo* (CPG 3646): H. Lietzmann. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Tübingen: Teubner, 1904, fr. 185–193.
- FidesSecPart* *Fides secundum partem* (Ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις; CPG 3645): H. Lietzmann. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Tübingen: Teubner, 1904.
- Aristophanes  
*Ach* *Acharnenses*: V. Coulon and M. van Daele. *Aristophane*. vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1923 (repr. 1967).
- Aristotle  
*Ἀθηνῶν Πολιτ* *Athenaion politeia*: H. Oppermann. *Aristotelis Athenaion politeia*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928 (repr. Stuttgart: 1968).
- Cat* *Categoriae*: L. Minio-Paluello. *Aristotelis categoriae et liber de interpretatione*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949 (repr. 1966). English translation used: J. L. Ackrill. *Categories and De interpretatione*. Clarendon Aristotle series. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- deAn* *De anima*: W. D. Ross. *Aristotle. De anima*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961 (repr. 1967).
- deGen* *De generatione animalium*: H. J. Drossaart Lulofs. *Aristotelis de generatione animalium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965 (repr. 1972).
- deVirt* *De virtutibus et vitiis*: I. Bekker. *Aristotelis opera*. vol. 2. Berlin: Reimer, 1831 (repr. De Gruyter, 1960).
- Eudem* *Ethica Eudemia*: F. Susemihl. *Aristotelis ethica Eudemia*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1884 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967).
- Metaph* *Metaphysica*: W. D. Ross. *Aristotle's metaphysics*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924 (repr. 1970 (of 1953 corr. edn.)).
- Nicom* *Ethica Nicomachea*: I. Bywater. *Aristotelis ethica Nicomachea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894 (repr. 1962).
- Pol* *Politica*: W. D. Ross. *Aristotelis politica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957 (repr. 1964).
- Problemata* *Problemata*: I. Bekker. *Aristotelis opera*. vol. 2. Berlin: Reimer, 1831 (repr. De Gruyter, 1960).
- Rhetorica* *Rhetorica*: W. D. Ross. *Aristotelis ars rhetorica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959 (repr. 1964).
- Athanasius of Alexandria  
*contArian* *Orationes tres contra Arianos* (CPG 2093): PG 26, 12–468.
- contraGen* *Contra gentes* (CPG 2090): R. W. Thomson. *Athanasius. Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- deIncarn* *De incarnatione Verbi* (CPG 2091): C. Kannengiesser. *Sur l'incarnation du verbe*. SChr 199.
- inPsal* *Expositiones in Psalmos* (CPG 2140): PG 27, 60–545, 548–589.
- deIncarnCont*  
*Arian* *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* (belongs to Marcellus of Ancyra, see CPG 2806): PG 26, 984–1028.

- Athenaeus  
*Deipnosophistae* *Deipnosophistae*: G. Kaibel. *Athenaei Naucratis deipnosophistarum libri xv*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1–2:1887; 3:1890 (repr. Stuttgart: 1–2:1965; 3:1966).
- Augustine  
*duabAnim* *De duabus animabus* (CPL 317): PL 42, 93–112.  
*contrJulian* *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem imperfectum opus* (CPL 356): PL 45, 1049–1608.
- Retractationes* *Retractationes* (CPL 250): PL 32, 583–656.  
 Bar Hebraeus  
*Chron* *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*: J. B. Abbeloos and Th. J. Lamy. *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum*. vol. 1. Louvain: C. Peeters, 1872.
- Basil of Caesarea  
*adBapt* *Homilia exhortatoria ad sanctum baptisma* (CPG 2857): PG 31, 424–444.  
*AttenteTibi* *Homilia in aliud: Attende tibi ipsi* (CPG 2847): S. Y. Rudberg. *L'homélie de Basile de Césarée sur le mot 'Observe-toi toi-même'* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962.  
*contEunom* *Contra Eunomium* (CPG 2837): PG 29, 497–768.  
*inSebast* *In quadraginta martyres Sebastenses* (CPG 2863–4): PG 31, 508–525.  
*TempFamis* *Homilia dicta tempore famis et siccitatis* (CPG 2852): PG 31, 304–328.
- Benjamin of Alexandria  
*Die Homilie* C. Müller. *Die Homilie über die Hochzeit zu Kana und weitere Schriften des Patriarchen Benjamin I von Alexandrien*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter—Universitätsverlag, 1968.
- Chronicon Paschale* (CPG 7960): L. Dindorf. *Chronicon paschale*. CSHB. Bonn: Weber, 1832; PG 92, 69–1028. English translation used: M. Whitby. *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 A.D. Translated texts for historians v. 7*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.
- Chrysippus  
*frMoral* *Fragmenta moralia*: J. von Arnim. *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*. vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903 (repr. Stuttgart: 1968).
- Clement of Alexandria  
*HymnChristi* *Hymnus Christi servatoris* (CPG 1356): Th. Wolbergs. *Griechische religiöse Gedichte der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte. Band I. Psalmen und Hymnen der Gnosis und des frühen Christentums*. Meisenheim am Glan, 1971.  
*Paedagogus* *Paedagogus* (CPG 1376): H.-I. Marrou, M. Harl, C. Mondésert and C. Matray. *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le pédagogue*. 3 vols. Sch 70, 108, 158.  
*Protrepticus* *Protrepticus* (CPG 1375): C. Mondésert and A. Plassart. *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le protreptique*. Sch 2<sup>2</sup>.  
*QuisDives* *Quis dives salvetur* (CPG 1379): O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 3. GCS 17.

- Stromata* *Stromata* (CPG 1377): O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. vols. 2 and 3. GCS 52(15) and 17.
- Clement of Rome  
*adCor* *Epistula ad Corinthios I* (CPG 1001): A. Jaubert. *Clément de Rome. Épître aux Corinthiens*. Sch 167.
- Constantine of Laodicea  
*adTheodoram* *Sermo ad Theodoram imperatricem* (CPG 7106): A. Van Roey and P. Allen. *Monophysite texts of the sixth century*. OLA 56.
- Constantine Manasses  
*BrevChron* *Breviarium chronicum*: O. Lampsides. *Constantini Manassis Breviarium chronicum*. CFHB 36.
- Cosmas Indicopleustes  
*Topogr* *Topographia Christiana* (CPG 7468): W. Wolska-Conus. *Cosmas Indicopleustès. Topographie chrétienne*. 3 vols. Sch 141, 159, 197.
- Cyril of Alexandria  
*adSuccen* *Epistula II ad Succensum episcopum Diocaesariae* (CPG 5346): ACO<sub>1</sub> I<sup>6</sup> 157–162.  
*deIncarn* *De incarnatione Unigeniti* (CPG 5227): G. M. de Durand. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux dialogues Christologiques*. Sch 97.  
*inIoan* *Commentarii in Joannem* (CPG 5208): P. E. Pusey. *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872 (repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965).  
*inPsal* *Expositio in Psalmos* (CPG 5202): PG 69, 717–1273.  
*QuodUnus* *Quod unus sit Christus* (CPG 5228): G. M. de Durand. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux dialogues Christologiques*. Sch 97.  
*RespTiberium* *Responsiones ad Tiberium diaconum sociosque suos* (CPG 5232): P. E. Pusey. *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*. vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872 (repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965).  
*Thesaurus* *Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali Trinitate* (CPG 5215): PG 75, 9–656.
- Damian of Alexandria  
*adBarad* *Epistula synodica ad Iacobum Baradaeum* (CPG 7240): J.-B. Chabot. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*. 5 vols. Paris, 1899–1924 (repr. Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1963).
- David  
*inPorpyrIsag* *In Porphyrii isagogen commentarium*: A. Busse. *Davidis prolegomena et in Porphyrii isagogen commentarium*. Berlin: Reimer, 1904.  
*Proleg* *Prolegomena philosophiae*: A. Busse. *Davidis prolegomena et in Porphyrii isagogen commentarium*. Berlin: Reimer, 1904.
- De sectis  
*deSectis* *Liber de Sectis* (CPG 6823): PG 86, 1193–1268.
- Demosthenes  
*Cor* *De corona*: S. H. Butcher. *Demosthenis orationes*. vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903 (repr. 1966).



- Didymus  
*adRoman* *Fragmenta in epistulam ad Romanos (in catenis)* (CPG 2558): K. Staab. *Pauluskommentar aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1933.
- deTrinit* *De trinitate* (CPG 2570, dubia): PG 39, 600–769.
- Dio Chrysostomus  
*Orationes* *Orationes*: J. von Arnim. *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*. vols. 1–2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1:1893; 2:1896 (repr. 1962).
- Diogenes Laertius  
*VitPhilosoph* *Vitae Philosophorum*: H. S. Long, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964 (repr. 1966): 1:1–246; 2:247–565.
- Dionysius Areopagita  
*CorpDionys* *Corpus Dionysiacum I*: B. R. Suchla. *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus*. PTS 33; *Corpus Dionysiacum II*: G. Heil and A. Ritter. *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De coelesti hierarchia, de ecclesiastica hierarchia, de mystica theologia, epistulae*. PTS 36.
- deCael* *De caelesti hierarchia* (CPG 6600): G. Heil and A. Ritter. *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De coelesti hierarchia, de ecclesiastica hierarchia, de mystica theologia, epistulae*. PTS 36.
- deDiv* *De divinis nominibus* (CPG 6602): B. R. Suchla. *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus*. PTS 33.
- Doctrina Patrum  
*DoctPatrum* *Doctrina patrum* (CPG 7781): F. Diekamp. *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1907.
- Elias  
*inAristotCat* *Eliae (olim Davidis) in Aristotelis categorias commentarium*: A. Busse. *Eliae in Porphyrii isagogen et Aristotelis categorias commentaria*. Berlin: Reimer, 1900.
- inPorphy* *In Porphyrii isagogen*: A. Busse. *Eliae in Porphyrii isagogen et Aristotelis categorias commentaria*. Berlin: Reimer, 1900.
- Epictetus  
*Dissertationum* *Dissertationum Epictetearum sive ab Arriano sive ab aliis digestarum fragmenta*: H. Schenkl. *Epicteti dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1916 (repr. Stuttgart: 1965).
- Epiphanius of Cyprus  
*inPalm* *Homilia in festo palmarum* (CPG 3767): PG 43: 428–437.
- Euripides  
*Fragmenta* *Fragmenta*: A. Nauck. *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1889 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964).
- Ion* *Ion*: J. Diggle. *Euripidis fabulae*. vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Medea* *Medea*: J. Diggle. *Euripidis fabulae*. vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

- Eusebius  
*Gener* *Generalis elementaria introduction* (CPG 3475): PG 22, 1021–1262.  
*EcclHist* *Historia ecclesiastica* (CPG 3495): G. Bardy. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*. 3 vols.: SCH 31, 41, 55.  
*inIsaiam* *Commentarius in Isaiam* (CPG 3468): J. Ziegler. *Eusebius Werke*. Band 9: *Der Jesajakommentar*. GCS (1975).  
*PraepEvang* *Praeparatio evangelica* (CPG 3486): K. Mras. *Eusebius Werke*. Band 8: *Die Praeparatio evangelica*. GCS 43, 1–2.  
*VitConst* *Vita Constantini* (CPG 3496): F. Winkelman. *Eusebius Werke*. Band 1.1: *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*. GCS (²1991).
- Eutyches of Alexandria  
*Annales* L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux, and H. Zayyat. *Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini Annales*. CSCO 50; M. Breydy. *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien. Ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden kompiliert von Sa'id Ibn Batriq um 935 A.D.* CSCO 471, 472.
- Facundus of Hermiane  
*proDefens* *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* (CPL 866): CSh.SL 90<sup>a</sup>.
- Fredegarius  
*Chron* *Chronicorum libri iv cum continuationibus* (CPL 1314): MGH *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 2. Hannover, 1888 (repr. 1984).
- George Cedrenus  
I. Bekker, G. Xylander, J. Goar, and Ch. Fabrot. *Georgius Cedrenus. Ioannis Scylitzae*. CSHB 13–14. Athenai: Spanos, 1838.
- Germanus of Constantinople  
*deHaeres* *De haeresibus et synodis* (8020): PG 98, 40–88.
- Gregorius of Nazianzus  
*CarmDogm* *Carmina dogmatica* (CPG 3034): PG 37, 397–522.  
*CarmMoral* *Carmina moralia* (CPG 3035): PG 37, 521–968.  
*ChristusPatiens* *Christus patiens* (CPG 3059, spuria): A. Tuilier. *Grégoire de Nazianze. La passion du Christ*. SCH 149.  
*contraIulian* *Contra Iulianum imperatorem* (CPG 3010): PG 35, 664–720.  
*deFilio* *De Filio* (CPG 3010): J. Barbel. *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963.  
*epTheol* *Epistulae Theologicae* (CPG 3032): P. Gallay. *Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres théologiques*. SCH 208.  
*inBasil* *Funebris oratio in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae* (CPG 3010): F. Boulenger. *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée*. Paris: Picard, 1908.
- Gregorius of Nyssa  
*adAblab* *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei* (CPG 3139): F. Müller. *Gregorii Nysseni opera*. vol. 3.1. Leiden: Brill, 1958.  
*adImag* *Ad imaginem dei et ad similitudinem* (CPG 3218): PG 44, 1328–1345.  
*advApol* *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarium* (CPG 3144): F. Müller. *Gregorii Nysseni opera*. vol. 3.1. Leiden: Brill, 1958.  
*advMaced* *Adversus Macedonianos de spiritu sancto* (CPG 3142): F. Müller. *Gregorii Nysseni opera*. vol. 3.1. Leiden: Brill, 1958.

- adXenodor* *Tractatus ad Xenodorum* (CPG 3201): F. Diekamp. *Analecta patristica*. OCA 117.
- deOccursu* *De occursu domini* (CPG 3195): PG 46, 1152–1181.
- deOpificio* *De opificio hominis* (CPG 3154): PG 44, 124–256.
- inCant* *In Canticum canticorum* (CPG 3158): H. Langerbeck. *Gregorii Nysseni opera*. vol. 6. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
- inEcclesiast* *In Ecclesiasten* (CPG 3157): P. Alexander. *Gregorii Nysseni opera*. vol. 5. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- inMart* *Encomium in xl martyres ii* (CPG 3189): PG 46, 773–788.
- VitMos* *De vita Mosis* (CPG 3159): J. Daniélou. *Grégoire de Nysse. La vie de Moïse*. SCH 1 ter.
- Hermas  
*Pastor* *Pastor* (CPG 1052): M. Whittaker. *Die apostolischen Väter I. Der Hirt des Hermas*. GCS 48, 2.
- Hesychius Lexicographus  
*Lexicon* *Lexicon*: M. Schmidt. *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. 5 vols. Halle, 1858–68 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965).
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam  
Ch. Torrey. *Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. Futūḥ miṣr wa akhbārūhā*. New Haven, Yale, 1922.
- Ignatius  
*Ep* *Epistulae vii genuinae* (CPG 1025): Th. Camelot. *Ignace d’Antioche. Polycarpe de Smyrne. Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe*. SCH 10.
- Irenaeus  
*Fragm* *Fragmenta varia graeca* (CPG 1315): W. W. Harvey. *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses*. vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1857.
- Isocrates  
*Busiris* *Busiris*: G. Mathieu and É. Brémond. *Isocrate. Discours*. vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1929 (repr. 1963).
- dePac* *De pace*: G. Mathieu. *Isocrate. Discours*. vol. 3. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942 (repr. 1966).
- Trapez* *Trapeziticus*: G. Mathieu and É. Brémond. *Isocrate. Discours*. vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1929 (repr. 1963).
- John II Pope  
*adSenat* *Epistula ad Senatores* (CPL 1692): ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 206–210; PL 66, 20.
- John Chrysostomus  
*inCor* *In epistolam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae* (CPG 4428): PG 61, 9–382.
- inIoan* *In Iohannem* (CPG 4425): PG 59, 23–482.
- inPhilip* *In epistolam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432): PG 62, 177–298.
- inThes I* *In epistolam i ad Thessalonicenses* (CPG 4434): PG 62, 391–468.
- John Beth-Aphthonia  
*VitSeveri* *Vita Severi*: M. A. Kugener. *Vie de Sévère par Jean, supérieur du monastère de Beith-Aphthonia*. PO II, 3.

- John of Damascus  
*deVol* *De duabus in Christo voluntatibus* (CPG 8052): B. Kotter. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*. vol. 4: PTS 22.
- John of Ephesus  
*Vitae* E. W. Brooks. *John of Ephesus. Lives of the Eastern Saints*. I PO 17, 1; II PO 18, 4; III PO 19, 2.
- John Moschus  
*PratSpirit* *Pratum Spirituale* (CPG 7376): PG 87<sup>3</sup>, 2852–3112.
- John of Nikiu  
*Chron* *Chronicle*: R. H. Charles. *The chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1916.
- John Rufus  
*Plerophoriae*: F. Nau. *Jean Rufus, évêque de Maiouma, Plérophories*. PO 8.
- John Zonaras  
 Th. Buettner-Wobst. *Joannis Zonarae Epitomae historiarum*. CSHB. Bonn: Weber, 1897.
- Julian of Halicarnasus  
*Anath 7* *Anathema septimum*: R. Draguet. *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ. Étude d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale; suivie des Fragments dogmatiques de Julien. (Texte syriaque et traduction grecque)*. Universitas catholica lovaniensis. Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate theologica consequendum conscriptae. Series 2; 12. Louvain: Peeters, 1924.
- Justin the Martyr  
*Apologia* *Apologia* (CPG 1073): E. J. Goodspeed. *Die ältesten Apologeten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915 (repr. New York, 1950).
- Justinian  
*adHormisd* *Epistula ad Hormisdam Papam* (CPG 6867): *CorpAvel* ep. 187; M. Amelotti and L. Migliardi Zingale. *Scritti teologici ed ecclesiastici di Giustiniano*. Milan: A. Giuffrè, 1977.
- CodexIustin* *Codex Iustiniani* (CPG 6893, CPL 1796): P. Krüger. *Corpus iuris civilis*. Ed. stereotypa 11. Berlin: Weidmann, 1954.
- Leo the Pope  
*adFlav* *Epistula ad Flavianum* (CPG 8922; CPL 1656, 28): ACO<sub>1</sub> II<sup>2</sup>, 24–33.
- Leontius of Byzantium  
*contNestEutych* *Libri tres contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* (CPG 6813): PG 86<sup>1</sup>, 1268–1396.
- Leontius of Jerusalem  
*contMonoph* *Contra Monophysitas* (CPG 6917): PG 86<sup>2</sup>, 1769–1901.
- Liber Pontificalis  
 L. Duchesne. *Le Liber pontificalis*. 3 vols. Paris: Boccard, <sup>2</sup>1957.

- Lysias  
Or *De caede Eratosthenis*: U. Albin. *Lisia. I discorsi*. Florence: Sansoni, 1955.
- Marcellus of Ancyra  
*deIncarnContArian* *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* (Ps-Athanasius, CPG 2806): PG 26, 984–1028.
- Marcus Aurelius  
*Tà eis éautón* *Ta eis eauton*: A. S. L. Farquharson. *The meditations of the emperor Marcus Aurelius*. vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944 (repr. 1968).
- Martin Pope  
*epEncycl* *Epistola Encyclica* (CPG 9403; CPL 1733): ACO<sub>2</sub> I 404–421.
- Maxentius et al.  
*adEpisc* *Epistula seu liber Petri diaconi et aliorum qui in causa fidei a Graecis ex Oriente Romam missi fuerunt, de incarnatione et gratia Domini nostri Christi ad Fulgentium et alios episcopos Africae* (CPL 663, spuria): Fr. Glorie. *Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ioannis Tomitanae urbis Episcopi opuscula*. CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>.  
*contNestor* *Capitula contra Nestorianos et Pelagianos* (CPL 657): Fr. Glorie. *Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ioannis Tomitanae urbis Episcopi opuscula*. CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>.  
*LibFid* *Libellus fidei, Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ioannis Tomitanae urbis episcopi opuscula* (CPL 656): Fr. Glorie. *Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ioannis Tomitanae urbis Episcopi opuscula*. CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>.  
*Respons* *Responsio adversus epistulam Hormisdæ* (CPL 662): Fr. Glorie. *Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ioannis Tomitanae urbis Episcopi opuscula*. CCh.SL 85<sup>a</sup>.
- Maximus the Confessor  
*adThalas* *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* (CPG 7688): PG 90, 244–785.  
*Ambigua* *Ambiguorum liber* (CPG 7705): PG 91, 1032–1417.  
*Disputatio* *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* (CPG 7698): PG 91, 288–353. Translations used: M. Doucet. *Dispute de Maxime le confesseur avec Pyrrhus*. Montreal, 1972; J. Farrell. *The disputation with Pyrrhus of our father among the saints Maximus the Confessor*. South Canaan, Pa.: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 1990.  
*OpuscThPol* *Opuscula theologica et polemica* (CPG 7697): PG 91, 9–37.  
*OratDomin* *Orationis dominicae expositio* (CPG 7691): PG 90, 872–909.  
*SpiritallisTomus* *Spiritallis tomus ac dogmaticus* (CPG 7697, 15): PG91, 153–184.  
*TomusDogm* *Tomus Dogmaticus ad Marinum presbyterum* (CPG 7697, 20): PG 91, 228–245.
- Melito  
*dePascha* *De pascha* (CPG 1092): O. Perler. *Méliton de Sardes. Sur la Pâque et fragments*. SCh 123.
- Michael the Syrian  
*Chron* J.-B. Chabot. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*. 5 vols. Paris, 1899–1924 (repr. Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1963).

## Narratio de rebus Armeniae

G. Garitte. *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae. Édition critique et commentaire*. CSCO 132.

## Nestorius

## adAlex

*Ad Alexandrum Hierapolitanum* (CPG 5675): F. Loofs, G. Kampffmeyer, and S. Cook. *Nestoriana: die Fragmente des Nestorius*. Halle a.S: Niemeyer, 1905.

## Sermo II

*Sermo II* (CPG 5691): F. Loofs, G. Kampffmeyer, and S. Cook. *Nestoriana: die Fragmente des Nestorius*. Halle a.S: Niemeyer, 1905.

## Sermo IV

*Sermo IV. In Iudam adversus heareticos* (CPG 5693): F. Loofs, G. Kampffmeyer, and S. Cook. *Nestoriana: die Fragmente des Nestorius*. Halle a.S: Niemeyer, 1905.

## Nicephorus

## BrevHist

C. Mango. *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople: Short history*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990.

## Olympiodorus of Alexandria

## contSever

*Contra Severum Antiochenum* (CPG 7459): PG 89, 1189.

## Origenes

## adMart

*Exhortatio ad martyrium* (CPG 1475): P. Koetschau. *Origenes Werke*. Band. 1: GCS 2.

## contCelsus

*Contra Celsum* (CPG 1476): M. Borret. *Origène. Contre Celse*. 4 vols. *SCh* 132, 136, 147, 150.

## inJerem

*In Jeremiam* (CPG 1438): P. Nautin. *Origène. Homélie sur Jérémie*. vol. 1: *SCh* 232.

## inMatt

*Commentarium in Matthaëum* (CPG 1450): E. Klostermann. *Origenes Werke*. Band. 10.1–2: GCS 40, 1–2.

## Philo

## deOpificio

*De opificio mundi*: L. Cohn. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. vol. 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1896 (repr. De Gruyter, 1962).

## deSacr

*De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*: L. Cohn. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. vol. 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1896 (repr. De Gruyter, 1962).

## deSpec

*De specialibus legibus*: L. Cohn. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. vol. 5. Berlin: Reimer, 1906 (repr. De Gruyter, 1962).

## Heres

*Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*: P. Wendland. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. vol. 3. Berlin: Reimer, 1898 (repr. De Gruyter, 1962): 1–71.

## LegAlleg

*Legum allegoriae libri i–iii*: L. Cohn. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. vol. 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1896 (repr. De Gruyter, 1962).

## Legatio

*Legatio ad Gaium*: L. Cohn and S. Reiter. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. vol. 6. Berlin: Reimer, 1915 (repr. De Gruyter, 1962).

## Photius

*Bibliotheca*: R. Henry. *Photius bibliothèque. Collection byzantine*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1977.

- Pindarus  
*Nemea* Nemea: H. Maehler (post B. Snell). *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Leipzig: Teubner, <sup>5</sup>1971.  
*Olympia* *Olympia*: H. Maehler (post B. Snell). *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Leipzig: Teubner, <sup>5</sup>1971.  
*P* *Pythia*: H. Maehler (post B. Snell). *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Leipzig: Teubner, <sup>5</sup>1971.
- Plato  
*Apol* *Apologia Socratis*: J. Burnet. *Platonis opera*. vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900 (repr. 1967).  
*Gorg* *Gorgias*: J. Burnet. *Platonis opera*. vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903 (repr. 1968).  
*Leges* *Leges*: J. Burnet. *Platonis opera*. vol. 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907 (repr. 1967).  
*Prot* *Protagoras*: J. Burnet. *Platonis opera*. vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903 (repr. 1968).  
*Respublica* *Respublica*: J. Burnet. *Platonis opera*. vol. 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902 (repr. 1968).
- Plutarchus  
*VitOrat* *Vitae decem oratorum*: J. Mau. *Plutarchi moralia*. vol. 5.2.1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1971.
- Porphyry  
*inCat* *In Aristotelis categorias expositio per interrogationem et responsionem*: A. Busse. *Porphyrii isagoge et in Aristotelis categorias commentarium*. Berlin: Reimer, 1887.
- Proclus of Constantinople  
*adArmen* *Tomus ad Armenios* (CPG 5897): ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 187–195.  
*epUniformis* *Epistula uniformis ad singulos Occidentis episcopos* (CPG 5915): ACO<sub>1</sub> IV<sup>2</sup> 65–68.
- Sebeos  
*Hist:* R. Thomson and T. Greenwood. *The Armenian history attributed to Sebeos*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999.
- Seneca  
*NatQuaest* *Naturales Quaestiones*: P. Oltramare. *Sénèque, Questions Naturelles*. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1929.
- Sergius the Grammarian  
*adSever III* *Epistula III ad Severum Antiochenum* (CPG 7104): J. Lebon. *Severi Antiocheni orations ad Nephaliū. Eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici epistulae mutuae*. CSCO 119, 120.
- Severus of Antioch  
*adIoan* *Ad Ioannem abbatem* (CPG 7071, 28): *Doctrina Patrum* 309<sup>20–22</sup>.  
*adOecum* *Ad Oecumenium* (CPG 7071, 45): E. W. Brooks. *A collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch*. PO 12 (1915).  
*adSerg* *Epistulae ad Sergium Grammaticum* (CPG 7025): J. Lebon. *Severi Antiocheni orationes ad Nephaliū, eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici epistulae mutuae*. CSCO 119, 120.

- advIul* *Adversus Apologiam Iuliani* (CPG 7030): R. Hespel. *Sévère d'Antiochie. La polémique antijulianiste*. CSCO 301, 302.
- apolPhilal* *Apologia Philalethis* (CPG 7031): R. Hespel. *Sévère d'Antiochie. La polémique antijulianiste*. CSCO 318, 319.
- censIul* *Censura tomi Iuliani* (CPG 7027): R. Hespel. *Sévère d'Antiochie. La polémique antijulianiste*. CSCO 244, 245.
- contGram* *Liber contra impium Grammaticum* (CPG 7024): J. Lebon. *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium Grammaticum*. CSCO 93, 94; 101, 102; 111, 112.
- Hom* *Homiliae cathedrales* (CPG 7035): M. Brière. *Les Homiliae cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioch. Homélies XCI à XCVIII*. PO 25.
- Philalethes* (CPG 7023): R. Hespel. *Sévère d'Antiochie. Le Philalèthe*. CSCO 133, 134.
- Severus of Ushmunain  
*Hist* B. Evetts. *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*. PO 1.
- Sophronius of Jerusalem  
*Narratio* *Narratio miraculorum ss. Cyri et Ioannis* (CPG 7646): PG 87, 3424–3676.
- Stephanus of Alexandria  
*inAristot* *In Aristotelis librum de interpretatione commentarium*: M. Hayduck, *Stephani in librum Aristotelis de interpretatione commentarium*. Berlin: Reimer, 1885.
- Synesius  
*Hymni* *Hymni*: A. Dell'Era. *Sinesio di Cirene. Inni*. Rome: Tumminelli, 1968.
- Synodicon Vetus  
 J. Duffy and J. Parker. *The Synodicon Vetus*. CFHB 15. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1979.
- Theodore of Alexandria  
*adPaul* *Epistula synodica ad Paulum Antiochenum* (CPG 7236): J. Chabot. *Documenta ad origins monophysitarum illustrandas*. CSCO 17, 103.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia  
*adDomn* *Epistula ad Domnum* (CPG 3863, 2): *Doctrina patrum* 305, 20–26.
- contEunom* *Contra Eunomium* (CPG 3859): L. Abramowski. 'Ein unbekanntes Zitat aus Contra Eunomium des Theodor von Mopsuestia.' *Muséon* 71 (1958).
- deIncarn* *De incarnatione* (CPG 3856): H. Swete. *Theodori episcopi Mopsuetei in epistolas B. Pauli commentarii II*. Cambridge, 1882.
- HomCatech* *Homiliae catecheticae = Liber ad baptizandos* (CPG 3852): R. Tonneau and R. Devreesse. *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste: reproduction phototypique du ms. Mingana Syr. 561*. StT 145.
- inIoan* *Commentarii in Iohannem* (CPG 3843): J. M. Vosté. *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in Euangelium Iohannis Apostoli*. CSCO 115, 116.
- inMatth* *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* (CPG 3840): H. Swete. *Theodori episcopi Mopsuetei in epistolas B. Pauli commentarii II*. Cambridge, 1882.
- inPaul* *Commentarii in epistulas Pauli minores* (CPG 3845): H. Swete. *Theodori episcopi Mopsuetei in epistolas B. Pauli commentarii I*. Cambridge, 1880.



- inPsal* *Expositio in psalmos* (CPG 3833): R. Devreesse. *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes: StT* 93.
- Theodoret of Cyrus  
*Expositio* *Expositio rectae fidei* (CPG 6218, wrongly attributed to Justin Martyr): C. Th. Otto. *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*. vol. 4, 3. Jena: Mauke, 1880 (repr. Wiesbaden: Sändig, 1969).
- Theodosius of Alexandria  
*adSever* *Epistula synodica ad Severum* (CPG 7134): J. Chabot. *Documenta ad origins monophysitarum illustrandas*. CSCO 17, 103.  
*adTheodoram* *Tomus ad Theodoram augustam* (CPG 7133): A. Van Roey and P. Allen. *Monophysite texts of the sixth century*, OLA 56, 1994.
- Theophanes  
*Chronographia*: C. de Boor. *Theophanis chronographia*. vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1883 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963).
- Theophylact Simocatta  
*Hist* *Historia*: C. de Boor. *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1887.
- Thucydides  
*Historiae*: H. S. Jones and J. E. Powell. *Thucydidis historiae*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942 (repr. 1967, 1970).
- Timothy I, Nestorian Patriarch  
*Epistulae*: O. Braun. *Timothei patriarchae I Epistulae*. CSCO 74, 75.
- Trifolius  
*adFaust* *Epistula ad beatum Faustum senatorem contra Ioannem Scytham monachum*: S. Gennaro and Fr. Glorie. *Scriptores Illyrici minores: Asterius, Dionisius Exiguus, 'Exempla sanctorum patrum', Trifolius, 'Confessio', sive 'Formula libelli fidei'*. CCh.SL 85.
- Xenophon  
*Hell* *Hellenica*: E. C. Marchant. *Xenophontis opera omnia*. vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900 (repr. 1968).
- Yovhannes Drasxanakert'i  
*Maksoudian Krikor. History of Armenia*. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1987.

### Secondary literature

- Prosopography of the Byzantine Empire I: 641–867* (CD). Ashgate.
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (E) (CD).
- Abramowski, L. 'Ein unbekanntes Zitat aus Contra Eunomium des Theodor von Mopsuestia.' *Muséon* 71 (1958).
- Albert, M. and Ch von Schönborn. *Lettre de Sophrone de Jérusalem à Arcadius de Chypre: version syriaque inédite du texte grec perdu*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1978.

- Allen, P. and B. Neil. *Scripta saeculi VII vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia, una cum Latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii iuxta posita*. CChr.SG 39. Turnhout, Leuven: Brepols, 1999.
- . *Maximus the Confessor and his companions: documents from exile*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Altaner, B. 'Der griechische Theologe Leontius und Leontius der skythische Mönch. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung.' *TQ* 127 (1947).
- . 'Zum Schrifttum der "skythischen" (gotischen) Mönche.' *HJGG* 72 (1953).
- Altaner, B. and H. Graef. *Patrology*. Roma: Herder, 1960.
- Amann, E. 'Thémistius.' *DTC* 15.
- Anastos, Th. 'Essence, energies and hypostasis: an epistemological analysis of the Eastern Orthodox model of God.' 1986.
- Armstrong, A. H. *The Cambridge history of later Greek and early medieval philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Awit, M. *Le Patriarcat maronite, histoire et mission = the Maronite Patriarchate, history & mission*. Lebanon: Arab Printing Press, 1996.
- Aziz, A. 'Cyrus Al-Muqawqas.' *Coptic Encyclopedia* 3.
- Bakhit, M. *Proceedings of the second symposium on the History of Bilad al-Sham during the early Islamic period up to 40 A.H./640 A.D. The Fourth International Conference on the History of Bilad al-Sham*. Amman: University of Jordan, 1987.
- Balthasar, H. U. von. *Kosmische Liturgie: das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners*. Einsiedeln: Johannes-Verlag, 1961.
- Bardenhewer, O. *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, <sup>2</sup>1913.
- Bathrellos, D. 'Person, nature and will in ancient Christology with special reference to Saint Maximus the Confessor.' (dissert.) London: University of London, 2001.
- . 'The Relationship between the Divine Will and the Human Will of Jesus Christ according to Saint Maximus the Confessor.' *SP* 37 (2001).
- . *The Byzantine Christ. Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Baumstark, A. *Aristoteles bei den Syrern vom V.-VIII. Jahrhundert: Syrische Texte*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1900.
- . *Syrisch-arabische Biographien des Aristoteles: Syrische Kommentare zur Eisagoge des Porphyrios, Aristoteles bei den Syrern vom v.-viii. Jahrhundert. Syrische Texte*. 1. Bd. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1900.
- . *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur: mit Ausschluss der christlich-palästinensischen Texte*. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1922.
- . *Aristoteles bei den Syrern vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert: syrische Texte*. Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1975.
- Bautz, F. W. 'Agatho.' *BBKL* (cited 9 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/agatho\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/agatho_p.shtml).
- . 'Anastasius Sinaita.' *BBKL* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/anastasius\\_sinaita.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/anastasius_sinaita.shtml).
- . 'Eugen I.' *BBKL* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/e/eugen\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/e/eugen_i_p.shtml).
- . 'Donus.' *BBKL* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/d/donus\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/d/donus_p.shtml).
- Beck, H.-G. *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*. München: Beck, 1959.
- Beggiani S. *Early Syriac theology: with special reference to the Maronite tradition*. Lanham, Md.; London: University Press of America, 1983.
- Beggiani S. J. and P. Dib. *History of the Maronite Church*. Detroit: Maronite Apostolic Exarchate, 1971.
- Bernard, R. *L'image de Dieu d'après Saint Athanase*. Paris: Aubier, 1952.
- Bertolini, O. *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*. Bologna, 1941.

- Blair, G. *Energeia and entelecheia: 'act' in Aristotle*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1992.
- Bolotov, V. *Лекции по истории Древней Церкви*, изд. А. Бриллиантов. Москва, 1994.
- Brandes, W. *Die Städte Kleinasiens im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert*, Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten; Bd. 56. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1989.
- . 'Apergios von Perge—ein Phantomhäretiker.' *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 48 (1998).
- . '„Juristische“ Krisenbewältigung im 7. Jahrhundert? Die Prozesse gegen Papst Martin I. und Maximos Homologetes.' *Fontes Minores* 10 (1998).
- . 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Seventh Century: Prosopographical Observations on Monothelitism.' In A. Cameron. *Fifty Years of Prosopography. The Late Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond*. Oxford, 2003.
- Breukelaar, A. 'Konstantin I.' *BBKI* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/k/Konstantin\\_I.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/k/Konstantin_I.shtml).
- Breydy, M. *Études sur Sa'id ibn Baṭṭīq et ses sources*. CSCO 450.
- . *Geschichte der syro-arabischen Literatur der Maroniten vom VII. bis XVI. Jahrhundert*. Lengerich, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1985.
- . *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien. Ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden kompiliert von Sa'id Ibn Batriq um 935 A.D.* CSCO 471, 472.
- . *Études maronites*. Gluckstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1991.
- Brière, M. 'Introduction générale aux homélies de Sévère d'Antioche.' *PO* 29.
- Brock, S. *The Christology of the church of the East in the synods of the 5th to early 7th centuries: preliminary considerations and materials*. Offprint from: G. D. Dragas. *Aksum—Thyateira. A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain*. London: Thyateira House, 1985.
- . 'An Early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor.' *AB* 41 (1973).
- . 'A Syriac fragment on the Sixth Council.' *Oriens Christianus* 57 (1973).
- . 'Some New Letters of the Patriarch Severos.' *SP* 12 (1975).
- . 'Syriac Sources for Seventh-Century History.' *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1976).
- . *Syriac perspectives on late antiquity. Collected studies series*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- . 'A Monothelite florilegium in Syriac.' In J. A. Munitiz, L. van Rompay, and C. Laga. *After Chalcedon: studies in theology and church history offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his seventieth birthday*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1985.
- . 'Two sets of monothelite questions to the Maximianists.' *OLP* 17 (1986).
- . *Studies in Syriac Christianity: history, literature and theology. Collected studies series*. Hampshire, Brookfield, Vt: Variorum, 1992.
- . *From Ephrem to Romanos: interactions between Syriac and Greek in late antiquity. Variorum collected studies series*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Butler, M. 'Hypostatic union and monothelitism: the dyothelite Christology of St. Maximus the Confessor.' (dissert.) 1993.
- Cairns, D. *The image of God in man*. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Cameron, A. 'Byzantine Africa: the literary evidence.' In J. H. Humphrey. *Excavations at Carthage conducted by the University of Michigan*. University of Michigan Press, 1978.
- Carcione, F. *Sergio di Costantinopoli ed Onorio I nella controversia monotelita del VII secolo: Alcuni chiarimenti sulla loro dottrina e sul loro ruolo nella vicenda*. Roma: Pontificia Università Lateranense, Istituto di Scienze Religiose, 1985.
- . 'Enérgeia, Thélēma e Theokinetos nella lettera di Sergio, patriarca di Costantinopoli, a papa Onorio Primo.' *OCP* 51 (1985).
- . *La genesi storico-teologica del monotelismo maronita: note per una lettura ortodossa della tradizione cristologica maronita*. Roma: Unitor, 1990.

- Casey, R. P. 'Julian of Halicarnassus.' *HTR* 19 (1926).
- Caspar, E. *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930.
- . 'Die Lateransynode von 649.' *ZK* 51 (1932).
- Chadwick, H. *Boethius: the consolations of music, logic, theology and philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Charles, D. *Aristotle's philosophy of action*. London: Duckworth, 1986.
- Chemnitz, M. *The two natures in Christ: a monograph concerning the two natures in Christ, their hypostatic union, the communication of their attributes, and related questions, recently prepared and revised on the basis of Scripture and the witnesses of the ancient church*. Saint Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1971.
- Chesnut, R. *Three monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug*. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Combefis, F. *Historia haeresis Monothelitarum, sanctaeque in eam sextae synodi actorum, vindiciae. Diuersorum item antiqua, ac medii aevi, tum historiae sacrae, tum dogmatica, Graeca opuscula. Accedit Manuelis Palaeologi in laudem defuncti Theodori fratris dicta oratio... adiuncta Deliberatiua Demetrii Cydonij. Opera ac studio... Francisci Combefis*. Parisiis: Sumptibus Antonii Bertier... 1648.
- Conte, P. *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1971.
- Cosma, G. 'De "oeconomia" incarnationis secundum s. Sophronium Hierosolymitanum.' (dissert.) Rome, 1940.
- Cross, R. 'Individual Natures in the Christology of Leontius of Byzantium.' *JECS* 10.2 (2002).
- Dahood, R. *The future of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: problems, trends, and opportunities for research*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
- Davits'dze, S. *История и повествование о Багратионах*. Тбилиси, 1979.
- Debs, J. *Les Maronites du Liban. Leur constante persévérance dans la foi catholique, épreuves religieuses qu'ils traversent*. Paris, 1875.
- Devreese, R. *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la*. Paris, 1945.
- Dib, P. *Quelques documents pour servir à l'histoire des Maronites*. Paris, 1945.
- . *Histoire de l'église maronite*. Beyrouth: La Sagesse, 1962.
- Dib, P. and S. J. Beggiani. *History of the Maronite Church*. Beirut: Imprimerie catholique, 1971.
- Diehl, Ch. *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'exarchat de Ravenne*. Paris, 1888.
- Diekamp, F. "Über das Wissen der Seele Christi." *Theologische Revue* 14 (1915).
- . 'Ein Christologisches Florilegium aus dem codex Athous Vatopedianus 507.' *Analecta patristica* (1938).
- Dieten, J. L. van. *Geschichte der griechischen Patriarchen von Konstantinopel*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1972.
- Dihle, A. *The theory of will in Classical antiquity*. Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1982.
- Dillon, J. M. *The middle Platonists, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Ditten, H. *Ethnische Verschiebungen zwischen der Balkanhalbinsel und Kleinasien vom Ende des 6. bis zur zweiten Hälfte des 9. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993.
- Dölger, F. and P. Wirth. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*. München: Beck, 1977.
- Dras, G. *St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem*. Athens: Church and Theology, 1988.
- Duayhy, S. *Liber brevis explicationis de Maronitarum origine eorumque perpetua orthodoxia et salute ab omni haeresi et superstitione*. 2 vols. Rome, 1974.
- Duchesne, L. and H. Quentin. *L'Église au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris: Fontemoing, 1925.

- Elert, W., W. Maurer, and E. Bergsträsser. *Der Ausgang der altkirchlichen Christologie: eine Untersuchung über Theodor von Pharan und seine Zeit als Einführung in die alte Dogmengeschichte*. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1957.
- Erphanovitch, S. 'Вопросоответы к Фалассию.' *Богословский Вестник*, Москва, 1916.
- . *Материалы к изучению жизни и творений преп. Максима Исповедника*. Киев, 1917.
- Erkizan, N. 'Energie, nous and non-discursive thinking in Aristotle' (dissert.) University of Bristol, 1997.
- Evans, D. *Leontius of Byzantium: an Origenist Christology*. Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1970.
- Farrell, J. 'Free choice in St. Maximus the confessor.' (dissert.) University of Oxford, 1987.
- . *Free choice in St. Maximus the confessor*. South Canaan, Pa.: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 1989.
- Feghali, J. *Histoire du droit de l'Église maronite etc.*: Paris, 1962.
- Florovsky, G. *Византийские отцы V–VIII веков*. Париж, 1933.
- Flusin, B. *Saint Anastase le Perse: et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: C.N.R.S., 1992.
- Fouyas, M. *The person of Jesus Christ in the decisions of the ecumenical councils: a historical and doctrinal study with the relevant documents referring to the Christological relations of the Western, Eastern and Oriental churches*. Addis Ababa: Central Printing Press, 1976.
- Frend, W. H. C. *The rise of the Monophysite movement: chapters in the history of the church in the fifth and sixth centuries*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Gaïth, J. *La conception de la liberté chez Grégoire de Nyse*. Paris: Vrin, 1953.
- Galtier, P. 'L'Occident et le néo-chalcédonisme.' *Gregorianum* 40 (1959).
- Gerostergios, A. 'The religious policy of Justinian I and his religious beliefs.' (dissert.) 1974.
- Gockel, M. 'A Dubious Christological Formula? Leontius of Byzantium and the Anhypostasis-Enhypostasis Theory.' *JTS* 51, 2 (2000).
- Grabar, A. *L'iconoclasme byzantin: le dossier archéologique*. Paris: Flammarion, 1984.
- Graef, H. C. 'L'image de Dieu et la structure de l'âme chez le Pères grecs.' *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale* 22 (1952).
- Graf, G. 'Zwei dogmatischen Florilegien der Kopten.' *OCP* 3 (1937).
- . *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1944.
- Gray, P. *The defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- . 'Neo-Chalcedonism and the Tradition: From Patristic to Byzantine Theology.' *BF* 16 (1982).
- Grillmeier, A. 'Vorbereitung des Mittelalters. Eine Studie über das Verhältnis von Chalkedonismus und Neu-Chalkedonismus in der lateinischen Theologie von Boethius bis zu Gregor dem Großen.' In A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*. vol. 2. Würzburg: Echter, 1952.
- . 'Der Neu-Chalkedonismus. Um die Berechtigung eines neuen Kapitels in der Dogmengeschichte.' *HJGG* 77 (1958).
- . *Christ in Christian tradition*. London, Oxford: Mowbrays. vol. 1: 1975; vol. 2 p.1: 1987; vol. 1 p. 2: 1995; vol. 2 p. 4: 1996.
- . 'Das östliche und das westliche Christusbild. Zu einer Studie über den Neuchalcedonismus.' *Theologie und Philosophie* 59 (1984).
- Grillmeier, A. and H. Bacht. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 3 vols. Würzburg: Echter, 1951–1953.
- Grumel, V. 'Les textes monothélites d'Aetius.' *EO* 28 (1928).
- . 'Recherches sur l'histoire de monothélisme.' *EO* 28 (1928), 29 (1929), 30 (1930).

- . *Les registes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*. Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1972.
- Hage, L. *Encyclopédie Maronite*. Kaslik: Université Saint Esprit, 1992.
- Haldon, J. *Byzantium in the seventh century: the transformation of a culture*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- . 'The works of Anastasius of Sinai.' *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East* 1 (1992).
- . *Byzantium in the seventh century: the transformation of a culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Harnack, A. von. *History of dogma*. New York: Dover Publications, 1961.
- Hefele, K. J. von. 'Sophronius und Maximus über die zwei Willen in Christus.' *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift* (1857).
- Hefele, K. J. von. *A history of the Councils of the Church: from the original documents*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- Heinzer, F. and Ch. von Schönborn. *Maximus Confessor: actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur, Fribourg, 2-5 septembre 1980*. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1982.
- Helmer, S. *Der Neuchalkedonismus: Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffes*. Bonn, 1962.
- Herrin, J. *The formation of Christendom*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Honigmann, E. *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. CSCO 127.
- . 'Anthimus of Trebizond, Patriarch of Constantinople (June 535–March 536).' *ST* 173 (1953).
- Jaeger, G. 'Nus' in *Platons Dialogen*. Göttingen, 1967.
- Jasper, D. and H. Fuhrmann. *Papal letters in the Early Middle Ages*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Jugie, M. 'Monothélisme.' *DTC* 10, 2.
- . *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium*. Paris: Sumptibus Letouzey et Ane, 1935.
- Jülicher, A. and K. Müller. *Die Liste der alexandrinischen Patriarchen im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1922.
- Kaegi, W. *Byzantine military unrest, 471–843: an interpretation*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1981.
- . 'The Strategy of Heraclius.' In M. Bakhit. *Proceedings of the second symposium on the History of Bilad al-Sham during the early Islamic period up to 40 A.H./640 A.D. The Fourth International Conference on the History of Bilad al-Sham*. Amman: University of Jordan, 1987.
- . *Byzantium and the early Islamic conquests*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . *Heraclius, Emperor of Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Kenny, A. *The anatomy of the soul: historical essays in the philosophy of mind*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973.
- . *The Aristotelian ethics: a study of the relationship between the 'Eudemean' and 'Nicomachean ethics' of Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- . *Aristotle's theory of the will*. London: Duckworth, 1979.
- Köpstein, H. and F. Winkelmann. *Studien zum 7. Jahrhundert in Byzanz: Probleme der Herausbildung des Feudalismus*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1976.
- Kreuzer, G. 'Theodor I.' *BBKL* (cited 13 October 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor_i_p.shtml).
- . 'Martin I.' *BBKL* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/m/martin\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/m/martin_i_p.shtml).

- . *Die Honoriusfrage im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit*. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1975.
- Kumpfmüller, J. B. *De Anastasio Sinaita, dissertatio maintaining that he, and not Anastasius i, patriarch of Antioch, is the author of the Hodegus*. Wirceburgi, 1865.
- Larchet, J.-C. *La divinisation de l'homme selon saint Maxime le Confesseur*. Paris: Cerf, 1996.
- . *Maxime le Confesseur, médiateur entre l'Orient et l'Occident*. Paris: Cerf, 1998.
- Lebon, J. *Le monophysisme Sévérien: étude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcédoine jusqu'à la constitution de l'Église jacobite*. Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Dissertationes ad gradum doctoris in facultate theologica consequendum conscriptae. Series 2; 4. Louvain: J. van Linthout, 1909.
- . 'Le pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite et Sévère d'Antioche.' *RHE* 26 (1930).
- . 'Encore; le pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite et Sévère d'Antioche.' *RHE* 28 (1932).
- . 'La Christologie du monophysisme syrien.' In A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*. vol. 1. Würzburg: Echter, 1951.
- Leclercq, H. 'Maron.' *DACL* 10, 1 (1931).
- Léthel, F. *Théologie de l'agonie du Christ: la liberté humaine du Fils de Dieu et son importance sotériologique mises en lumière par saint Maxime le Confesseur*. Beauchesne, 1979.
- Liske, M. Th. 'Kinesis und Energeia bei Aristoteles.' *Phronesis* 36, 2 (1991).
- Losev, A. 'Античный космос и современная наука.' In *Бытие Имя Космос*. Москва: Мысль, 1993.
- . *История античной эстетики (ранняя классика)*. Москва: Высшая школа, 1969.
- Lossky, V. *In the image and likeness of God*. London: Mowbrays, 1975.
- . *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989.
- . *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976.
- Lourie, B. 'Un autre monothélisme: le cas de Constantin d'Apamee au VI<sup>e</sup> Concile Oecuménique.' *SP* 29 (1997).
- Louth, A. *Maximus the Confessor*. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.
- . *St. John Damascene: tradition and originality in Byzantine theology*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Luibhéid, C. and P. Rorem. *Pseudo-Dionysius: the complete works*. London: SPCK, 1987.
- Lumpe, A. 'Proklos.' *BBKl* (cited 12 June 2003). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/p/proklos\\_p\\_v\\_k.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/p/proklos_p_v_k.shtml).
- . 'Stephanos von Alexandria.' *BBKl* (cited 27 September 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephanos\\_v\\_a.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephanos_v_a.shtml).
- Mahfuz, Y. and S. Foukx. *Short history of the Maronite church*. Jounieh: Maronite Order of Lebanese Monks, 1987.
- Maksoudian, K. *History of Armenia*. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Malouf, G. 'Η ιστορία και η θεολογία των Μαρωνίτων και η σχέση τους με την Ορθόδοξη Εκκλησία της Αντιόχειας.' (dissert.) Cappodistrian University of Athens, 2001.
- Martino I papa (649–653) e il suo tempo: atti del XXVIII convegno storico internazionale: Todi, 13–16 ottobre 1991. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medievale, 1992.
- Maspero, J., A. Fortescue, and G. Wiet. *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie: depuis la mort de l'empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises jacobites (518–616)*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Edouard Champion, 1923.
- Matsoukas, N. *Δογματική και Συμβολική θεολογία Β': έκθεση της ὀρθόδοξης πίστεως σὲ ἀντιπαράθεση μετὰ τὴ δυτικὴ Χριστιανοσύνη*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Π. Πουρναρά, 1992.

- McCullough, W. *A short history of Syriac Christianity to the rise of Islam*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982.
- McGuckin, J. "The 'Theopaschite Confession' (Text and Historical Context): a Study in the Cyrilline Re-interpretation of Chalcedon." *JEH* 35 (1984).
- Meyendorff, J. 'Chalcedonians and Monophysites after Chalcedon.' *GOTR* 10, 2 (1964-1965).
- . *Christ in Eastern Christian thought*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975.
- . *Imperial unity and Christian divisions: the Church 450-680 A.D.* Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988.
- Moeller, Ch. 'Un Représentant de la Christologie néochalcédonienne au début du sixième siècle en orient: Nephalius d'Alexandrie.' *RHE* 40 (1944-1945).
- . *Le Chalcedonisme et le néo-chalcedonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. In A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*. vol. 1. Würzburg: Echter, 1951.
- . 'Textes 'monophysites' de Léonce de Jérusalem.' *ETL* 27 (1951).
- Moorhead, J. 'The Monophysite response to the Arab invasions.' *Byzantion* 51 (1981).
- Moosa, M. *The Maronites in history*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Mourelatos, A. 'Aristotle's Kinesis/Energeia Distinction: A Marginal Note On Kathleen Gill's Paper.' *CJP* 23, 3 (1993).
- Moutafakis, N. 'Christology and its Philosophical Complexities in the Thought of Leontius of Byzantium.' *HPQ* 10, 2 (1993).
- J. A. Munitiz, L. van Rompay, and C. Laga. *After Chalcedon: studies in theology and church history offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his seventieth birthday*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1985.
- Murtagh, J. *The Maronite Church*. Dublin: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1965.
- Naaman, P. *Théodore de Cyr et le monastère de Saint Maroun: les origines des maronites; essai d'histoire et de géographie*. Sin el-Fil, Liban: Inst. of Scientific Studies, 1971.
- Naironus, A. *Dissertatio de origine, nomine, ac religione Maronitarum*. Romae: Per Zachariam Dominicum Acsamitek a Kronenfeld Boemum Pragensem, linguarum Orientalem typographum, 1679.
- Nau, F. *Opusculs Maronites. Ouvres inédites de Jean Maron. Chronique syriaque*. Paris, 1899.
- . 'Les Maronites inquisiteurs de la Foi Catholique du VI<sup>e</sup> au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle.' *Bulletin de l'Association de S. Louis des Maronites* 97 (1903).
- Nikas, A. 'Θεόδωρος τῆς Ραϊθοῦ: βίος, ἔργα καὶ διδασκαλία αὐτοῦ.' (dissert.) Ἀθήναι.
- Norris, R. *Manhood and Christ: a study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- . *The Christological controversy. Sources of early Christian thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Owsepian, G. *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Monotheismus nach ihren Quellen geprüft und dargestellt*. Leipzig, 1897.
- Palmer, A. *The seventh century in the West-Syrian chronicles, including two seventh-century Syriac apocalyptic texts*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1993.
- Pargoire, J. *Histoire de l'Eglise Byzantine de 527 à 847*. Paris, 1904.
- Pascher, E. 'Energeia.' *RAC* V.
- Pelikan, J. *The Christian tradition: a history of the development of doctrine*. 5 vols. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1: 1971; 2: 1974; 3: 1978; 4: 1983; 5: 1989.
- Perrone, L. *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche: dal Concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo Concilio di Costantinopoli (553)*. Brescia: Paideia, 1980.
- Peters, F. E. *Greek philosophical terms; a historical lexicon*. New York: New York University Press, 1967.
- Petrosian, G. *Ἡ θέσις τῆς Ἀρμενικῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἔναντι τῶν ἱερῶν εἰκόνων. Διδακτορικὴ διατριβή, Ἑκδόση τοῦ Καθολικαίου τῆς Ἀρμενικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, Ἀγ. Εντζιματζίν, Ἀθήνα, 1987.*



- Pheidias, V. *Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία Α'*. Αθήνα, <sup>2</sup>1995.
- Pinggéra, K. 'Beniamin I.' *BBkl* (cited 03 December 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/b/benjamin\\_i\\_p\\_v\\_k.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/b/benjamin_i_p_v_k.shtml).
- Pospelov, D. *Диспут с Пирром. Прп. Максим Исповедник и христологические споры VII столетия: сборник—Σμάραδος Φιλοκαλίας*. Москва: Храм Софии Премудрости Божией, 2004.
- Prestige, G., and H. Chadwick. *St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*. London: SPCK, 1956.
- Pulsfort, E. 'Severinus.' *BBkl* (cited 29 May 2003). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/severinus\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/severinus_p.shtml).
- Raven, Ch. *Apollinarianism: an essay on the Christology of the early Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.
- Reichert, E. 'Nestorius.' *BBkl* (cited 7 January 2003). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/n/nestorius\\_v\\_k.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/n/nestorius_v_k.shtml).
- . 'Pyrrhos.' *BBkl* (cited 29 May 2003). Available from <http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/p/pyrrhos.shtml>.
- Reinink, G. J. and B. Stolte. *The reign of Heraclius (610–641): crisis and confrontation*. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Richard, M. 'Proclus de Constantinople et le theopaschisme.' *RHE* 38 (1942).
- . 'L'introduction du mot hypostase dans la théologie de l'incarnation.' *MSR* 2 (1945).
- . 'Le néo-chalcédonisme.' *MSR* 3 (1946).
- . 'Anastase le Sinaïte, l'Hodégos et le monothélisme.' *Revue des études byzantines* 16 (1958).
- Riedinger, R. 'Aus den Akten der Lateran-Synode von 649.' *BZ* 69 (1976).
- . *Die Präsenz- und Subskriptionslisten des VI. Oekumenischen Konzils (680/81) und der Papyrus Vind. G.3*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979.
- . *Lateinische Übersetzungen griechischer Häretikertexte des siebenten Jahrhunderts*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979.
- . 'Zwei Briefe aus den Akten der Lateransynode von 649.' *JÖB* 29 (1980).
- . 'Sprachschichten in der lateinischen Übersetzung der Lateranakten von 649.' *ZK* 92 (1981).
- . 'Die Epistula synodica des Sophronios von Jerusalem im Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115.' *Byzantiaka* 2 (1982).
- . 'Papst Martin I. und Papst Leo I. in den Akten der Lateran-Synode von 649.' *JÖB* 33 (1983).
- . 'Die Lateranakten von 649: ein Werk der Byzantiner um Maximus Homologes.' *Byzantina* 13 (1985).
- . *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts*. Steenbrugis, Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
- Riedmatten, H. 'Some neglected aspects of Apollinarian Christology.' *DomStud* 1 (1948).
- . 'Sur les notions doctrinales opposées à Apollinaire.' *Revue thomiste* 51 (1951).
- . 'La correspondance entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée.' *JTS* 7 (1956); 8 (1957).
- . 'La Christologie d'Apollinaire de Laodicée.' *SP* 2 (1957).
- Rissberger, J. 'Das Glaubenskenntnis des Patriarchen Makarius von Antiochien.' (dissert.) 1940.
- Roey, A. Van, and P. Allen. *Monophysite texts of the sixth century*. OLA 56.
- Roem, P. and J. Lamoreaux. *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian corpus: annotating the Areopagite*. Oxford, New York: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Rosenbaum, H.-U. 'Julianus von Halikarnassus.' *BBkl* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/julianus\\_v\\_hal.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/julianus_v_hal.shtml).

- Roueché, M. 'Byzantine Philosophical Texts of the Seventh Century.' *JÖB* 23 (1974).
- Rudberg, S. *L'homélie de Basile de Césarée sur le mot 'observe-toi toi-même'; édition critique du texte grec et étude sur la tradition manuscrite*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962.
- Salibi, K. *Maronite historians of mediæval Lebanon*. Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1959.
- Sansterre, J.-M. *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne: milieu du VI<sup>e</sup> s.-fin du IX<sup>e</sup> s.* Bruxelles: Académie royale de Belgique, 1982.
- Schmemmann, A. *The historical road of Eastern orthodoxy*. London, 1965.
- Schönborn, Ch. von. *Sophrone de Jérusalem: vie monastique et confession dogmatique*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.
- Schulz, W. 'Johannes IV.' *BBKL* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/Johannes\\_IV.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/j/Johannes_IV.shtml).
- Schurr, V. *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der 'skythischen Kontroversen.'* Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1935.
- Schwartz, E. *Konzilstudien*. Strassburg: K. J. Trubner, 1914.
- . *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1934.
- . *Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts*. In *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*. Berlin: Tölpelmann, 1935.
- Sherwood, P. *An annotated date-list of the works of Maximus the Confessor*. Rome: 'Orbis Catholicus', Herder, 1952.
- . 'Sergius of Reishaina and the Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Denys.' *Sacris Erudiri* 4 (1952).
- Sodini, J.-P. 'Les inscriptions de l'Aqueduc de Kythrea à Salamine de Chypre.' *Eupsychia. Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler*. Paris, 1998.
- Sorabji, R. *Philoponus and the rejection of Aristotelian science*. London: Duckwork, 1987.
- . *Matter, space and motion: theories in antiquity and their sequel*. London: Duckworth, 1988.
- . *Aristotle transformed: the ancient commentators and their influence*. London: Duckworth, 1990.
- . *Aristotle and after*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1997.
- Sorge, G. *I Maroniti nella storia: lineamenti e ricerche*. Roma: Le muse, 1978.
- Stallmach, J. *Dynamis und Energeia. Untersuchungen am Werk des Aristoteles*. Meisenheim am Glan, 1959.
- Stephanides, V. *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία: Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι σήμερον*. Ἀθήνα, <sup>5</sup>1990.
- Stiglmayr, J. 'Das Aufkommen der Pseudo-Dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindringen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Lateranconcil 649.' *Jahresbericht des öffentlichen Privatgymnasiums an der Stella matutina zu Feldkirch* 4 (1894/5).
- Stratos, A. *Byzantium in the seventh century*. 5 vols. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1968.
- Straubinger, H. 'Die Lehre des Patriarchen Sophronius von Jerusalem über die Trinität, die Inkarnation und die Person Christi.' *Der Katholik* 87 (1907).
- Suchla, B. R. *Die sogenannten Maximus-Scholien des Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Suermann, H. *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1998.
- Talatinian, B. *Il monofisismo nella chiesa armena: storia e dottrina*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1980.
- Tenberg, R. 'Isco'jahb II.' *BBKL* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/i/Ischo\\_II.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/i/Ischo_II.shtml).
- Tetz, M. 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra.' *ZK* 75 (1964).
- Thanner, A. *Papst Honorius I (625–638)*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1989.

- Theodorou, A. *Ἡ χριστολογικὴ ὁρολογία καὶ διδασκαλία Σεβήρου τοῦ Ἀντιοχείας*. Ἀθήναι, 1957.
- Thomson, R. *The Armenian version of the works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite*. CSCO 488–489.
- Thunberg, L. 'Microcosm and mediator: the theological anthropology of Maximus the Confessor.' (dissert.) Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1965.
- . *Man and the cosmos: the vision of St. Maximus the Confessor*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.
- Tilly, M. 'Honorius I.' *BBKI* (cited 10 June 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/h/honorius\\_i\\_p.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/h/honorius_i_p.shtml).
- Tixeront, J. *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne*. Paris: Lecoffre, <sup>8</sup>1928.
- Torrance, I. *Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988.
- Uthemann, K.-H. 'Sergios I.' *BBKI* (cited 19 May 2003). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios\\_i.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s2/sergios_i.shtml).
- . 'Stephan von Dor.' *BBKI* (cited 27 September 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephan\\_v\\_dor.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/s4/stephan_v_dor.shtml).
- . 'Der Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monothetismus: Ein Beitrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus.' *SP* 29 (1997).
- Vacant, A. 'Agnoètes ou Agnoites.' *DTC* 1.
- Vailhe, S. 'Sophrone le sophiste et Sophrone le patriarche.' *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 7 (1902), 8 (1903).
- . 'L'église maronite du V<sup>e</sup> au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle.' *EO* 9 (1906).
- Verdenius, W. and H. Waszink. *Philosophia antiqua*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1947.
- Voisin, G. *L'apollinarisme: étude historique, littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses Christologiques au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1901.
- Völker, W. *Maximus Confessor: als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1965.
- Vööbus, A. *History of asceticism in the Syrian Orient: a contribution to the history of culture in the Near East*. CSCO 197.
- Wesseling, K.-G. 'Theodor von Mopsuestia.' *BBKI* (cited 13 October 2002). Available from [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor\\_v\\_mo.shtml](http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/t/theodor_v_mo.shtml).
- Westerink, L. 'The Alexandrian commentators and the introductions to their commentaries.' In R. Sorabji. *Aristotle transformed: the ancient commentators and their influence*. London: Duckworth, 1990.
- Wigram, W. A. *The separation of the Monophysites*. London: Faith Press, 1923.
- Winkelmann, F. 'Die Quellen zur Erforschung des monenergetisch-monothelischen Streites.' *Klio* 69, 2 (1987).
- . *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*. Frankfurt am Main; Oxford: P. Lang, 2001.



## INDEX OF NAMES, PLACES, AND SUBJECTS

- Abd al-Ḥakam 69, 69 n. 83  
 Acacian schism 42–43  
 Achillius the Scythian monk 41  
 Ackrill, J. 137 nn. 208–209  
 Adam 8 n. 16, 26–27, 129–131  
 Adoptionism 6  
 Aelius Aristides 139 n. 219, 140 n. 234  
 Aelius Herodianus 139 n. 216  
 Aeschines 140 nn. 230, 232  
 Aeschylus 140 n. 232  
 Africa 42–43, 57, 79–80, 83–84, 164  
 African bishops 80 n. 159  
 Agatho of Rome 2, 74 n. 107, 87,  
     87 n. 196, 88, 89 n. 207, 91 n. 212,  
     105 n. 16, 107, 125, 131, 132 n. 175,  
     154, 157, 161 n. 338  
 agent 17 n. 49, 21 n. 73, 31  
 Agnoetism 5, 30, 32–33, 38, 41, 50, 101,  
     110  
 agony 146  
 Albert, M. 61 n. 46  
 Aleppo 64  
 Alexandria 5, 25, 30, 33, 48, 53, 66–69,  
     71, 96 n. 243, 108, 108 nn. 32–33, 109,  
     111, 164, 166  
 Alexander of Alexandria 88 n. 207  
 Allen, P. 2 n. 15, 33 nn. 114–116,  
     36 n. 133  
 Al-Maqrīsī 97 n. 248  
 Altaner, B. 41 n. 155  
 Amandus of Traiectum 84 n. 182  
 Amann, E. 30 n. 103  
 Amelotti, M. 43 nn. 161–162,  
     44 nn. 163, 166–167, 48 nn. 194–196,  
     49 n. 202  
 Amida 53  
 Amr 69  
*anaphora* 61 n. 45, 87–88  
 Anastasius Bibliothecarius 78 nn. 138,  
     146, 79 n. 151  
 Anastasius disciple of Maximus 62  
 Anastasius I the emperor 44, 46  
 Anastasius II the emperor 92  
 Anastasius of Antioch 88 n. 207, 116  
 Anastasius of Sinai 2, 56, 126 n. 144,  
     127 n. 149, 104 n. 6, 111, 125, 127,  
     127 n. 152, 132, 154, 158  
 Anastos, Th. 125 n. 135  
 anathema 48, 50, 80, 84–85, 90, 93, 106,  
     112  
 Anatolia 53  
 Andocides 139 n. 216, 140 n. 230  
 angel 137  
 Anthimus of Trebizond 33 n. 116,  
     35–36, 38  
 Anthony of Bacatha 84 n. 182  
 Anthony of Hypæpa 89  
 anti-Agnoetism 33  
 Antioch 5, 9, 13–14, 45, 53, 64,  
     64 n. 63, 84 n. 182, 87 n. 202, 94 n. 235,  
     97 n. 250, 101, 102, 127, 139 n. 216,  
     164, 166  
 Antiphon 139 n. 216  
 Apamea 94, 94 n. 235, 100  
 Apergius of Perge 90  
 Aphthartodocetism 101  
 Apollinarian 8, 10, 35, 102, 163, 166  
 Apollinarius of Laodicea 3, 5–8, 8 n. 16,  
     9, 9 n. 20, 10, 12–13, 42, 101  
 appellation 19, 136  
 Arab 66, 68, 68 n. 82, 69, 71, 73, 81,  
     81 n. 169, 82–83, 86–87, 93, 96 n. 243,  
     97 nn. 248, 250, 99 n. 258  
 Arabia 84 n. 182  
 Arcadius of Cyprus 61, 61 n. 42, 62,  
     62 n. 42  
 Arian 10, 33 n. 116, 124, 148  
 Aristippus 139 n. 217  
 Aristophanes 140 n. 230  
 Aristotle 39, 39 n. 149, 108–109,  
     109 n. 41, 110, 110 n. 48, 111,  
     111 n. 65, 137, 138 n. 215, 139 n. 216,  
     140 n. 230, 147, 150, 153, 155  
 Arius 42, 148, 156  
 Armenia 45, 53, 57, 57 n. 21, 58, 60, 62,  
     65, 65 n. 70, 66, 66 n. 73, 83, 92, 102,  
     108 n. 33, 112 n. 71, 158  
 Armstrong, A. 109 n. 41  
 Asia Minor 53  
 Assido 54  
 assumption 6, 10–11, 14 n. 40, 17 n. 51,  
     20, 28, 30, 72, 128–131  
 Athanasius of Alexandria 18 n. 54, 27,  
     32 n. 110, 88 n. 207, 141, 148

- Athanasius the Camel-Driver 54 n. 7,  
     64, 95  
 Athenaeus 139 n. 217, 140  
 Athens 95 n. 236, 138 n. 215, 140  
 Atiya, A. 68 n. 80  
 Audi, R. 110 n. 48  
 Augustine 149 n. 285  
 Australia 102  
*autokinetos* 6  
 Avars 54, 56  
  
 Babylon 53, 68  
 Bar Hebraeus 65, 95, 96  
 Barlaam of Calabria 152, 167  
 Basil of Caesaria 21, 46 n. 181, 140,  
     151 n. 297  
 Bathrellos, D. 125 n. 135, 129 n. 160,  
     134, 134 n. 190, 135 n. 193, 141,  
     141 nn. 247–248, 142 n. 249, 145,  
     145 nn. 268–269, 128 n. 159  
 Bautz, F. W. 86 n. 190, 87 nn. 194, 196  
 Beck, H. G. 37 n. 136, 58 n. 30,  
     78 n. 145  
 Beggiani, S. 96 n. 241, 97–98 n. 250,  
     98 nn. 251, 255, 99 nn. 256–257, 259,  
     100 nn. 260–261  
 Benjamin of Alexandria 50, 50 n. 207,  
     51, 67–68, 68 n. 81  
 Bergsträsser, E. 1 n. 1  
 Bêth Maron 65, 95, 95 n. 237, 96–98  
 Black Sea 41 n. 155  
 blameless passions 30 n. 104, 33–34,  
     129, 135, 147  
 blood 68, 90, 94, 114  
 bodily 106  
 body 10, 18, 22, 26, 29–30, 32, 40,  
     109–110, 118, 120–122, 126, 130,  
     152–154  
 Boethius 13  
 Bolotov, V. 59, 59 n. 36, 60 n. 40,  
     65 n. 71, 72 n. 96, 73 n. 101, 78 n. 149,  
     79 n. 150, 82, 83 n. 175  
 Bonos the Patrician 56  
 Boran II 63  
 Brandes, W. 1 n. 12, 57 n. 26, 85 n. 185,  
     90 n. 210, 91, 91 n. 211  
 bread 51  
 Breukelaar, A. 92 n. 224  
 Breydy, M. 96 n. 243  
 Brilliantov, A. 65 n. 71  
 Britain 72 n. 97, 87  
 Brock, S. 2 n. 15, 59 n. 32, 61 n. 46,  
     62 nn. 47–48, 89 n. 207  
 Bulgars 56  
  
 Butler, M. 125 n. 135  
 butter 27  
 Byzia 85  
  
 Caesareum 67  
 Cairo 53, 68, 98  
 Cameron, A. 76 n. 125  
 Cana 51, 121  
 Cappadocia 53, 57 n. 21  
 Cappadocians 57 n. 21, 111, 144, 158  
 Carcione, F. 100, 100 n. 262,  
     101 nn. 263–268, 127 n. 148  
 Carthage 56–57, 76, 78, 84 n. 182, 85  
 Caspar, E. 1, 1 n. 4, 81 nn. 169–170,  
     83 nn. 177–178  
 Caucasus 53  
 Chadwick, H. 6 n. 6, 46 n. 183  
 Charles, D. 110 n. 48  
 Charles, R. 54 n. 5  
 Chersonese 85  
 Chesnut, R. 15 n. 44  
 child 27, 58, 114  
 Chrysopolis 76  
 circumscribed 106  
 cithara 18  
 Clement of Alexandria 88 n. 207,  
     124 nn. 125–126, 139–140, 148  
 Clement of Rome 124 n. 125  
 coal 17 n. 51  
 Colluthus 37  
 Combefis 85 n. 184  
*communicatio idiomatum* 17 n. 49, 72,  
     106, 106 n. 20, 107, 115, 122, 160–161  
*communicatio operationum* 122  
*communicatio voluntatum* 161  
 composite 12, 16, 19, 19 n. 61, 20,  
     20 n. 67, 24, 24 n. 82, 36, 38, 114–115,  
     137, 153  
 confusion 11, 20, 25, 99, 107, 117, 123,  
     130, 144, 148, 155, 157, 161  
 Constans II the emperor 66, 66 n. 73,  
     73 n. 107, 76, 80, 80 n. 159, 81,  
     81 n. 169, 82–83, 84 n. 182, 86,  
     87 n. 202, 97 n. 250  
 Constantia 62 n. 49  
 Constantine IV the emperor 86–87,  
     88 n. 204, 91 nn. 212–213, 97 n. 250  
 Constantine Manasses 57 n. 21  
 Constantine of Apamea 90, 93–95, 97,  
     100, 102, 166  
 Constantine of Constantinople 90  
 Constantine of Laodicea 30 n. 104,  
     33 n. 115, 37  
 Constantine of Perge 90 n. 210

- Constantine of Rome 92, 92 n. 222  
Constantinople 41–43, 45, 48,  
48 n. 199, 53–54, 55 n. 11, 56, 63, 67,  
76, 82, 85–86, 91, 95 n. 237, 108, 164,  
166  
Conte, P. 1, 1 n. 6  
Copts 51 n. 210, 68, 68 nn. 80–81, 69  
corporeal 21–22  
*Corpus Areopageticum* 112, 112 n. 71,  
114  
corruption 29, 29 n. 97, 30, 32–33, 121,  
127–128, 144, 146, 164  
Council  
Byzacene 80 n. 159  
Carthago 80 n. 159  
Chalcedon 6, 12, 15, 17, 27,  
30 n. 100, 41–42, 42 n. 157, 44, 55,  
57–59, 59 n. 32, 65, 66, 66 n. 73, 88,  
93, 95, 95 n. 236, 96–97, 102, 104,  
111, 137, 163  
Constantinople 553 48, 88, 90, 97,  
107, 121, 123, 125, 130, 132, 138,  
145, 151, 155, 158  
Constantinople 680/1 1, 5, 5 n. 3,  
72 n. 98, 75–76, 81, 86–87, 87 n. 202,  
91–93, 97, 100, 102, 107, 121, 123,  
125, 130, 132, 138, 145, 151, 155,  
158  
Dvin 66, 83  
*endemousa* 63, 70  
Ephesos 88  
Lateran 1, 5 n. 3, 6 n. 5, 15, 37,  
67 n. 77, 73 n. 104, 106, 74 n. 109,  
80 nn. 157, 159, 81 n. 166, 82–83,  
84 n. 180, 85 n. 184, 105 n. 15,  
106–107, 113, 115–116, 118, 120,  
122, 128–130, 132 n. 175, 136–137,  
146, 154, 157, 159, 166  
Mauritania 80 n. 159  
Numidia 80 n. 159  
Orlean 80 n. 158  
Rome 80 n. 158, 88  
created 26, 106, 118, 122–123, 146, 148,  
152, 159–160, 161  
Crimea 85  
crucifixion 29 n. 97, 121  
Crusade 102  
Cyprus 60–61, 61 n. 44, 62, 62 n. 47,  
86, 102  
Cyril of Alexandria 5, 5 n. 3, 6, 6 n. 5,  
15–16, 17 n. 51, 20, 20 n. 64, 29 n. 97,  
34–35, 35 n. 127, 42, 46 n. 181, 50,  
63–64, 101, 103, 104 nn. 10, 13, 105,  
111–113, 112 n. 68, 113 n. 72, 116,  
117, n. 123, 123 n. 123, 130, 135,  
136 n. 202  
Cyrus of Alexandria 2, 58, 60 n. 39,  
61 nn. 43, 45, 62, 62 n. 53, 63, 67,  
67 n. 78, 68, 68 n. 80, 69, 70–71,  
72 n. 98, 74, 74 n. 108, 80, 84, 90, 93,  
97, 102  
Cyzicus 86  
Damascus 53, 94 n. 235, 97 n. 250  
Damian of Alexandria 50  
Danube 41 n. 155  
David the neoplatonist 108, 108 n. 33,  
109–110, 124  
David the prophet 126–127  
Davitidze, S. 66  
deification 131–132  
Delphi 138 n. 215  
Demosthenes 140 n. 230  
Deusdedit 113, 120, 146  
Diadochus of Photike 88 n. 207, 144,  
156  
Dib, P. 96 n. 241, 97–98, 98 n. 250,  
98 nn. 251, 255, 99, 99 nn. 256–257,  
259, 100, 100 nn. 260–261  
Didymus 124, 158 n. 327  
Diehl, M. 78 n. 143  
Diekamp, F. 89 n. 207  
Dieten, J. L. van 1, 1 n. 5, 55 n. 12,  
56 nn. 15, 18, 60 n. 41, 64 n. 64,  
73 nn. 105–107, 76 n. 123, 78 nn. 143,  
149, 80 n. 159, 81 nn. 165–166, 169,  
82 n. 172, 83 nn. 177–178, 84 n. 182,  
85 nn. 187–189, 87 nn. 195, 198,  
91 n. 212, 92 nn. 216, 221–222,  
93 n. 226  
Dihle, A. 124 n. 124, 147, 148 nn.  
279–281, 284, 149 n. 285  
Dillon, J. 109 n. 41  
Dio Chrysostom 140 n. 233  
Diogenes Laertius 139 n. 217  
Dionysius of Tell-Mahrē 95, 97  
Dionysius the Areopagite 6, 18–19, 31,  
34, 38, 112, 112 nn. 70–71, 113–114,  
114 n. 77, 115–116, 118, 123  
Dioscorus the deacon 42 n. 157, 47  
Ditten, H. 1 n. 12  
Dölger, F. 1, 1 n. 7  
Dometius of Prusiade 130  
Donus of Rome 87, 87 n. 194  
Doucet, M. 78 n. 149, 143 nn. 255–256  
*doxa* 17, 17 n. 51, 30  
Drasxanakert'ci, Y. 65 n. 70  
drink 94

- duality 16, 19, 22–24, 26, 28–29, 37,  
     39–41, 117  
 Duayhy, S. 98, 98 n. 253  
 Dvin 66  
 dynamic 7–8, 8 n. 15, 10, 13, 20, 138  
*dynamis* 34, 37, 161  
  
 earth 9  
 earthquake 121  
 eat 27, 94, 129  
 Ebied, R. 50 n. 205  
*Ecthesis* 14, 58, 58 n. 28, 73–74,  
     74 nn. 108, 115, 77 n. 133, 78 n. 138,  
     80, 82, 84, 88 n. 207, 103 n. 1,  
     104 nn. 3–4, 6–8, 107, 126, 126 n. 144,  
     136 n. 202, 160 n. 333, 162, 162 n. 346  
 Eden 129  
 Edessa 53, 97 n. 250  
*Edict* 91, 131, 132 nn. 175, 177, 149  
 Egypt 50–51, 53, 59, 64 n. 63, 66–69,  
     71, 73, 82, 85–86, 93, 97 n. 248, 102,  
     117, 164  
*eidōs* 153–154  
 Eleatic school 110  
 Elert, W. 1 n. 1  
 Elias the neoplatonist 108, 108 nn. 32,  
     35, 109, 110, 124  
 Elisabeth 121  
 Emesa 65, 95–96, 97 n. 250  
 Emmanuel 17 n. 49, 22–23, 27, 35, 136  
 encyclical letter 71, 73–74, 84,  
     84 n. 182, 103  
 Epiphania 57 n. 21  
 Epiphanius of Constantinople 47  
 Epiphanius of Cyprus 112 n. 70  
 Epiphanovitch, S. 77 n. 133, 78 nn. 142,  
     147–148, 79 nn. 153–156, 135,  
     135 n. 194  
 Erzurum 60  
 essence 11, 16–17, 39, 88 n. 207, 109,  
     111, 130, 144, 149–150, 152–154, 156,  
     158, 161, 167  
 Eudocia 76, 80  
 Eugenius of Rome 86  
 Euphrates 57 n. 21, 94 n. 235  
 Euripides 138 n. 215, 139 n. 219  
 Eusebius of Caesaria 139, 141  
 Eustathius of Antioch 88 n. 207  
 Eutyches 30, 101  
 Eutyches of Alexandria 96  
 evil 27–28, 121, 127  
 Ezr the Catholicos 65  
  
 Facundus of Hermiane 46  
  
 Farrell, J. 5 nn. 2–3, 6 n. 4, 14  
     nn. 41–43, 106, 119, 123 n. 122,  
     125 n. 135, 127 n. 147, 133, 133 n. 180,  
     159, 183, 185, 134 nn. 187–189,  
     192, 147 n. 275, 153 nn. 307, 310,  
     154 n. 311, 155 n. 317, 156 n. 319–322,  
     161 nn. 337, 339, 341, 343  
 Father 12, 17 n. 51, 32, 34, 39, 48,  
     58 n. 30, 78, 94, 98, 104, 112, 124,  
     129 n. 160, 130–131, 137, 139 n. 220,  
     145, 147–148, 152, 157  
 Faustus the senator 42  
 fear 11, 26–27, 44, 66 n. 73, 98, 130,  
     146–147  
 fire 17 n. 51, 51, 119  
 flagellation 121  
 flesh 6–8, 10, 12, 16, 18 n. 54, 20,  
     22–23, 25–29, 29 n. 97, 35, 42, 44,  
     47–48, 51, 90, 94, 98, 105, 111–112,  
     116, 120, 142, 145, 156–157, 160  
 flesh endowed with a soul 6–7, 17, 27,  
     36, 104, 106, 115, 126, 132  
*florilegium* 14 n. 40, 15, 59, 71,  
     78 n. 142, 51 n. 210, 81, 88,  
     88–89 n. 207, 131 n. 174  
 Florovsky, G. 135 n. 195  
 Flusin, B. 64  
 food 10, 26  
*forma* 16 n. 47, 105, 105 nn. 16–17,  
     122 nn. 118–119, 142  
 Fredegarius 54 n. 6  
 Frend, W. 15 n. 44, 38 n. 146  
 Fulgentius of Ruspe 43  
  
 Gaius 18, 75, 112, 112 n. 71  
 Gaius the deacon 62  
 George Arsas 59, 89 n. 207  
 George Cedrenus 71 n. 90, 92 n. 222  
 George of Constantinople 87, 90  
 George of Pisidia 55 n. 11  
 George the archimandrite 84 n. 182  
 Georgia 66, 66 n. 74  
 Germanus of Constantinople 93, 97  
 Gerostergios, A. 44 n. 168, 49 n. 201  
 Gethsemane 146  
 Glorie, F. 41 n. 155  
 glory 12–13, 17, 48, 106  
*gnome* 134–135  
 gnomonic 77 n. 134, 134, 134 n. 190, 135  
 good 11, 27–28, 128, 134–135, 138,  
     139 n. 219, 141, 159  
 Gospel 18, 25, 36  
 Grabar, A. 92 n. 223  
 Graf, G. 51 n. 210



- Greek 16, 31, 66 n. 73, 81, 83–84,  
84 n. 181, 105 n. 15, 112 n. 71, 141  
Gregory Akindynus 152  
Gregory of Nazianzus 20, 36, 38,  
128 n. 156, 131–132, 139, 141  
Gregory of Nyssa 8, 88 n. 207, 111, 124,  
139, 148, 158 n. 327  
Gregory Palamas 152  
Gregory the exarch 76, 78–79, 85  
Grillmeier, A. 10, 10 nn. 22–25, 11,  
11 n. 27, 12, 12 nn. 32–33, 13 nn. 34,  
37, 16 n. 45, 17, 17 nn. 48–51, 18,  
18 nn. 54–56, 19 nn. 59–60, 20,  
20 n. 67, 21 n. 73, 22 n. 75, 25 nn. 85,  
88, 26 nn. 89–90, 27 nn. 91–92,  
28 nn. 94, 96, 29 nn. 97, 99,  
30 nn. 100, 102, 33 n. 117, 34,  
34 nn. 118–119, 35 nn. 124, 127, 36,  
36 n. 135, 38 n. 146, 39 nn. 148, 150,  
42, 42 n. 156, 45 n. 170, 46 n. 184,  
50 n. 203, 51 n. 212  
Grumel, V. 1 n. 3, 61 n. 45, 73 nn. 104,  
106–107, 74 n. 108, 75 n. 120,  
81 n. 166, 85 nn. 184, 189, 92 n. 222,  
93 nn. 226, 229  
  
Hagia Sophia 73, 82, 91  
Haldon, J. 1, 1 n. 10, 74 n. 114,  
92 n. 218  
hammer 51  
Harnack, A. 88, 88 n. 205  
Hatfield 87  
heaven 9, 32, 121, 131, 145, 160  
Hefele, K. J. 58 n. 28, 63 n. 57, 67 n. 78,  
73 nn. 104, 106, 74 n. 113, 80 nn.  
158–159, 162, 82 nn. 173–174,  
87 n. 197, 92 n. 220, 93 n. 228,  
112 n. 69, 120 nn. 107–108,  
130 n. 165  
*hegemon* 10  
Heinzer, F. 84 nn. 180–181  
Helmer, S. 1 n. 1  
*Henotikon* 46, 70  
Heraclionas the emperor 76  
Heraclius Constantine the emperor 75,  
80  
Heraclius the Elder 57  
Heraclius the emperor 53–55,  
55 nn. 11, 13, 56–58, 58 n. 28, 60, 62,  
62 n. 49, 63, 63 n. 58, 64–67, 69–71,  
71 n. 89, 72–74, 74 n. 115, 75–76, 80,  
80 n. 163, 92, 95–96, 97 n. 250, 102,  
108  
heresy 47, 80, 97 n. 250, 114 n. 77  
  
Herrin, J. 56 n. 17, 84 n. 181  
hesychast controversy 152, 167  
Hesychius Lexicographus 140 n. 230  
Hierapolis 64–66, 94 n. 235, 95  
Hispania 54  
Holy Cross 53, 55, 63  
Holy Lance 55, 73  
Holy Land 73  
Holy Spirit 48, 94, 119, 137, 139  
Holy Sponge 55  
*homousios* 12, 130  
Homs 96  
honey 27  
Honigsmann, E. 35 n. 129, 37 n. 142  
Honorius of Rome 2, 60, 60 n. 39,  
61 n. 43, 62, 67 n. 76, 71, 71 n. 90, 72,  
72 nn. 97–98, 74, 80, 90, 97, 103 n. 1,  
104 nn. 3–4, 119–120, 130, 146, 149,  
164  
honour 12–13, 40  
Hormisdas of Rome 42 n. 157, 43–44,  
47, 47 n. 190  
*Horos* 87, 91, 107 n. 24, 121, 132,  
136 n. 201, 138, 138 n. 210, 145 n. 270,  
155  
horse 39  
hunger 10, 24, 30 n. 104, 34, 50,  
120–121, 147  
Hypatius of Ephesus 47  
  
Ignatius of Antioch 124 n. 125  
ignorance 33, 33 n. 115, 34–35,  
35 n. 127, 36, 38, 134  
Illyricum 54  
imaginary 146  
immortality 26, 30, 48, 161  
immutable 106–107  
impassibility 30 n. 104, 40, 108  
impetus 25  
impulse 9, 28, 128, 147 n. 278  
incarnation 6, 17 nn. 49, 51, 18–19, 21,  
21 n. 73, 25, 27, 29, 32, 32 n. 110, 34,  
39, 46, 129  
incorrupt 29–30  
individuum 88 n. 207  
indwelling 6, 10  
Innocent of Marona 46–47  
instrument 18, 34, 118  
intangibility 24  
intellect 6–7, 9, 118, 147 n. 278,  
148–149  
intouchable 25  
invisible 24–25, 106, 108, 161  
involuntary 27

- Irenaeus of Lyon 88 n. 207, 124,  
     125 n. 136, 148, 148 n. 279  
 iron 51, 119  
 Isaiah the prophet 27  
 Ishoyahb the Catholicos 63–64  
 Islamic 97  
 Isocrates 139 n. 219, 140 n. 230  
 Italy 79, 83
- Jacob Baradeus 50  
 Jacobite 56, 64, 64 n. 63, 95–96  
 Jaeger, G. 147 n. 278  
 Jerusalem 45, 48, 53, 62–64, 71,  
     84 n. 182, 97 n. 250, 108, 164  
 John II Nicaïotes of Alexandria 25  
 John II of Rome 48, 48 n. 199  
 John IV of Rome 2, 58 n. 28, 73 n. 107,  
     75, 78 n. 146, 80  
 John Moschus 109, 109 n. 36,  
     150 n. 295  
 John of Antioch 46  
 John of Beth-Aphthonia 46 n. 187  
 John of Ephesus 35  
 John of Nikiu 54, 57 n. 21, 59 n. 32  
 John of Philadelphia 84 n. 182  
 John of Scythopolis 112 n. 71, 114  
 John Philoponus 116  
 John Rufus 46 n. 184  
 John the abbot 16, 19, 20 n. 65, 114  
 John the Almsgiver 59, 66  
 John the Chamberlain 78  
 John the Damascene 79 n. 154, 111  
 John the deacon 42, 62 n. 46  
 John the Grammarian 16  
 John the Scythian monk 41  
 John V of Constantinople 90  
 John V of Rome 92 n. 216  
 John VI of Constantinople 92,  
     92 n. 222, 93  
 John Zonaras 71 n. 90  
 Judaic 33 n. 116  
 Jugie, M. 50 n. 205  
 Julian of Halicarnassus 16, 28–29,  
     29 nn. 98–99, 30, 38, 40–41,  
     112 n. 71  
 Julianism 5, 41, 101  
 Justin I the emperor 45  
 Justin the martyr 124 n. 126, 148  
 Justinian the emperor 33 n. 116, 35,  
     43, 43 nn. 161–162, 44, 44 nn. 163,  
     165–167, 46–48, 48 n. 199, 49, 59 n. 32,  
     60, 88  
 Justinian II the emperor 91, 92 n. 216
- Kaegi, W. 1, 1 n. 11, 53 n. 1, 54 nn. 3,  
     9–10, 56 nn. 14–15, 57, 57 nn. 21–25,  
     58, 58 n. 27, 63 n. 58, 64 n. 60,  
     66 n. 75, 68 n. 82, 69 n. 83, 71 n. 89,  
     74 n. 115, 75 n. 116, 85 n. 186,  
     96 n. 245  
 Kaukhchishvili, S. 66 n. 74  
*keleusis* 61, 61 n. 45, 71, 71 n. 90  
 Kenny, A. 147 n. 277  
 Khusrau II Parviz 53–54, 56, 63  
 knowledge 27, 30, 32, 34–35, 35 n. 127,  
     36–38, 51, 110, 121, 139  
 Kolb 65  
 Köpstein, H. 1 n. 12  
 Kos 86  
 Kreuzer, G. 72 n. 98, 81 n. 168,  
     83 n. 176  
 Krüger, P. 47 n. 191, 48 nn. 194–197  
*kyrios* 139 n. 219, 141
- Lamoëaux, J. 31 n. 107, 114 nn. 81–82  
 Larchet, J. C. 77 n. 131  
 Latin 33 n. 115, 78 n. 138, 79 n. 151,  
     81 n. 165, 84, 105 n. 15  
 Lazarus 32, 40  
 Lazica 62, 85  
 Lebanese Phoenicia 94 n. 235  
 Lebanon 102  
 Lebon, J. 15 n. 44, 19 nn. 59, 61,  
     20 nn. 65, 67, 38 n. 146, 114,  
     114 n. 80  
 Leclercq, H. 96 n. 241  
 Leo I of Rome 16, 16 n. 47, 17, 43,  
     49–50, 66 n. 73, 72, 105, 122,  
     122 n. 119, 123 nn. 121, 123, 141–142,  
     142 n. 252, 163  
 Leo II of Rome 88 n. 204,  
     91 nn. 212–213  
 Leontius of Byzantium 13, 153  
 Leontius of Jerusalem 20 n. 67  
 Leontius the Scythian monk 41–42  
 leper 18, 25  
 Léthel, F. 125 n. 135, 133, 133 n. 185  
 Liberatus 30, 31 n. 105  
 Liddell, H. 107 n. 25  
 Lietzmann, H. 6 nn. 6–8, 7 nn. 9–12,  
     8 nn. 13–17, 9 nn. 18–20  
*Logos-anthropos* Christology 10  
*Logos-sarx* Christology 10  
 Lombards 72 n. 97  
 Losev, A. 110 n. 48, 147, 147 n. 277  
 Lossky, V. 129 n. 160  
 Lourié, B. 101, 101 n. 269

- Louth, A. 3, 3 n. 17, 5 nn. 2–3,  
77 n. 135, 109 n. 37, 112 n. 71,  
114 n. 80, 134 n. 192, 144 nn. 262,  
266
- Luibhéid, C. 113 n. 76, 114 n. 77
- Luke the monk 87 n. 202
- Lumpe, A. 45 n. 170, 108 n. 35
- Lysias 140 n. 230
- Mabbough 46, 64–65, 95–96
- Macarius of Antioch 2, 74, 85 n. 188,  
87, 87 n. 202, 88, 88 n. 20, 89,  
89 n. 207, 90–91, 97, 100, 104 nn. 3–6,  
9, 118 n. 102, 119, 126 n. 144, 127,  
129–130, 131 n. 174, 143, 160 n. 333,  
162, 165
- Macedonius of Antioch 74, 87 n. 202
- Macedonius of Constantinople  
46 n. 187
- Magi 121
- Maksoudian, K. 65 n. 70
- Malacca 54
- Malouf, G. 95 n. 236
- Manes 30
- Mansi, G. D. 58 n. 28, 75 n. 118,  
78 n. 138, 80 nn. 162, 164, 81 n. 169,  
84 n. 182, 85 n. 188, 87 nn. 195,  
198–199, 91 n. 212, 92 n. 222,  
93 n. 226, 95 n. 237
- Marcellinus the presbyter 31
- Marcellus of Ancyra 27 n. 91
- Marinus the deacon 62
- Marinus the priest 77, 79, 79 n. 152,  
116
- Maritime Phoenicia 94 n. 235
- Maron 96 n. 241
- Maronite 65, 68, 93, 95–96, 96 n. 241,  
97, 97 nn. 248, 250, 98–99, 99 n. 258,  
100–102, 166
- marriage 51, 56, 121
- Martin of Rome 2, 6 n. 5, 81 n. 166,  
83, 83 n. 176, 84, 84 n. 182, 85–86,  
105 n. 15, 113, 114 n. 77, 115, 118,  
122–123, 129, 151, 158 n. 329, 161
- Martina 56, 75–76, 80
- Mas‘ūdī 97 n. 248
- Maspero, J. 50 n. 205
- Matsoukas, N. 134 n. 192
- Maurer, W. 1 n. 1
- Mauritius the Scythian monk 41
- Maxentius the Scythian monk 41,  
45–46
- Maximus of Aquileia 128, 132 n. 175,  
136, 146, 154, 157, 159, 162
- Maximus the Confessor 1, 2, 2 n. 15,  
3, 6 n. 5, 11 n. 30, 14, 14 n. 40, 15,  
58, 58 n. 31, 59, 59 nn. 33–35, 61,  
61 nn. 42, 46, 62, 62 n. 48, 69, 75–76,  
76 n. 126, 77, 77 nn. 130–131, 133,  
78, 78 nn. 138, 140, 142, 144, 146,  
79, 79 nn. 152, 154, 79–80, 80 n. 157,  
81–84, 84 n. 180, 85, 88, 89 n. 207,  
90 n. 210, 97 n. 250, 105 n. 15, 106,  
106 n. 20, 108, 111, 114, 114 n. 77,  
116, 116 n. 92, 117, 119, 123–125,  
125 n. 135, 126, 128–129, 132,  
132 n. 175, 133–134, 134 n. 190,  
135, 136 n. 201, 137, 141–142,  
143 n. 256, 144–147, 149–151, 153,  
155–156, 159–161, 161 n. 342, 164,  
166
- McCambly, R. 8 n. 14
- McCoull, L. 65 n. 67
- McCullough, W. 63 n. 59, 64 n. 62
- McGuckin, J. 42 n. 159
- mediator 25, 55, 120, 139 n. 220
- Melito of Sardes 124 n. 126
- Melkite 59, 96, 96 n. 243, 99
- Menas of Constantinople 58, 59 n. 32,  
61, 63, 88, 90
- Menas 68
- Mesopotamia 53, 66, 73
- Meyendorff, J. 21 n. 73, 23 n. 80,  
24 n. 82, 54 n. 8, 58 n. 29, 60 n. 37,  
64 n. 61, 72 n. 98, 88, 88 n. 206
- Michael the Syrian 65 n. 66, 68 n. 82,  
95, 97 n. 250, 98 n. 251
- Migliardi Zingale, L. 43 nn. 161–162,  
44 nn. 163, 166–167, 48 nn. 194–196,  
49 n. 202
- Migne, J. P. 143 n. 256
- Milan 87
- Million gates 92
- miracle 9, 18, 47, 54, 90, 98, 105,  
114–115, 122, 136, 160
- mixture 18, 20, 106, 114, 123, 125
- mode of existence 144, 144 n. 263
- Moeller, Ch. 5 n. 2, 142 n. 252
- monad 20
- Moorhead, J. 68 n. 82
- Moosa, M. 96 n. 242
- Morony, M. 96 n. 242
- mortality 24
- Moses the prophet 76, 126–127
- motion 6–8, 16, 21, 21 n. 73, 22, 25,  
109–111, 111 n. 65, 124, 155, 158,  
162
- motionless 110

- Mount Sinai 62 n. 46  
 Mtskheta 66  
 Müller, C. 50 nn. 208–209,  
 51 nn. 210–211, 213–214  
 Muslim 71 n. 89, 73, 97 n. 248
- Naironus, F. 98, 98 n. 254  
 Nau, F. 96 n. 241  
 Near East 45–46  
 necessity 40, 147, 154, 158–160, 162  
 Neil, B. 2 n. 15  
 Nemesis of Emesa 88 n. 207  
 neo-Chalcedonianism 3, 5–6, 103, 158,  
 163  
 Neoplatonism 108  
 Nephalius 16  
 Nerses the Catholicos 65–66,  
 66 n. 73  
 Nestorian 14, 14 n. 40, 15, 42, 42 n. 157,  
 46, 63, 98, 134, 137, 163  
 Nestorius of Constantinople 12–13,  
 13 n. 36, 14–15, 18, 42 n. 157, 64 n. 61,  
 99, 136  
*neuma* 126, 162  
 Nicandrus the bishop 77  
 Nicephorus 53 n. 2, 75 n. 117  
 Nikas, A. 58 n. 30  
 Nikiu 53, 57 n. 21  
 Norris, R. 6 n. 6, 8 n. 13, 10 n. 26,  
 138 n. 210, 142 nn. 250–251  
 noun 111, 138  
 nourishment 26  
*nous* 6, 9–10, 39, 124 n. 124, 141, 147,  
 149, 154
- Olympiodorus the deacon 25  
 Olympiodorus 108 n. 32  
 Olympius the exarch 85  
 Olympus 139 n. 219  
 omniscience 35, 35 n. 127, 36, 38  
 one and the same Christ 22, 144, 146,  
 150, 165  
 one incarnate nature 19–20, 22, 34, 36,  
 50, 104, 111  
 oneness 16, 20, 22, 26, 28–29, 103, 107,  
 120, 136, 153  
 One-Who-Acts 135, 157  
 One-Who-Wills 143, 157  
*organon* 17–18, 18 n. 54  
 Origenes 148 n. 279  
 Oulpianus 139  
*ousia* 11–12, 17, 39, 78 n. 142, 109,  
 152–154  
 Owsepian, G. 1, 1 n. 2
- Pact of Alexandria 33, 51, 60, 67,  
 67 n. 77, 68–69, 90, 103, 103 n. 1,  
 104 n. 10, 111–112, 117–118  
 Palestine 53, 69, 81, 83, 83 n. 177, 102,  
 164  
 Pamphilus of Abydos 46 n. 181  
 Pantaleon 84 n. 182  
 Pargoire, J. 93 n. 226  
 Parker, J. 19 n. 57, 112 n. 70  
 paronym 137, 137 n. 209  
*paršopā* 34  
 Pascher, E. 109, 111 n. 65  
 passibility 7  
 passion 7, 26, 129  
 passive 6–8, 28, 34, 109, 111, 121  
*pathetikon* 7  
 Paul II of Constantinople 2, 36, 76,  
 78 n. 145, 80 n. 159, 81, 81 nn. 166,  
 169, 82, 84, 90, 93, 104 n. 13, 104 n. 9,  
 107 n. 29, 126, 126 n. 144, 136 n. 202,  
 143 n. 257, 146, 160, 160 n. 334,  
 162 n. 346  
 Paul of Antioch 50  
 Paul of Thessalonica 84 n. 182  
 Paul the apostle 11–12  
 Paul the monk 95 n. 237  
 Paul the One-Eyed 58, 60–61, 61 n. 45,  
 62  
 Pelagian controversy 149 n. 285  
 Pelikan, J. 5 n. 2, 64 n. 61, 113 n. 76,  
 114 n. 77, 125 n. 136  
 Pelusium 53  
*pentarchy* 74, 86, 164  
*perichoresis* 116  
 Persia 53, 53 n. 2, 54, 54 nn. 7–8,  
 55 n. 11, 56–58, 62–63, 64 n. 63, 67,  
 69, 73  
 Peter Mongus 70  
 Peter of Constantinople 85–86,  
 89 n. 207, 90, 93  
 Peter of Nicomedia 89  
 Peter the Archdeacon 62  
 Peter the Iberian 46  
 Peter the Illustis 70 n. 85, 78, 84 n. 182  
 Petrosian, E. 65 n. 72  
 Phasis 62  
 Pheidias, V. 5 n. 1, 74, 86, 91, 134 n. 192  
 Philagrius 75  
 Philippicus the emperor 92  
 Philoxenus of Mabbough 46  
 Phokas the emperor 53, 55  
 Photius of Constantinople 71, 71 n. 93  
*physis* 13, 20 n. 65, 35 n. 127, 39, 42,  
 96, 101

- Pierres, J. 81  
 Pindarus 138 n. 214, 139 n. 218,  
 140 n. 231  
 Pinggéra, K. 50 n. 207  
 Plato 109, 109 n. 41, 138 n. 214,  
 139 n. 219, 140 n. 230  
 Plutarchus 139 n. 216  
*pneuma* 6  
 Polychronius the monk 90–91  
 Polyenergism, 120  
 Porphyry 108 n. 31, 109, 137  
 Pospelov, D. 125 n. 135  
 possibility 30 n. 104  
 prayer 66 n. 73, 146–147  
 Presocratics 109 n. 38  
 Prestige, G. 6 n. 6  
 Probus of Chalcidon 108 n. 35  
 Proclus of Constantinople 42, 45,  
 45 n. 170, 46, 158  
 Proconsularia 80 n. 159  
 properties-in-the-plural 22, 24, 40  
 property-in-the-singular 22–23, 40  
*prosopon* 11–15, 47, 94, 150  
*prytanis* 138, 139 n. 219, 140–141  
*Psephos* 70–71, 76, 76 n. 126, 77 n. 130,  
 85, 119  
 Pulsfort, E. 80 n. 160  
 Pyrrhus of Constantinople 2, 14–15,  
 73, 75–78, 78 n. 146, 79, 79 n. 151,  
 80–81, 81 n. 169, 84, 90, 93, 104 n. 3,  
 113 n. 75, 106, 113, 123, 126, 132–134,  
 136, 146, 150, 152–153, 155, 158–159,  
 165  
 Qādi ‘Abdalġabbār 97 n. 248  
*qnomā* 34  
 quaternity 99  
 Ra’s al-‘Ayn 53  
 Raven, Ch. 6 n. 6  
 Ravenna 72 n. 97, 79, 83, 85  
 Reichert, R. 13 n. 36, 73 n. 105  
 Reinink, G. 1 n. 12  
 resurrection 26, 29 n. 97, 94, 121  
 revelation 12, 14, 121  
 Rhodes 86  
 Richard, M. 45 n. 170, 46, 158 n. 326  
 Riedinger, R. 1, 71 n. 92, 82, 82 n. 171,  
 84, 84 nn. 180–181, 166  
 Riedmatten, H. de 6 n. 6  
 Rissberger, J. 87 n. 202  
 Rome 42–45, 47, 49, 71, 72 n. 97, 74,  
 79, 79 n. 151, 81–83, 85–87, 91–92,  
 164  
 Rorem, P. 31 n. 107, 113 n. 76,  
 114 nn. 77, 81–82  
 Rosenbaum, H.-U. 28 n. 95  
 Roueché, M. 108 n. 31, 109 n. 37  
 Sabellius 156  
*sacra* 87, 91 nn. 212–213, 92–93  
 Salamis 62 n. 49  
 Salibi, K. 98 n. 252  
 Sansterre, J. M. 83 n. 178  
 Sardinia 42  
 Schönborn, Ch. 61 n. 46, 69 n. 84,  
 71 nn. 91, 93, 84 nn. 180–181,  
 144 nn. 263–264, 152, 152 nn. 304,  
 306  
 Schurr, V. 46, 46 n. 183  
 Schwartz, E. 42 n. 158, 44 n. 168,  
 45 n. 173  
 Scott, R. 107 n. 25  
 Scythia 41–42, 42 n. 157, 43–47  
 Scythian monks 43–44  
 Sebeos 65 nn. 70–71, 66 n. 73  
 Septimius Severus 94 n. 235  
 Sergius Grammarian 40 n. 153  
 Sergius of Arsenoë 58 n. 30, 59  
 Sergius of Constantinople 2, 36, 55,  
 55 n. 13, 56, 58, 58 n. 28, 59, 59 n. 33,  
 60, 60 n. 39, 61, 61 nn. 43, 45, 62–63,  
 67, 67 nn. 76, 78, 70–71, 71 n. 90,  
 72, 72 nn. 96, 98, 73–74, 74 n. 108,  
 75–76, 76 n. 126, 80, 84, 89 n. 207, 90,  
 92–93, 101–102, 103 n. 1, 104 nn. 3–4,  
 10, 13, 113, 113 n. 72, 119, 133, 135,  
 136 n. 202, 149  
 Sergius of Jerusalem 74  
 Sergius of Reishaina 112 n. 71  
 Sergius son of Mansour 97 n. 250  
 Sergius the Grammarian 16, 22–23, 38,  
 38 n. 146, 39, 40–41  
 Severan 3, 16, 28, 30–31, 33–35, 38,  
 40–42, 44, 47–51, 56–57, 63–64, 67–68,  
 68 n. 82, 69, 71, 93, 101–102, 117, 153,  
 163–164  
 Severinus of Rome 80  
 Severus of Antioch 3, 5, 15–16,  
 16 n. 47, 17, 17 nn. 49, 51, 18, 18 n. 54,  
 19, 19 n. 60, 20, 20 nn. 63–64, 67,  
 21, 21 n. 73, 22–23, 23 n. 79, 24–25,  
 25 n. 88, 26–27, 27 n. 91, 28–29,  
 29 nn. 97–98, 30, 30 nn. 101–102, 31,  
 31 n. 107, 32, 32 n. 110, 34, 35 n. 127,  
 36, 38, 40, 40 n. 154, 41, 46, 46 n. 187,  
 50, 74 n. 115, 101, 112 n. 71, 113, 114,  
 117

- Severus of Ushmunain 54 n. 7,  
     68 nn. 79, 81  
 Shahrbarāz 55, 63  
 Sherwood, P. 76 nn. 126–127,  
     77 nn. 130–131, 133–134, 136–137,  
     78 nn. 138–146, 149, 79 nn. 151–154,  
     79–80 n. 157, 85 nn. 183–184,  
     88 n. 207, 112 n. 71  
 Sicily 79  
 sin 7, 12, 39, 50, 99–100, 104, 127–131,  
     135, 143–144, 146, 154, 157  
 sinless 7  
 Sisebut 54  
 slave 7  
 Slavs 54, 56  
 sleep 94  
 Smyrna 86  
 Socrates 139 n. 217  
 Sodini, J. P. 62 nn. 49–50  
 solar eclipse 121  
 Solomon of Cleneus 89  
 Son 10, 27, 29, 32, 38, 48, 50, 94, 98,  
     112, 124, 129 n. 160, 131, 139 n. 220,  
     142, 148, 157  
 Sophronius of Jerusalem 2, 6 n. 5, 61,  
     61–62 n. 46, 62, 62 n. 47, 69, 69 n. 84,  
     70–72, 72 n. 98, 74, 83, 85, 88 n. 207,  
     89, 103, 106, 108–110, 114–115, 120,  
     120 n. 109, 121–122, 122 n. 119, 124,  
     126, 130, 135, 138, 140–142, 144,  
     150–152, 154, 159, 160–162, 166  
 soul 8, 10, 18, 22–23, 26, 28–29, 35, 40  
 species 153–154  
 spirit 6, 8, 8 n. 16, 16, 27, 29  
 static 8, 20, 29 n. 99, 138  
 Stephan of Dora 82, 83, 88 n. 207  
 Stephan of Siunik 112 n. 71  
 Stephan the deacon 31  
 Stephan the Monothelite 88, 88 n. 204,  
     89, 90–91, 131 n. 174  
 Stephan the neoplatonist 108, 108 n. 35,  
     109, 111, 124, 150  
 Stephanides, B. 96 n. 242  
 Stoicism 10  
 Stoics 111 n. 65  
 Stolte, B. 1 n. 12  
 Stratos, A. 1, 1 n. 9  
 Suchla, B. R. 114 n. 81  
 Suermann, H. 95 nn. 236, 239,  
     96 nn. 241, 243, 245–246  
 suffering 9  
 sweat 11, 40  
 sword 119  
*symphony* 56, 163–164  
*symphyia* 18, 116  
*symploke* 27  
 Synesius 140  
 synonym 19 n. 60, 20, 137, 137 n. 209,  
     139 n. 219, 140 n. 230  
*synthesis* 20  
 Syria 2 n. 15, 30 n. 104, 33 n. 115,  
     45, 53, 56, 58, 59 n. 32, 61, 61 n. 46,  
     62 n. 48, 64 n. 63, 68, 73, 89 n. 207,  
     93–94, 94 n. 235, 95, 95 n. 237,  
     96–97, 98 n. 250, 99 n. 258, 100, 102,  
     108 n. 31, 112 n. 71  
*tamias* 138, 138 n. 214–215, 139,  
     139 nn. 219–220, 140–141  
*tautokinetos* 6  
 Tbilisi 66  
 tear 11  
 Tella 53  
 temporal 104, 108  
 Tetz, M. 27 n. 91  
 Thalassius the abbot 78  
 Thanner, A. 72 n. 97  
 theandric 6, 19, 19 n. 61, 20 n. 67,  
     31, 31 n. 107, 32, 34, 38, 40, 51, 75,  
     111–112, 112 nn. 70–71, 113–118, 120,  
     123, 125–126, 137, 165  
 Themistius the deacon 30, 30 n. 104,  
     31, 31 n. 107, 32, 32 n. 110, 33–35,  
     38  
 Theodora the empress 37, 88  
 Theodore Kalliopas the exarch 85  
 Theodore of Alexandria 50  
 Theodore of Esbus 84 n. 182  
 Theodore of Melitene 89  
 Theodore of Mopsuestia 3, 5, 9–15, 64,  
     101  
 Theodore of Pharan 2, 58, 58 n. 30, 59,  
     61, 84, 90, 118, 165  
 Theodore of Raithu 58 n. 30, 165  
 Theodore of Rome 2, 62, 79, 80 n. 159,  
     81, 81 nn. 166, 169, 83, 83 n. 177, 160,  
     104 nn. 9, 13, 107 n. 29, 126 n. 144,  
     136 n. 202, 160 n. 334  
 Theodore the deacon 78 n. 145  
 Theodore the monk 33 n. 115  
 Theodoret of Cyrus 12, 140  
 Theodorou, A. 40 n. 154  
 Theodosiopolis 60, 65–66  
 Theodosius of Alexandria 30 n. 104,  
     33–34, 34 n. 119, 35–37, 50–51, 117  
 Theodosius the emperor 57  
 Theopaschism 41–46, 46 n. 183, 47–49,  
     60, 111

- Theophanes 54, 55 n. 11, 56 n. 16,  
 57 n. 21, 71 n. 90, 80 n. 162, 92 n. 222  
 Theophanes of Antioch 90  
 Theophylact Simocatta 57 n. 21  
 Thessalonica 54, 84 n. 182  
 thirst 10, 24, 34, 50, 120–121, 147  
 Thomas II of Constantinople 90  
 Thomson, R. 112 n. 71  
 Thrace 85  
 Thucydides 139 n. 216, 140 n. 230  
 Thunberg, L. 5 n. 2, 6 n. 5, 106 n. 20,  
 134 n. 192  
 Tilly, M. 72 n. 97  
 Timothy of Alexandria 31  
 Timothy the Patriarch 14 n. 40  
 tiredness 10, 34, 120  
 tomb 121  
 Torrance, I. 21 nn. 68–70, 22 nn. 75–76,  
 23 nn. 77–79, 81, 38 n. 146, 24 n. 83,  
 25 nn. 84, 87, 39 nn. 147, 151,  
 40 nn. 152–153  
 Torrey, Ch. 69 n. 83  
 touchable 25, 29 n. 97, 106, 161  
 Trebizond 48  
 Trifolius presbyter 42, 42 n. 158  
 Trinity 34, 46–48, 99, 112, 124, 130,  
 137, 144, 152, 154, 157–158  
*Trisagion* 62 n. 46, 97 n. 250  
*Typos* 81–84, 86, 89, 144–145  
 Tyre 94 n. 235
- Ujarma 66  
 unbodily 29, 106  
 unchangeable 23, 130, 153, 160, 165  
 uncircumscribed 106  
 uncreated 106, 122–123, 159–161  
 United States 102  
 unlimited 24  
 unmingled 34  
 untouchable 106, 161  
 Uthemann, K. H. 2, 5 n. 2, 55 n. 12,  
 56 nn. 14, 20, 72 n. 98, 83 n. 177
- Vailhé, S. 96 n. 241  
 Van Roey, A. 33 nn. 114–116,  
 36 n. 133  
 Vandals 42  
 Vaux, B. 97 n. 248  
 vehicle 18, 25 n. 88  
 verb 110–111, 138  
 Verdenius, W. 109  
 Victor of Carthago 80 n. 159  
 Vigilius of Rome 58, 59 n. 32, 88, 90
- Virgin 48, 98, 104, 121  
 virginity 121  
 visible 12, 22, 24–25, 36, 106, 108, 161  
 Visigothic 54  
 Vitalian of Rome 86  
 Vitalian the general 42  
 voice 11, 18, 25 n. 88, 120–121  
 Voisin, G. 6 n. 6  
 Vööbus, A. 95 n. 238
- walk 94  
 Waszink, H. 109  
 water 29 n. 97, 121  
 Wesseling, K. G. 9 n. 21  
 Westerink, L. 108 nn. 32–33, 35  
 Wigram, W. 15 n. 44  
 Wildberg, Ch. 108 n. 32  
 wine 51, 121  
 Winkelmann, F. 1, 1 n. 8, 5 n. 2,  
 55 n. 12, 58 nn. 30–31, 59 nn. 32–34,  
 60 n. 39, 61 nn. 42–46, 62 nn. 47–48,  
 52–53, 63 nn. 54–55, 57, 64 n. 63–65,  
 65 n. 71, 66 n. 73, 67 nn. 77–78,  
 69 n. 84, 70 n. 86, 71 nn. 90, 92,  
 72 nn. 97–98, 73 nn. 101, 104–107,  
 74 nn. 108–110, 75 nn. 118–119,  
 76 nn. 121–124, 126–127, 77 nn.  
 130–131, 133, 136–137, 78 nn.  
 138–149, 79 nn. 151–157, 80 nn. 159,  
 161–164, 81 nn. 165–169, 82 n. 172,  
 83 nn. 176–178, 84 nn. 179, 182,  
 85 nn. 183–184, 187–189, 86 nn.  
 190–192, 87 nn. 194, 195–196,  
 198–202, 88 n. 203, 88–89 n. 207,  
 90 n. 208, 210, 91 n. 212, 215,  
 92 nn. 216–217, 219–222, 224,  
 93 nn. 226–227, 229
- Wirth, P. 1 n. 7  
 wisdom 32, 35–36, 126, 139–140, 159  
 womb 98, 121  
 wood 17 n. 51  
 worship 9, 12–13, 121
- Xenodor 111  
 Xenophon 140 n. 230
- Yarmūk 73
- Zalta, E. N. 108 n. 32  
 Zeno the emperor 44, 46, 70  
 Zeus 138 n. 214, 139 n. 219, 140  
 Zeuxippus' baths 90  
 Zoilus of Alexandria 49